System wide AMS Working Group 11-09-2015 Meeting Minutes

Present:
Reshela Dupuis from Hawaii CC, Eric Engh from UH Maui, Yao Hill from UH Manoa, Jacque Honda from UH West Oahu, Pat McGrath from Kauai CC, Joanne Itano from UH System, Bob Ming from Kapi‘olani CC, John McKee from UH Maui, Jan Lubin from Windward CC

Agenda:
1. Approve the minutes
2. Brainstorm goals (short-term and long term) for the group
   Yao: short term: AMS system; long term: peer support
   Pat: short term: AMS system; long term: peer support
   Jan: short term: AMS system; Long term: meet as assessment coordinators
   Bob: short term: having AMS system was crucial to resolving accreditation recommendations, important for campuses and for the system--having each campus pass accreditation is also important for the accreditation
   Reshela: system bear some responsibility to meet accreditation on each campus.

Interest in home-grown system: support is great to maintenance, server, build system, personnel, the person may not stay with the system. Not sustainable. unable to dedicate personnel. unable to provide training.

Support, continuity, scaffolding that is important.

Joanne: curriculum central to Kuaili supported by an organization. Lesson learned: need to bring ITS right now.

Peer support is short-term and long-term as the assessment coordinators

Notion of support -- require Assessment Coordinator on campus just for TaskStream
Kapiolani CC -- Hired an assessment coordinator whose partial responsibility is to work with faculty training them using the system
WCC -- provided workshops on modification
Pat -- if there is a new system, if already requires a point person. We can ask software to provide training.
We can look for positions on campus. Be explicit.
Jan -- Funds from UHCC system is available
Bob -- once the AMS system is in place, part of the training would be applying what you are teaching them and inputting it in the software. Faculty committee can help too.

Two themes:
1. support is needed no matter what
2. can engage willing faculty

The group can come up with clear recommendation of financial cost, in terms of both software and personnel time.

3. Brainstorm the advantages/challenges for a systemwide software solution and possible scenarios

4. Brainstorm the information and process each campus needs to move the conversation forward
Procurement process:
Win CC: Sandbox accounts
Pat: live demo and have faculty to meet with consultants
Reshela: sandbox
Jacque: ready to make a decision
Why are campuses interested in systemwide effort?

- Cost savings and student centered – students transfer among UH campuses;
- subscription can be carried across campuses; same system, familiarity with use as faculty teach across campuses;
- helpful to students to have one system.
- For CTE programs, can link external competencies so faculty can demonstrate the extent students have met these external competencies.
- Finally, assessment is significant part of accreditation

Challenges

- significant front-end cost in terms of personnel hours (inputting outcomes and assessments, developing rubrics, inputting them, training faculty to use, etc);
- Continuing on-campus IT and Instructional Design support for faculty and students and to administrate the system;
- Financial outlay by students, campus, or both.