Assessment Subcommittee on Data and Program Review

Date/Time/Location: April 17, 2012, 10:00 a.m. – 11:00 a.m., Bldg 6-101

Agenda

1. Formation

One of the key tasks and responsibilities of the Assessment Committee is to "provide a forum for discussion and agreement of all sectors of the College regarding standards, templates, and policies related to assessment activities to include annual assessment and program review."

To comply with this mandate, the Assessment Subcommittee on Data and Program Review has been created to discuss data and program review issues in greater breadth and depth than would be possible in the parent committee. The subcommittee will meet, discuss its findings, and make recommendations to the Assessment Committee for further action.

2. Membership

Assessment Committee
Steven Shigemoto, subcommittee chair
Pat Patterson
Russell Uyeno
Jim Poole

External members
Sally Dunan
Elliott Higa

3. Scope

Decide between at least three competing possibilities:

A. For the Annual Reports of Program Data (ARPD), investigate data definitions and health call rubric calculations, and make recommendations to improve the accuracy and appropriateness within the context of that report. Example: Request that majors for the academic year be defined as the unduplicated fall and spring semester count rather than half of the duplicated total.

B. For the Annual Reports of Program Data (ARPD), suggest more radical changes to streamline its structure. Example: Remove extraneous data from the reports that do not affect the health calls such as the distribution of SSH between majors and non-majors, FTE enrollment, number of withdrawals and successful course completion. Recommend additions or subtractions to the health call rubric such as Cost/SSH or Analytic FTE Faculty/FTE BOR Appointed Faculty.

C. Develop a process and reporting structure for program review without regard to the content and limitations of the ARPD. Example: The subcommittee decides on four or five levels of health calls instead of three, and what these levels mean on a practical level. Perhaps the subcommittee decides to develop a different scale of measurement or abandons a grading system altogether. Suggest restricting a re-engineered program review to 10-12 relevant data points that may be completely different from those in the ARPD.

4. Process

The subsequent task for subcommittee members will vary greatly depending on the scope that is chosen. It may start with reviewing in detail specific data points in the ARPD or perhaps with taking a broader philosophical approach to what program review is supposed to accomplish.