Assessment Subcommittee on Data and Program Review Minutes

1. Date/Time/Location: April 9, 2013, 11:05 a.m. – 12:47 p.m., Bldg 6 Admin Conference Room

2. Attended

Steven Shigemoto     Sally Dunan
Russell Uyeno      Jim Poole
Pat Patterson

3. Discussion

A. Minutes of 10/26/12 approved as submitted.

B. Elliott Higa in an email to Steve dated 11/05/12 stated that he was discontinuing participation on this subcommittee. There was discussion about possibly seeking a replacement from FSEC or a Tech I representative from the Assessment Committee, though no definitive conclusion was reached. Members felt that the current composition of the subcommittee was capable of continuing without a sixth member.

C. Jim asked about the status of ACCJC’s recommendations for the UHCC system and Russell responded that he was taking the lead at the Instructional Program Review Council (IPRC) for a review of CTE programs on the Annual Report of Program Data (ARPD). For the first part of this review he has requested feedback from CTE Deans throughout the system. Russell added that Louise Pagotto from Kapiolani CC was spearheading the effort to review Academic Support/IT and Charles Sasaki, also from Kapiolani CC, was focusing on Liberal Arts. Jim asked whether these efforts would impact the upcoming ARPD and Russell responded that since feedback is currently being solicited any changes adopted by the IPRC would not take place in time for the 2012-2013 ARPD.

Steve explained that what was included in the “Majors Exploration” handout (emailed 4/1/13) represented a slight departure from the intended direction after the 10/26 meeting. At that time, the sample reporting structure was to be populated with possible measures with the specific aim of attempting to identify point or range thresholds at which program performance was concerning. The intent was to define, for example, three discrete demand measures and attempt to combine them into a rubric for a health range.

For sake of discussion, and due to the timing of the meeting, 2012-2013 program data was included so that four years instead of three were evaluated. Three programs each from the Tech 1 and Tech 2 divisions were selected and overall totals were derived from these six programs. It was envisioned that this total could eventually consist of all programs in a division and/or of all CTE programs as a basis for comparison. The data measures included in “Majors Exploration” were based on some of the previously discussed items (unduplicated annual declared majors, unduplicated annual majors in program courses, new majors, etc.).
Steve stated that although “Majors Exploration” did not produce selectable measures, in the spirit of the directive managed to identify a number of possibilities not previously considered. For example, instead of employing year-to-year differences, percentage changes were calculated between a program’s most recent data (2012-2013) and both the initial year of data (2009-2010) and the four-year mean. Furthermore, these individual program percentages were placed in the larger context of what was occurring with the total group of six programs.

The subcommittee members generally favored having an additional year of comparison and utilizing averages and a comparison with a larger grouping. Using the average had the effect of mitigating sometimes extreme year-to-year changes in favor of a more generalized trend. Similarly, comparison with the total group’s changes, a proxy for division or all CTE program performance, served to better assess a given program’s performance.

During discussion one of the issues that arose was the prescription of program health in the ARPD prior to the programs reviewing the data. This seemed to leave unfulfilled the self-assessment required by accreditation. It was agreed that programs would discuss a campus-developed program review with their respective Division Chair and Dean before any determinations are made.

Pat noted that establishing a performance range would be helpful to see the capacity of a program through high- and low-demand periods. A program like EIMT has a relatively small percentage of total declared majors taking program courses, which might be something to investigate further; program capacity might need to be expanded depending on costs, or there could also be a counseling/student services issue.

Pat asked if the subcommittee’s efforts were constrained by data availability and Steve replied that this wasn’t an obstacle to further progress in developing a program review structure.

4. Decisions

Members agreed that the subcommittee would 1) forward a summary of what has been discussed to the Assessment Committee for discussion/action, and 2) continue to work on program review issues and build upon prior definitions/analyses/discussions.

5. Next actions

Steve will draft the aforementioned summary for review by members before transmittal. Steve will also continue developing data measures and analyses for the next meeting.