Assessment Subcommittee on Data and Program Review Minutes

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

2. Attended

Steven Shigemoto    Sally Dunan
Pat Patterson       Elliott Higa
Russell Uyeno      Jim Poole

3. Discussion

The subcommittee was faced with a continuum of choices from which to select its scope of responsibility. For simplicity, its reporting concept was chosen based on three manifestly discrete options:

A. Basic changes to the Annual Reports of Program Data (ARPD)
B. More radical changes to the ARPD to streamline its structure
C. Development of a process and reporting structure for program review without regard to the content and limitations of the ARPD.

In considering either of the first two options, it was surmised that an indefinite period of time would lapse before any recommended changes, even relatively small ones, would materialize in the ARPD. Inasmuch as the third option may be dovetailed into the comprehensive five-year program review, the campus has the ability to develop and use its own reporting structure to effect change for annual evaluations. Instead of making data available to a rotation of three to four programs every year, the idea was for all data to be available to all programs—even those not writing a comprehensive review.

All members agreed that they would like the result of these subcommittee meetings to be a reporting apparatus that is:

A. Useful for program improvement
B. Transparent, with accurate and verifiable data
C. Flexible, customizable to program needs

Members also generally agreed that a different health call structure was necessary if the subcommittee were to continue utilizing one. The preference was to preserve a program score over a range of values so that relative performance is preserved. It was generally believed that the terminology using healthy/cautionary/unhealthy judgments served to not only suppress important detail (e.g., if a program was “cautionary”, was it within a few points of “healthy” or closer to “unhealthy” status?), but also unnecessarily provoke an emotional and perhaps counterproductive reaction from program faculty.

Lastly, in recognition of and response to general campus criticism of the ARPD, the subcommittee members regard this work a positive statement and important contribution to assessment at Honolulu Community College.
4. Decisions

A. Based on the preceding considerations, the subcommittee will endeavor to develop a new reporting structure for program evaluation as well as to supplement the information contained in the ARPD.
B. Subcommittee members will review data measures from the ARPD and prepare to discuss systematically and in detail their preferred definition(s) and use(s) in this revised reporting structure.

5. Next actions

The next subcommittee meeting will focus on program majors and defining and using this data point by itself and in other metrics. This should occupy at least another meeting, but the subcommittee may move on to another topic, time providing. Steve will put together a document prior to the meeting that incorporates additional data alternatives and potential metrics. Hopefully this provides contextual support and focuses efforts towards the overarching objective.