Assessment Subcommittee on Data and Program Review Minutes

1. Date/Time/Location: October 26, 2012, 11:50 a.m. – 12:40 p.m., Bldg 27-207

2. Attended

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

3. Discussion

A. Minutes of 4/17/12 approved as submitted.

B. Pat Patterson’s absence due to sabbatical was noted. Pat stated his preference to continue receiving materials and follow the subcommittee’s progress and attend in-person as time allowed. Elliott Higa via email communicated the difficulty of attending meetings this semester due to his schedule. Due to the intensive and cumulative nature of the program review material, Steve asked if absences posed a problem, though it was likely at most two meetings would be held this fall semester. It was agreed that they both could continue attending meetings without posing undue difficulty for themselves or the subcommittee’s work. However, Elliott’s status on the subcommittee as a representative of FSEC was questioned as he is no longer a member of that body. It was determined that Elliott was welcome if he decided to rejoin the group in the spring. Moreover, the members noted that any interested parties were welcome to attend and participate in the subcommittee. Should Elliott discontinue his participation, the subcommittee may seek another representative from the FSEC.

C. Steve explained that although the 10/03/12 Data Items report was highly detailed, the essential points were to illustrate the myriad options in terms of data definitions and to encourage the group to understand the importance of sequence and primacy of an overarching evaluation system.

Members thought it was interesting to include some of the proposed additional detail for the major count and how it might be useful to see how students flow through the system and if there were issues with programs attracting new majors. Sally pointed out that a new reporting structure could potentially separate student outcomes (majors, degrees, etc.) from the items that pertain to management information (costs, estimated revenue).

The group felt that it would employ strategies to eventually further this process, including vetting this through the relevant campus constituencies to ensure the data and analyses are used appropriately, then possibly introducing the results to other UHCC campuses to build support for incorporating systemic changes into the ARPD.

Although the specificity of a health call rubric has yet to be established, members expressed optimism that these details could later be developed in a rubric that is consistent and logical, yet flexible enough to accommodate the uniqueness of individual programs.
4. Decision

The subcommittee members agreed to proceed by first examining potential rubric/evaluation systems and determining how well the data selected for them inform program performance.

5. Next actions

Steve will contact Elliott Higa to ask about his intentions for subcommittee attendance in Spring 2012 and beyond.

Steve will put together a document that builds upon the sample reporting structure at the end of the 10/03/12 Data Items report. It should include sample data from a handful of programs and be placed in a side-by-side comparison with the ARPD data and health call rubric as practicable. One or more reporting structures are possible and should include discussion of a rubric containing data point or range thresholds and/or incorporate trend data and statistical results (% changes, standard deviation, etc.). The document will be distributed prior to the next subcommittee meeting for further discussion/action.