Notes

Present: Ross, Ron, Erika, Jon, Suzette, Cheryl, Guy, Kathy, Peter, Richard, Doug, Mona, Sam.

Old Business

TABLED 10/16/08: Liberal Arts Program Review & Demand Measures:
Subcommittee met in the summer & end of October. Demand measures related
to workforce for Liberal Arts don’t exist. Impacts the overall health calls.
Perhaps using longitudinal data: % change over time in majors and % change in
applications. Set benchmarks to variation over time (check after 3 years).
Effectiveness measure: unduplicated (degrees + certificates + transfers)/majors;
need to calibrate across 7 colleges. LBART not really a major (default, pre-
majors). Idea: use a subset of majors as the denominator (i.e. those whose
intention it is to transfer). If we COULD have a means to identify the students’
educational goals, this would be helpful (long history of efforts in this area).
Promise: Richard will coordinate the compilation of the AA degree data in
these measures.

Action: Use existing measures: 2 efficiency, 1 effectiveness. Cheryl’s
Office will review LBART health & distribute.

Report from Doug’s Group on aligning Comprehensive program review and
annual program review data elements: Summer 09, met with a subset of
committee, Shawn Flood, Cheryl, Louise, Doug, Guy. UHCCP 5.202. Will create
a simplified version. Seven components of Sec 7 are the most immediately of
interest. Should be included in template for all UHCCs. Not been updated. New
data elements still in flux. Suggested changes: VII (A). include program SLOs &
description; (B) .E.g. strategic plan, industry trends, advisory, external factors. C.
SLOs, trends on key measures. (D) is OK. (E) licensure, (F) add SLO data, (G)
as is. Efficiency needs to be re-examined. Timeline: over the course of this next
year.
Promise: Doug will coordinate the update and present the revised proposal
to UHCC IPRC early in the Spring for sharing with the campuses & review
by UHCC IPRC at Spring meeting.
New Business

1. Recalibrating benchmarks, based on Fall 2009 rubric and new data on Fall-Spring enrollment:
   Effectiveness: #20/#2 is impossible, even if pro rated. may be removed from the program review for further review. Ignore this calculation.


3. Academic Support Program Review Report: needs "blessing" so that it can be recommended for approval, benchmarks? Second iteration. Some revision to the data elements. Need to talk about benchmarks. No measures of impact of library instruction, technology, etc. on student learning. Identify key data elements and set benchmarks. Start thinking about a possible distinction between annual and comprehensive. Need to help support units with professional development.
   Peter will research assessment methodologies for outcomes for academic support.

4. What gets included in the Cost per SSH? How is the information obtained? A+B+C, from Admin Services. Ken Kato, confirmed for DOIS.

5. ETC Program Review: Need comparable report for ETC. This year, shared the academic program rubric. Group endorses the report & benchmarks.

6. Scheduling the Spring 2010 Meeting: March 11, 2010. 1:00-4:00

7. What's on your mind?
   Suzette: data elements, persistence for nursing students is impacted because they graduate in Fall.

HOMEWORK for Spring meeting: identify those data elements required by BOR or executive policy that are no longer relevant;

Remedial/Developmental review. This is the first year that they’ve had data to look at. By spring they may also have some ideas on if their measures work and possible benchmarks

AGENDA for Spring: Look at removing the graduates from the denominator for persistence.

Majors/BOR Faculty can be problematic.