PRESENT:

Facilitator: Cheryl Chappell-Long, OVPCC-APAPA
Attendees: Chancellors - Noreen Yamane (HAW); Vice Chancellors- Russell Uyeno (HON), Louise Pagotto (KAP), Jim Dire (KAU), David Grooms (MAU), Richard Fulton (WIN); Div Chair/Dept Chair - Joel Tanabe (HAW), Ron Takahashi (KAP); IR - Jon Kalk (KAU), Guy Nishimoto (LEE); OVPCC Sam Prather, Suzette Robinson

Continuing Business

- After welcomes and introductions Cheryl Chappell-Long reviewed the UHCC 5.202 Review of Established Programs basic policy and attachments and the language on annual and comprehensive program reviews. She stated there were a few procedural updates this year which included placing the Academic Support Program template online and developing a scoring rubric for the Remedial/Developmental report and providing space on the template for program Student Learning Outcomes.

- There was some discussion on the importance particularly to accreditation of placing program Student Learning Outcomes (SLOs) in the online templates. There were questions/discussion as to the utility of SLOs in non-instructional program reports.

- There were questions and discussion as to the mechanics of the on-line tool. The “time-out”/saving issue is solved by creating text in WORD and then copy and save. APAPA provided a review of who had access to the online reports for editing.

New Business

- Development of Scoring Rubric for Academic Support Services. Following discussion, about the metrics now being used, the I-PRC decided that they see a real value in taking a step back and looking at these health indicators. How well do they align with what we need to measure for accreditation? How much of this information is useful in making decisions on budget for these endeavors? Are there other measures that would be more useful for decision-making? The IRPC anticipates calling together the campuses for a robust discussion on these questions. The Vice Chancellor reps will ask each of the Vice Chancellors Academic Affairs to have the appropriate folks have their own discussion first to get a sense of what metrics would be useful to the
campus. The system can then come together to see what commonalities exist and what else we want to include. The systemwide meeting will likely be scheduled for some time in the spring, to give campuses time to have their preliminary discussion. Following a review of the metrics, a scoring rubric is still needed.

- Review of the ARPD process for effectiveness. Consensus that the process is working. Items for further discussion:
  - Scoring Rubric
    - Liberal Arts – general comments were that the Demand element needs to be revisited. VCAAs will be asked to review.
    - Colleges with AAs in specific disciplines (e.g. Natural Science, Hawaiian Studies) need to discuss whether or not these are separate “programs” or are part of Liberal Arts. VCAAs will be asked to review.
    - Group also discussed reviewing the new and replacement positions element, as some programs were unhealthy in Demand and Effectiveness because they were not providing sufficient graduates to fill the openings. Brief discussion followed regarding the re-alignment of Standard Occupational Classification (SOC) codes to the program Classification of Instructional Program (CIP) codes resulting in some changes for this year.
    - Questions raised by a Vice Chancellor Student Services regarding the Remedial Developmental measures with accelerated classes. APAPA discussed this issue with the Rem/Dev group earlier in the semester and changes were made. APAPA will meet again with the group.

What’s On Your Mind?

- Next meeting – APAPA will find a time in early spring 2013.