

UHCC IPRC
March 29, 2007

Attending: Mary Goya (HAW), Steve Shigemoto (HON), Guy Nishimoto, Louise Pagotto, Ron Takahashi (KAP), Molly Summers, Steven Wong (KAU), Manny Cabral, Mike Pecsok (LEE), Suzette Robinson, Clyde Sakamoto (MAU), Linka Mulikin (WIN), Cheryl Chappell-Long, flo wiger, Sam Prather (OVPC).

Clyde requested that best practices be added to the agenda.

1. Doug's memo on behalf of the DOI/ADOIs dated February 20, 2007 to John M. was reviewed. Discussion of ACCJC's request for data on Student Learning Outcomes to be on each institution's annual report to ACCJC. Discussion that with ACCJC asking for this information on an annual basis, the consensus was to use ACCJC's format and add the SLOS to the UHCC annual report of program data. This will be recommended to the VPCC and Chancellors. Louise will draft the memo.

2. Report of annual program data due April 16, 2007, to OVPC. These data are in the UHCCP 5.202, 2005(posted on the website).

3. The results of these reports will be presented to the BOR this summer. Colleges were asked to discuss the rationale used for assessing programs as healthy, unhealthy, or cautionary for demand, efficiency, outcomes, and overall status. It is anticipated that the BOR will request this information. It was noted that the Perkins indicators (with performance levels set by the feds) are among the measures of outcomes. Questions about process for determining program health. The colleges reported the following:

KAP: cutoffs for various measures, # of majors; occupancy rates, graduates; for some of those cutoffs were set a long time ago (10 years?); however, some fudging but will argue that shrinking doesn't mean not healthy. BUT: 4 indicators of demand? How to aggregate? Use just two #of majors & #of applicants; some conflicts: HIGH efficiency but low demand?

MAU: elements not the same? Not the same environment? Neighbor islands have different situations. Smaller communities, but still legitimate demands Need to reflect context. Standard for each measure, + or - for each standard and if more +'s, then healthy; IR person, Dean +VC for overall. Each program has its own standard.

WIN: look at & discuss; sometimes the programs have a need even if they're small. Make a call on status. Set by program.

KAU: haven't discussed it yet. Cabinet will review & decide as a group on the status. Very subjective.

LEE: CTE follows Perkins. Not sure how things were set.

HON: PHI # of majors/intake; class fill; unduplicated grads/intake. Benchmarks set for the institution.

HAW: don't know definitely; used cutoffs based on history of the program. Instructors & program people insights. Not based on any guidelines

The colleges stated that the process should allow for some flexibility based on the variations of individual college environments. Campuses need to be working with their employers, influencing program demands.

Some of the challenges are we're not using metrics and we have not established benchmarks. e.g. what's healthy? Need to do an environmental scan. How much is it costing us? Maybe there's a real demand, but what can resources accommodate? How much does it cost? How many graduates? We need to be doing this.

Question posed, What's the purpose of the status?

A: For program improvement funding, allocating funds for sector development.

A lengthy discussion what were normalized scores and the lack of systemwide standardization on how to determine the status of health. Some of the comments include:

Maybe you want to know how you're making the decision.

Sense of program compared within the institution as across the system

Look at common elements, eventually. But for now focus on the institution

Look at easiest: # of majors, decide what's healthy; Look at state needs, look at program capacity, Plus an explanation. Using measures to compare who's doing what well.

Benchmarks need to be reviewed. Based on program data, some readjustment of activities may be needed.

Dashboards – we will look at what other colleges/systems have done to establish dashboards.

Need to accommodate growing, emerging fields. Can get data from other than established sources for industries that aren't reflected in the state's data.

Current vs. outlook of programs.

Need to include assumptions about economic picture.

Key Data Elements

The group decided to use the following data elements in Doug's memo (plus the ACCJC SLOs annual report) to determine the health status.

Demand

Absolute number and percentage change

of majors? (#3)

annual positions? (#1&2)

SSH (#6)

Health status: program intake meets with demand (current & anticipated)

Efficiency

Absolute number and **percentage change**

Class fill rate (#11)

Number of majors/FTE faculty (#14)

Cost per SSH (#16)

Effectiveness

CTE

Persistence fall to spring (#19)

Completion (#23)

Placement in employment (#24)

For Liberal Arts

Persistence fall to spring (#19)

Number of transfers (#20)

Number of graduates (not on the list)

It was noted that some program data will most likely come from STAR. Colleges are reminded to make sure that programs are accurately represented in STAR.

At the conclusion of the time, the group had not talked about benchmarking or best practices. Particularly for Benchmarking, please review Comparative Assessment Materials forwarded by email.

Tentative next meeting May 3, 2007. 1-3 pm via polycom.