

**Annual Reports of Program Data (ARPD)  
Meta-Assessment Report on  
August 12, 2017 and February 10, 2018 Focus Groups**

**Introduction**

In an effort to improve the relevance and use of ARPD, the College supported two one-day assessment initiatives with a total 21 participants. Four of the participants contributed to the work on both days. Five 2016 ARPD were assessed in August, 2017, and four 2017 ARPD were assessed in February. The scoring rubrics, revised between the two days, are attached.

**Major Findings From Both Assessments**

A lot of time was spent questioning the data, especially in the Demand and Efficiency sections of the ARPD. Concerns were raised that the data used in making Health Calls (Healthy, Unhealthy, Cautionary) was inaccurate or that the data definitions changed without notification to the programs. A lot of concern was raised since these “Health Calls” broadly represent the program to the wider public, parents, private sector representatives, and the legislature.

The OFIE Director emphasized the importance of the Effectiveness Measures as these are aligned with strategic planning and performance funding measures. The relationship between ARPD and performance and other campus funding was generally unclear to all the participants. Also, they did not see a real commitment to closing feedback loops from program deans and administrators. Not only were they not getting robust and timely verbal feedback on their ARPD, they saw no funding directed to their programs as a result of the ARPD process. Thus the process seems to be part of just being compliant to deadlines rather than effectively leading to program improvement. A compliance culture is not a highly motivated one.

Some ARPD made direct connections to the campus Strategic Plan and others tried to incorporate their work on the Student Success Pathways. Most ARPD did not simply identify a weakness on an Effectiveness measure, and then develop a plan to remedy it. For example, almost all the ARPD showed a weakness on fall-to-fall re-enrollment, but none addressed it with a tactic for improvement. There was general consensus that developing an exemplary ARPD would help the process get better faster.

Programs should be encouraged to identify their unique features at the beginning of their ARPD, especially those factors that may influence the ARPD Effectiveness measures. Some programs seem to be in different developmental stages, that is, some have strong and positive data outcomes and their ARPD reflects a kind of “we know what we’re doing, just leave us alone” tone, while most have generally passive, even compliant tones, with an effort to make the case for their unique developmental stage, or other idiosyncratic events in the program year.

Program Learning Assessments in the reviewed ARPD were generally weak. Some ARPD indicated that they had not assessed any of their Learning Outcomes, but they did not state that they had a completed an assessment cycle in previous years, or that they had any plan to do so in current or future years. There was little to no disaggregation of student data, except for a little focus on the distance education students. The ARPD as currently constructed provide little disaggregated data that programs could use to target new tactics for student success.

Overall, participants did not know who the primary audience was for the ARPD, this a reflection of uncompleted feedback loops. At the same time, the ARPD are the public facing representation of program health. Also, there was no expectation that a funding need, even if it were focused on an identified Effectiveness weakness, would garner additional budget. The Annual Request for Funding (ARF) process was viewed as requiring a lot of focused work for little reward. Also, there needs to be some discussion and perhaps policy work around the College's allocation of Strategic Planning performance funding. Perhaps a formulaic approach could be developed with, for example, 50 percent of performance funding reinvested in the performance responsible for the additional funding, and 50 percent going to a "Cautionary Program" or an "Unhealthy Program" to address weaknesses in their Effectiveness Measures. These latter funds would require that the program identify specific tactics targeted on specific Effectiveness measures.

Most participants felt it was time to reduce redundancy in reporting by not tackling a separate Comprehensive Program Review Process. They want ARPD to be a valued and valuable process for improvement, but it will require administrative commitment to providing feedback and funding if this process is going to get "back on the rails" as our central program improvement vehicle.

### **Assessment of the Meta-Assessment Process**

Participants found the process useful and meaningful, especially if they get prompt feedback. They would like a simplified more concise and targeted rubric. Their preference moving forward was for a "Exemplary ARPD" they can use as a template. We should run this meta-assessment every year when ARPD are completed. The time allotted for the meta-assessment was about right and four was a sufficient number of ARPD to review. A lot of time could be invested in trying to develop rubric rater skills and consistency but I think the meta-assessment works best when the scoring simply provides a focus for discussion, and there is not the concern about an individual ARPD score, or some kind of ranking or a punitive administrative response based on the score.

OFIE remains committed to getting this process back on the rails, if administration commits to an annual cycle of constructive feedback to the programs and the alignment of ARPD with budgeting decisions.

**Annual Reports of Program Data (2016)**  
**Meta-Assessment Notes**  
**August 12, 2017**

**Participants**

2 Liberal Arts faculty, 6 CTE faculty, 1 administrator

This assessment team reviewed five different ARPDs. In round one they reviewed three in round one and two in round two.

**Discussion: Findings from the ARPD Assessment**

Everyone questions the data, especially in the Demand and Efficiency areas and the related health calls.

**Criteria A – Use of Data**

Round 1 and 2 Detailed Findings

Scores floated to the middle, ie, 2.

Analysis sections were good, but some inconsistency in format and framework

- Used ARPD format, one used Student Success Pathway format, and one used Strategic Plan formats
- Data from the analysis section did not make it to action plan
- One dispute data, then found other data
- Too much information, over-narrative, need precision
- SLOs and PLOs are not tied into what the program would do differently>budget
- Data linkages to action plans weak
- Data does not give you the why, only the what.
- Should use student focus groups to get at the why of the data
- Need to align data from ARPD with program accreditation data

**Criteria B – Student Achievement**

Round 1 and 2 Detailed Findings

Scores floated to the middle (score of 2)

Dry narratives

Data viewed statically, not as 3-year trends

Need for precision in connecting findings to corrective action

Major issues (eg. Re-enrollment Fall-to-Fall) should be focused on

Tendency to identify new strategies vs discussing things already in place and improving them

Lots of new initiatives

Tone and perspective comes through. Seems like there really saying, “We’re successful so leave us alone rather they should tell us why they are successful?”

Comments too general –“need a counselor” why?

No solutions, only inputs

What does “student-focused” mean?

What is the role of the Student Success Pathway?

Provide guidelines for integrating the Student Success Pathway into ARPD.

Not clear on how, whether to include it in ARPD.

### **Criteria C: Student Learning Outcomes Assessment**

Round 1 and 2 - Detailed Findings

Scores were 2,2, 3.

Style within the reports very different, had to filter through the styles.

Program Learning Assessment done - Data is there but not closing the loop on how to improve the data.

Program SLOs every 5 years but some PLOs not assessed since 2012.

Not a lot of analysis on course level slos

Not closing the loop

Not adequate coverage of SLOs

### **Criteria D: Action Plans**

Round 1 and 2 – Detailed Findings

Scores were 3,3,2

Need to step up the pace of our reading

Just focusing on that section

What they intend to change should be more evident

Liked the SSP integration or a link to SSP

Want things to jump out at you

Timeline needed (1-year of 3-year timeline?)

When folks read their own it's a little different

Accreditation is “whip” for some programs

Gaps evident in analysis to action plan

Program Accreditation requires more narrative

More attention needed on the 3-year trend.

Statements like “it is working” are not substantiated, sometimes the “it” is not even defined.

Do counselors count in the FTE count?

Programs should explain nuances in your program at the beginning of the ARPD narrative, so that data outliers are clear.

When a program revises its Program Learning Outcomes they need to so state and then state plan for assessing the new ones

Need for training identified without statement of what training and what benefits will derive from the training.

Humor helps

The comment “they need to connect the dots” was stated many times by the assessors.

### **Discussion: Assessing the Process of Assessing ARPD**

Need to clarify what's a 3,2,1 (Exemplary=3, Acceptable =2, Developing =1)

Rubric needs to more sharply distinguish a 3 ,2, or 1.

Assessors would like more a little more time to balance whole ARPD read vs. criterion-targeted reading.

An example of a well-written ARPD would be helpful, with an imaginary degree program

Make up a perfect example

Did this process enable us to draw some conclusions about our ARPD process? Yes  
Who is the audience for this meta-assessment- Probably the Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs  
Health calls can be threatening –especially since the public can see them.  
How can what we say loop into improving ARPD particularly how the health calls are made.  
Are we good at moving from grants to campus-based program supports  
Chairs and unit heads want more feedback on their specific ARPD.  
How does the feedback loop work?  
We need a template that guides connection-making (achievement outcomes, learning outcomes)  
Assessors thought that 5 ARPDS was about right to review. They also requested a little more time.  
Suggestion to support more Departmental Retreats to improve ARPD.  
Encourage use of Student Success Pathways in ARPD  
Rubric to be revised and sent through Suzan Kazama, Acting Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs  
Do we need the CPR process?

**Annual Reports of Program Data (2017)**  
**Meta-Assessment Notes**  
**Saturday, February 10, 2018**

## Participants

1 Liberal Arts, 1 Title III project member, 7 CTE instructors, 1 Dean

## Opening Thoughts

- ARFs require a lot of effort for little reward
- **Short-term planning has recently taken precedence over long-term planning**
  - Accreditation planning is sufficient within 2 years
  - Now: Reevaluation of Comprehensive Program Review?
- **Where do ARPDs fit into planning process? How are they useful?**
- **Closing the Loop (Budgeting cycle not done)**
  - Effectiveness Measures
  - Accreditation
  - ISS (Institutional Set Standards): Most important
- **Performance Funding Measures → loop in with ARPD Effectiveness Indicators**
  - What is the process for determining how performance funding will be allocated?
  - What is the process of allocation of performance funding measures?
    - Two possible decision-making tactics:
      - Put money into underperforming programs for development
      - Reward stronger programs

## Reflection *Feedback on rubric and explanation of retention rate*

- **Feedback** Using Rubric as a Guide (Negative and Positive Elements of Evaluated ARPDS)
  - Use of Data: No attention to fall-to-fall reenrollment -
  - Student Focused: Incorporation of Student Success Pathway +
  - Outcome Assessment: No attention to program learning outcomes -
  - Plans: Not enough linkage between SSP and Strategic Plan -
- **What do we mean by retention rate?**
  - Now: Persisting to end of the program (interpretation of accreditation)
  - Idiosyncrasies within programs
- Campus: Focus on Effectiveness Indicators in ARPD
  - Our campus can take action to facilitate change within these areas (tied to Performance Funding Measures too)
- Ideal ratio: for majors to analytic FTE faculty: Based on Program Accreditation Standards

**Annual Reports of Program Data (2017)**  
**Meta-Assessment Notes**  
**Saturday, February 10, 2018**

<b>Scoring Based on Rubric (12 Points Possible)</b>			
	Round 1	Round 2	Average
Information Technology (#1)	7	4	5.5
Marketing (#2)	8	5	6.5
Natural Science (#3)	6	9	7.5
Physical Therapy Therapist (#4)	4	6	5

## Additional Issues

- Reports lacking the why: data indicates the what, need qualitative methods (focus groups, reflection prompts with large samples) to get at the why and to identify tactics for improvement
- Research on best practices at other community colleges should also inform tactics
- Developmental Timing: Where are programs in process and development? (Programs in different stages)
- ASNS: Some Strategic Plan measures are specific to ASNS Program.
- What happens when federal funding disappears and gap with institutional funds?
- Who is the audience for the ARPD? Who is using the ARPDs to make decisions? Lawmakers?
- How do faculty benefit from completing the ARPD? Can we get more commitment to the ARPD process by supporting one-day retreats?
- **Data Integrity issues**
- Concerns for developmental trajectory
- Gaps in the plan
- Learning outcomes assessment
- Reported that ARF funds not disbursed to PTA program even though they've been awarded
- Institutional Climate Survey Results coming out soon
- Rubric match up with ARPD (e.g. use of data appears in plans not by its own)

**Annual Reports of Program Data (2017)  
Meta-Assessment Notes  
Saturday, February 10, 2018**

- Disaggregated data: distance education
- Productive futures
  - ILOs preparing students for their productive futures
  - CTE Programs: Easy to see “productive futures”
  - Do the liberal arts ARPDs address students’ productive futures
- Arts & Sciences more difficult: Creative thinking, communication skills, diversity, Hawaiian culture, integrated learning, problem solving, etc.
- Linking campus missions + program missions (intentional alignment)- we all should be preparing students for “their productive careers”

**Closing Thoughts: Key Takeaways**

<b>Program Related</b>	<b>System/Campus Related</b>
Tie ARPD assessment back to student achievement and learning	Allocation of performance funding measurement: What is admin looking for? Where does this money go?
Calculations and data sources: having this all together to help KCC programs with ARPD	Clarification of how these reports are being used (budgets, personnel, facilities, etc.): <i>Part of compliance culture (contributes to low morale). No feedback until accreditation.</i>
Different tones/attitudes come out of ARPDs	Alerting users when definitions are recalculated -- source of data
SLOs different throughout all the programs	Annual Reports of Program Data + 3 Year comprehensive (CPR) is redundant
Best practice of report (template): guidelines / rubric	Simple “heard ya” from administration would be beneficial
All accredited programs: Effectiveness indicators under the control of the program	Ask System: Who reads these?
Supplementary addendum to program ARPD (internal campus procedure) with what each program deems important	Anxious for loops to be closed
Looking at bigger plan	ARPD process can become CPR process which will seem redundant
Be mindful of the workload of the faculty completing multiple assessments	Reward/recognize faculty who close the loop with assessment rather than just filling in cells

**Annual Reports of Program Data (2017)**  
**Meta-Assessment Notes**  
**Saturday, February 10, 2018**

Be truly student-centered	Where is data coming from?
Simplify everything: What can be consolidated? What is necessary?	"Fix it" --- Fix ARPD. How can campus be part of this conversation?
	Is this 1 year or 3 year planning cycle? How much funding should departments be asking for?

## Rubric To Assess and Improve Annual Reports of Program Review for August 15, 2017

Criterion A	Exemplary	Acceptable	Developing
<p><b>Use of data</b></p> <p><b>Other sources include:</b> Strategic Plan Scorecard, Student Success Pathway, Distance Education Plan, Sustainability Plan, CCSSE, or program-specific research.</p> <p><b>Diverse learner characteristics</b> include gender, ethnicity, online learners, other)</p>	<p>The use of ARPD data is strongly tied to decision-making.</p> <p>Discussions include a review of previous year, and previous 3-year trends.</p> <p>Data from <b>other sources</b> are effectively integrated included in the review.</p> <p>Data inquiry includes disaggregation based on <b>characteristics of diverse learners.</b></p> <p>Links between findings and planning are strong.</p> <p>Analysis leads to thorough identification of program improvements.</p>	<p>The use of ARPD data makes some ties to decision-making.</p> <p><b>Discussions only include previous year data.</b></p> <p>Data from <b>other sources</b> are minimally integrated included in the review.</p> <p>Data inquiry minimally disaggregates <b>diverse learner characteristics.</b></p> <p>Links between findings and planning are weak.</p> <p>Analysis leads to some identification of program improvements</p>	<p>The use of ARPD data makes weak ties to decision-making.</p> <p>Discussion only includes previous year data,</p> <p>Data from <b>other sources</b> is not integrated included in the review.</p> <p>No disaggregation of <b>diverse learner characteristics.</b></p> <p>Links between findings and planning are weak.</p> <p>No identification of program Improvements.</p>
Criterion B	Exemplary	Acceptable	Developing
<p><b>Student Achievement</b></p>	<p>Program clearly identifies weaknesses in program effectiveness and student achievement.</p> <p>Program has clearly identified strategies and practices to improve program effectiveness and student engagement and achievement.</p> <p>Budget requests to implement strategies and practice are specified.</p>	<p>Program minimally identifies weaknesses in program effectiveness and student achievement.</p> <p>Program considers strategies and practices to program effectiveness and student engagement and achievement.</p> <p>Budget requests to implement strategies and practices are not specified.</p>	<p>Program does not identify weaknesses in program effectiveness in student achievement.</p> <p>No new practices to improve program effectiveness and student engagement and achievement are identified.</p> <p>No student-focused budget requests are specified.</p>

Criterion C	Exemplary	Acceptable	Developing
<p><b>Student Learning Outcomes Assessment (Program and Courses)</b></p>	<p>Program learning outcomes and the year(s) of their assessments are specified. Outcomes needing assessment in current year are targeted.</p> <p>Strategies to improve program learning outcomes are specified, implemented, and assessed.</p> <p><b>Mission Statement Alignment:</b> Program learning prepares students for their productive futures.</p> <p>Progress on course learning outcomes assessment and next steps are clearly summarized.</p>	<p>Program learning outcomes and the year(s) of their assessments are specified. Outcomes needing assessment in current year are not targeted</p> <p>Strategies to improve program learning outcomes are specified but not implemented.</p> <p><b>Mission Statement Alignment:</b> Program learning prepares students for their productive futures</p> <p>Progress on course learning outcomes assessment and next steps are not clearly summarized.</p>	<p>Program learning outcomes and the year(s) of their assessments are specified. Some outcomes have not been assessed within 5 year period, and they are not targeted.</p> <p>Strategies to improve program learning outcomes are not identified.</p> <p><b>Mission Statement Alignment:</b> Program learning prepares students for their productive futures</p> <p>Progress on course learning outcomes assessment and next steps is not discussed.</p>
Criterion D	Exemplary	Acceptable	Developing
<p><b>Action Plans</b></p>	<p>Plan identifies priority actions to address weaknesses and support improvements identified in Criteria A, B, C..</p> <p>Plan identifies actions that also support the Strategic Plan and Student Success Pathway.</p> <p>The plan includes a timeline and criteria for success.</p> <p>The plan robustly demonstrates innovation, attention to best practices, and creativity to substantiate budget requests.</p>	<p>Plan identifies but does not prioritize actions to address weaknesses and support improvements identified in Criteria A, B, C.</p> <p>Plan identifies actions that also support the Strategic Plan and Student Success Pathway</p> <p>The plan lacks a timeline or criteria for success.</p> <p>The plan weakly demonstrates innovation, attention to best practices, and creativity to substantiate budget requests.</p>	<p>Plan does not identify nor prioritize actions to address weaknesses and support improvements identified in Criteria A, B, C.</p> <p>Plan does not identify actions that also support the Strategic Plan and Student Success Pathway.</p> <p>The plan lacks a timeline and criteria for success.</p> <p>The plan does not demonstrate innovation, attention to best practices, and creativity to substantiate budget requests</p>

**Annual Reports of Program Data (2017)  
Meta-Assessment Scoring Rubric  
February 10, 2018**

Criterion	Exemplary (3)	Acceptable (2)	Developing (1)
<b>Use of data</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Data is strongly tied to decision-making.</li> <li>- Discussions include a thorough review of previous year findings.</li> <li>- Discussions include thorough identification of three-year data trends.</li> <li>- Data from other sources is included in the review (Strategic Plan Scorecard, CCSSE, program-specific research)</li> <li>- Data inquiry includes disaggregation based on diverse learners (e.g., gender, ethnicity, online learners, other)</li> <li>- Data analysis leads to clear identification of needed program improvements.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- The use of data makes some ties to decision-making.</li> <li>- Discussions include a limited review of previous year findings.</li> <li>- Discussions include loose identification of three-year data trends.</li> <li>- Data from other sources is limited.</li> <li>- Some attention to data focused on diverse learners.</li> <li>- Data analysis leads to loose identification of needed program improvements.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- The use of data makes minimal ties to decision-making.</li> <li>- Discussions include a no review of previous year findings.</li> <li>- Discussions include no identification of three-year data trends.</li> <li>- No data from other sources is included.</li> <li>- No or little attention on diverse learners.</li> <li>- Data is not tied to program improvement.</li> </ul>
	Exemplary (3)	Acceptable (2)	Developing (1)
<b>Student- Focused</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Clearly identifies and addresses the needs of its students.</li> <li>- Program has reviewed findings and identified best practices for improved student engagement, learning and achievement, and to prepare students for their productive futures.</li> <li>- Budget requests to implement best practices are specified.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Program identifies the needs of its students.</li> <li>- Program considers student engagement, learning, and achievement practices, and their productive futures.</li> <li>- Budget requests specific but loosely linked to student success strategies.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Program minimally or does not identify their users or their needs.</li> <li>- No new practices to improve student engagement, learning, and achievement are identified. No connections are made to students' productive futures.</li> <li>- Budget requests not linked to student success strategies.</li> </ul>

Criterion	Exemplary (3)	Acceptable (2)	Developing (1)
<b>Outcome Assessment (SLOs and PLOs)</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Outcomes are clearly identified, measured, and analyzed.</li> <li>- The program has closed the assessment loop.</li> <li>- Evidence for analysis is drawn from multiple sources.</li> <li>- Program is reflective and provides critical assessment of the role it plays in student engagement, learning and achievement, and preparing them for their productive futures.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Outcomes are identified and measured.</li> <li>- The program has yet to close the assessment loop.</li> <li>- Evidence from more than one source is not addressed.</li> <li>- Program considers assessment of the role it played in student learning and success.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Outcomes not addressed in program review reflection or plans.</li> <li>- Student learning and achievement are not addressed.</li> </ul>

Criterion	Exemplary (3)	Acceptable (2)	Developing (1)
<b>Plans</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Current Plan directly linked to gaps identified in the analysis.</li> <li>- Current Plan strongly supports Mission and Strategic Directions of the College.</li> <li>- A strong assessment of the plan is provided and a timeline is included.</li> <li>- The plan clearly demonstrates innovation, attention to best practices, and creativity to substantiate the hiring request for staff/faculty, or other resources.</li> <li>- Analysis includes thorough evaluations of previous year plans.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Current Plan makes loose connection to gaps addressed in the analysis.</li> <li>- Current Plan loosely supports Mission and Strategic Directions of the College.</li> <li>- A loose assessment of the plan and timeline is provided.</li> <li>- The plan weakly demonstrates innovation, attention to best practices, and creativity to substantiate the hiring request for staff/faculty, or other resources.</li> <li>- Analysis includes some evaluations of previous year plans.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Current Plan makes little or no connection to gaps in the analysis.</li> <li>- Current Plan provides minimal support to Mission and Strategic Directions of the College.</li> <li>- An assessment of the plan and timeline is not included.</li> <li>- Analysis includes only one year of data.</li> </ul>