1. **Recap of 10/18 meeting:** Ruth, Ed and Meo – *discussion about getting more analytical data from accuplacer math placement exams to assist the department in evaluating students and the placement ranges that CCRI is using – compare input to output. Data should be obtainable but has not been so utilized to date. Do we have enough staffing in terms of managing and interpreting data from testing/placement? The ACES report by Accuplacer, based on student performance, helps to refine cut-offs. The following items were also submitted by Ed Madonna as chair of the Math department*

1. A process / program that will easily let departments trace students' academic progress from the placement test through the courses they take. In addition it would be great to know the section they were in and the name of the instructor.

2. A program that will scan the courses a student registers for, check the prerequisites and drop students who do not meet the prerequisites. In addition the students should receive an e-mail informing them that they did not meet the prerequisite and what options will be available. This must be done on a regular basis once the registration process begins and must be done during the crunch. In addition it should be an institutional philosophy to enforce the processes.

Ed was under the impression from John Panzica before he left that this was 80% complete, but who will take this over now, if anyone?

Retake policy is still also hanging out there?

1. **Update from NEASC Chair meeting of 10/18/2012** – refer to PDF forwarded to committee members. This is a draft working/thinking type of document to help assess where each of the standards foresee themselves in the next 12 months. Cathy Livingston's notes were guidelines for assessment not actual status reports. Is helpful to our committee so that our work meshes but doesn't overlap with the work of other committees.

    As an example, Standard 2: Planning & Evaluation speaks to "collecting and analyzing data across the college to evaluate its institutional effectiveness" – not to be confused with Standard 9 data use but complementary. Another example is in Standard 6: Students about Accuplacer Diagnostics – a key issue for the Math dept for example in terms of course placements, # of developmental students etc. (*emailed attachment to members 10/23/2012*)

2. **Priority 2 Data-Based Decision Making - Elements for Focus and Action**

Describe strategic objectives – align performance and funding with strategy, reflect institutional priorities, maximize resource utilization. Assess cultural acceptance for the role of data in decision making in improving effective resource allocation and reallocation.

Envision intended results – programs will be assessed for growth and change based on factors that are consistent with educational mission, needs of students, fiscal resources, and equity. Use data to determine where we are vs where we optimally want to be consistent with strategic plan.

Determine data sources and develop data trust; think longer term

Identify performance measures – examples include educational spending per FTE student by program/department, faculty and staff per FTE student, # of remedial courses vs non-remedial; graduates, certificates, transfer measures as program indicators. Compare to "norms" , i.e., benchmarks- both internal and external

Develop initiatives – designed to improve your outcome; need processes that address both increasing and decreasing the budgets

Next steps: Flesh out each one of the above - See Power Point handout

In attendance: David Rawlinson, Cecile Roberti, Sue Valicenti, Ruth Barrington

Discussed our responsibilities as a committee from here. Ruth will bring up with Lela and Kathy and NEASC one-on-one meeting. For Priority 2 felt it was a 3-step process:

Identify where we are

Identify where we want to be

Make suggestions on how to get there and what it should look like

To large degree, that is already addressed in the power point