

MEMORANDUM

Date: March 15, 2011

To: Mary Goya and Mai Wong

From: College Effectiveness Review Committee (CERC)

Subject: Early Childhood Education (ECE) Comprehensive Program Review

The process of Program Review assures quality in all facets of our operation at Hawaii Community College. It encompasses planning, assessment, and evaluation. Thank you for conducting and submitting the annual and comprehensive program reviews for the Early Childhood Education Program. This is not an end into itself but a part of a process that leads to a much greater end. It answers the questions:

- Did our programs and services work to our expectations?
- Did we get the results we expected?
- How can we improve what we are doing?

The community college system initiated a set of formulas to ensure consistency in identifying the strength of programs. As such, the demand, efficiency, effectiveness, and overall health of a program reflect the results of the formulas.

Overall: Cautionary

As a result of your team attitude and effort, the AEC Technology program continues to be progressive for the benefit of the students. Your leadership is very much appreciated.

Demand: Cautionary

This element is based on the number of majors to annual new/replacement positions. Number of majors increased from 91 to 93 with 73 new and replacement positions in the County. This equates to 1.27 majors per job, a Cautionary call. The demand in the program classes consists of both program majors as well as non-majors.

Efficiency: Cautionary

This element is based on two criteria – class fill rate and student to faculty ratio. The ratio of majors to FTE BOR appointed faculty is 46.5, a Cautionary call. The fill rate increased 12% and at 73% is deemed Cautionary. Number of low-enrolled classes decreased from 11 to 7.

Effectiveness: Unhealthy

This element is based on three criteria – unduplicated degrees and certificates earned in relationship to number of majors, unduplicated degrees and certificates earned in relationship to annual/new replacement positions, and persistence from fall to spring. The ratio of degrees

awarded to new and replacement positions in the County is .16, a Cautionary call. The 55% Persistence (Fall to Spring) is a decrease of 10% and is Unhealthy. 74% had successful completion. There were 12 withdrawals, an area to address.

Other Elements:

- ECE met two of the six Perkins IV Core Indicators and did not meet both nontraditional participation and completion. Non-traditional participation includes broad economic, social and cultural issues extending beyond the scope of the program. The faculty should continue to dialogue with their statewide colleagues about these important factors and creative solutions.
- It is suggested ECE explore ways to improve Perkins indicators and apply for Perkins funding if financial resources are needed.

The following is feedback from the Comprehensive Program Review.

A. Program Effectiveness

1. There was a weak connection to ILOs in the narrative and a moderate connection to the HawCC mission.

Recommendation: include more description about ECE's connection to the ILOs.

2. The 2+2 articulation with UHWO and with 3 other UH community colleges is excellent. Seeking national accreditation is commendable, especially with it being a collaborative effort by the colleges involved. Commendable progress in Learning Outcomes Assessment and the use of results (i.e., expectations were met in all assessments) to seek national accreditation.

Recommendation: none.

3. List of Strengths and Weaknesses was not easy to find in Section A; had to look in Section B for the list. Weakness #2 is not realistic for the time being (ie, no campus yet or in the foreseeable future). Instead, there needs to be a review of the Unhealthy Effectiveness Indicators and the 4 of 6 Perkins Core Indicators that were not met based on goals.

Recommendation: use the template and list strengths & weaknesses accordingly in the correct section. Include the effectiveness data and Perkins Core indicators as weaknesses and address them accordingly in the Action Plan.

4. Goals appear to have been achieved but a description of how the achievement was made was lacking. Excellent progress on assessment plans.

Recommendation: provide more description of goals and progress made.

5. Goal 1 is not related to strengths or weaknesses but is definitely important. Goal 2 adequately relates to Strength 1. Goal 3 is supported by Strength 3 but there is not enough justification or details for Goal 3 in Weaknesses 1 & 2.

Recommendation: include more details in explanation of goals set and goals accomplished.

B. Action Plan (non cost)

1. Action item #2 should be related only to Strength #3.

Recommendation: use distance education technologies (ie, polycom and online) to increase outreach to students.

C. Action Plan Supports Budget Priorities (cost items)

1. This cost item supports the HawCC Strategic Plan (A.2.5.b.) but does not need to be based in West HI. For island-wide and state-wide coverage, distance education technologies (ie, polycom and online) can be based from Hilo campus.
2. This cost item does not belong in the budget ask as part of a comprehensive program review Accreditation costs can be supported by either the Chancellor's Office or offset by revenues from Childcare Center (ie, should not be part of legislative funding requests).

To be effective, student learning outcomes assessment must contribute directly to student learning. Moreover, assessment for improvement is most effective when it is embedded within the curriculum and so has a direct connection to student learning. You have done a commendable job on assessing student learning outcomes as well as closing the loop by reflecting on assessment results and making adjustments to your teaching and/or curriculum. It is through the process of ongoing assessment of student learning outcomes that you can improve the quality of your program and demonstrate the level of quality to others.

By 2012, ACCJC is requiring that all programs reach the sustainable quality improvement level for Program Review and Planning, and the proficiency level for Student Learning Outcomes, so work with your division chair, dean, and/or assessment coordinator to develop a timeline to ensure that your program will be at those levels by 2012. Continue developing assessment strategies to assess student learning outcomes that lead to program improvement

c Guy Kimura
Noreen Yamane