MEMORANDUM

Date: March 15, 2011

To: Annie Brown

From: College Effectiveness Review Committee (CERC)

Subject: Information Technology (IT) 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 (IT) 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
Your leadership of the IT program is very much appreciated.

Demand: Healthy
This element is based on the number of majors to annual new/replacement positions. Number of majors decreased by 2 to 31 with 12 new and replacement positions in the County. This equates to 2.6 majors per job, a Healthy call. The demand in the program classes are 55% program majors to 45% non-majors primarily due to ICS 100/101 being open to anyone meeting the prerequisites.

Efficiency: Unhealthy
This element is based on two criteria – class fill rate and student to faculty ratio. Fill rate is at 49% and no FTE BOR appointed faculty for 31 majors. This data is not accurate as IT has one FTE BOR appointed faculty with 31 majors and is actually a Healthy call.

Effectiveness: Cautionary
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 majors is 19.4% and the ratio of degrees awarded to new and replacement positions in the County is .5, both Cautionary calls. The 64% Persistence (Fall to Spring) is a decrease of 10% and is Cautionary. This is a significant decrease that needs to be addressed. Successful Completion was 83%, an increase of 11% with three withdrawals.

Other Elements:
- IT met three of the four Perkins IV Core Indicators.

The following is feedback from the narrative portion of the Comprehensive Program Review.

Part A. Program Effectiveness
1. College mission and institutional learning outcomes
   a. The narrative does not adequately show how the program supports the College's mission and Institutional Learning Outcomes (ILO). The average score given by CERC for this section was less than 2, with 2 judged "adequate description and connection to mission and ILO."
   b. ILOs are in the 2010-11 catalog, page 6.
2. Changes made
   a. We applaud the addition of a Certificate of Completion.
   b. There is insufficient discussion on how changing the math prerequisite will increase the number of majors. Lowering math may get more students in but how it will affect students' ability to progress deserves discussion.
   c. Low completion rates based on the table included on page 3 under Analysis of Data deserves further discussion. The program needs to show data as to what is happening to majors, explaining why they are not graduating.
   d. The IT program provides critical skills classes for programs in general; specifying the BEAT Division seems inaccurate since the Business Technology, Marketing, and Accounting programs have BUSN classes as requirements, not IT classes.
3. Program strengths and weaknesses
   a. There is no concrete evidence to substantiate strengths. How does the writer know that there is "high success rate of graduates in the workforce" and "great satisfaction with interns?"
   b. Information on course completion rates should be included. In lieu of the low graduation to number of majors, courses completion rates could be analyzed to see if there are gatekeeper courses within the program.
   c. Weakness #3 is not supported by the data presented. Data in table 5 shows that even when there were 2 FTE faculty, the program had low numbers. The number of majors does not warrant 2 FTE faculty. The lack of a faculty person does not mean classes are not being offered, rather it means classes are taught by lecturers.

4. Report on previous goals
   a. Data on students who have been awarded the certificate should be included to document its value.
   b. At other schools within the UHCC system, ICS 100 is the "computing literacy class for AA majors." There is no reasoning as to why it is necessary to create a different course; would it not be better to adjust our ICS 100 to 3 credits so it articulates easily with the other campuses?
   c. Stating that a goal is a "continuous process" does not constitute reporting on goal achievement. What has been done during the review period should be reported. If nothing was done, this should be stated and explained.
   d. Instead of waiting for Hawaii CC to be ready for electronic portfolios, it seems IT should consider leading the way. Explaining why the program frizzled should be included if this is the reason for not accomplishing one of three major goals set for the review period.
5. New "top three" goals
   a. Requesting additional faculty is a good goal; unfortunately, data included in table 5 does not support 2 FTE faculty.
   b. Development of the Health IT certificate is a great goal. Including a date for first offering would be appropriate as well as a number of students enrolled would make it measurable.
   c. Including three ongoing goals to be the third goals does not comply with the intention of the review.
   d. A goal specific to increasing majors and graduates by a stated percentage is supported by data but not included.

Part B: Action Plan for Program Improvement
1. Table 1
   a. Developing a Health IT certificate is a good action strategy and ties directly to one of the programs top three goals.
   b. Establishing an IT lab was not mentioned in the program's top three goals. Is establishing a lab a non-cost item? Unfortunately, data provided on the size of the program does not support the allocating of additional space.
   c. Articulation is a good action strategy. Members of CERC were aware of problems with IT courses at Hawaii CC having a different number of credits so request that number of credits as well as curriculum be articulated.
   d. CERC members recommend an action strategy be adopted that will develop a plan on how to address weaknesses of recruiting students and the apparent failure of existing students to complete their degree within a 2-3 year time period.
2. Table 2

a. When goal A is listed goal B from the Strategic plan should also be listed. Goal A focuses on Hawaiian students whereas goal B includes all students.

b. Since table 4 was not completed, CERC members have no way of knowing the age of computers identified in Table 2 as needing replacement. If the program needs $33,000 of replacement equipment it seems this need should be discussed in the review narrative, not just input on Table 2. All computer classrooms are on a revolving replacement schedule by the ACU unit. If this is not sufficient for the program's needs, it should be discussed. CERC recommends the program ask ACU when the computers are up for replacement and if appropriate, ask that the schedule be changed to accommodate need.

c. The MSDN subscription should be paid by the program's B budget.

Set specific benchmarks and monitor the program's progress throughout the year. Next year's review should include concrete outcomes.

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. Close the loop by reflecting on your assessment results and make adjustments to your teaching and/or curriculum, if necessary. Work with the other CCs on developing common student learning outcomes for common courses. 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 continuous 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.

If you have any questions, please contact Joni Onishi at x47484 or jonishi@hawaii.edu.

c Robert Yamane
    Jim Yoshida
    Noreen Yamane