

# 2013 Unit Review Process Improvement Questionnaire



## 1. Do you find the annual unit review training helpful?

		Response Percent	Response Count
Yes		64.3%	9
No		35.7%	5
If not, what could be done differently to better suit your needs?			6
answered question			14
skipped question			2

## 2. For those units that used a template this year (either comprehensive or annual), did the templates suit your needs?

		Response Percent	Response Count
Yes		56.3%	9
No		43.8%	7
If not, what can we do to improve them?			8
answered question			16
skipped question			0

**3. All program review presentation material, templates, and documentation are made available to you through the Hawaii Community College websites. Do you find this method of delivery useful?**

		Response Percent	Response Count
Yes		81.3%	13
No		18.8%	3

If not, what could be done differently to better suit your needs? 3

answered question	16
skipped question	0

**4. This year we provided three separate training sessions (one for CTE programs, one for the Liberal Arts program, and one for Units) to better fit your individual needs. Was this helpful?**

		Response Percent	Response Count
Yes		78.6%	11
No		21.4%	3

Should we continue this practice? 9

answered question	14
skipped question	2

**5. For units that submit their annual reviews on the system annual reports of program data (ARPD) website, did you encounter any issues this year with this form of delivery?**

		Response Percent	Response Count
Yes		30.0%	3
No		70.0%	7
	Other (please specify)		7
	answered question		10
	skipped question		6

**6. In general terms, what can be done to improve the existing unit review process?**

	Response Count
	9
answered question	9
skipped question	7

**7. Do you feel that appropriate resources are allocated to conduct a unit review of meaningful quality?**

		Response Percent	Response Count
Yes		50.0%	6
No		50.0%	6
	If not, what resources do you need? Please be specific.		10
	answered question		12
	skipped question		4

**8. Is there anything else that you would like to add that you feel would create a more inclusive and positive environment to develop your unit review?**

**Response  
Count**

8

**answered question**

**8**

**skipped question**

**8**

### Q1. Do you find the annual unit review training helpful?

1	F2F Training was helpful but some thought that it would be more helpful to have the training tailored more specifically towards the unit. For example, OCET's template would prompt the author to add information specific to OCET. We would need to determine how granular we want the training as well. For example do we want training at the Academic Support level, or at the Library level, or even more granular than that? Also recommended earlier training opportunities, for example meeting to discuss what data elements to include in the review prior to being in the review (meet over the summer for example) IR and Assessment Coordinator could be invited to help out as needed. Some folks also wanted to have the face to face feedback sessions include the responses of the online survey, so they knew how others had weighed in.	Jan 30, 2014 2:20 PM
2	I was unable to attend the unit training due to scheduling conflicts	Jan 21, 2014 2:43 PM
3	I found that much of the information being collected or solicited was instruction-centric in nature and did not adequately allow for units to capture the ways in which they support student success. I know that the ACCJC dinged our campus on instructional items, including assessment, but comments made and the structure of the template made it seem as though the entire review process is based on improving instruction. Student affairs units were an afterthought, with our template mimicking what instruction was asked to provide. However, student affairs and administrative affairs do not have the same kinds of data or the same mechanisms in place to capture data. I understand that data is important, but many of the AMP items and Strategic Plan items that we were asked to align with are instructional in nature. The College needs to provide plans that include our units as part of the plan, more than an afterthought.	Jan 13, 2014 11:15 PM
4	I think the current training offered is too general. To really make it beneficial, it would be more helpful to have the training delivered to individual units (or several like units). It would also be helpful if the training were done by the unit head or someone who can answer questions on their behalf. That way specific needs/questions can be addressed.	Jan 13, 2014 9:23 AM
5	It would really be helpful to have the VC of the unit present to answer questions about his/her expectations for the unit review.	Dec 23, 2013 5:30 PM
6	I said yes because it was. But, I would prefer it if the room used for the meeting was able to seat comfortably the number of participants. Many of us did not have desk space, and we had to sit awkwardly in chairs around the main table. Not all units are alike, so I had to sit through some (long) parts that had nothing to do with me which is boring.	Dec 20, 2013 11:38 AM

**Q2. For those units that used a template this year (either comprehensive or annual), did the templates suit your needs?**

1	F2F Many participants from the feedback session felt that the templates were not specific enough to get whether their unit was actually performing adequately. There seemed to be many items being asked for in the template that did not seem to be of use. Also, on the annual template, if the unit was not asking for anything in the way of resources (people, equipment, etc), you still have to fill the template out as if you were making "asks", linking to the strategic plan and other documentation for no apparent reason. Also brought up was the question of whether units would be receiving any kind of feedback when they complete their annual review. Otherwise the units (and instruction) would be waiting for 5 years, when they do a comprehensive to receive feedback on their programs.	Jan 30, 2014 2:20 PM
2	Comprehensive Unit Review template: Part I. Table of ARPD--it would be nice for us to do a summary analysis of any trends we see before going to Part II. We asked to include ARPD figures in Table 3 to look at strengths and weaknesses but there is a jump from Part I. to Table 3. In general, the program/unit review process is getting better each year. Just a few minor fixes (above) are needed.	Jan 14, 2014 1:47 PM
3	Again, the template was very instruction-focused, asking us to align our actions with the AMP and Strategic Plan. The flow of the comprehensive should match the flow of the annual - items were placed in different orders. The Unit Outcomes section at the end of the annual template was clumsy - if you assessed multiple items, you had to explain every assessment in each of the areas (level of achievement, strategy, etc.). It would have been better to explain one assessment from start to finish and then move to the next assessment from start to finish. The template asked us to talk describe our strengths and weaknesses connected to data. It asked us for action plans connected to the ILOs, AMP, Strategic Plan. It asked us for budget items connected to ILOs, AMP, and Strategic Plan, and strengths/weaknesses. It asked us for assessment. But it did not connect the dots. It would be more helpful if the template first asked for (1) assessment and data items, which could be linked to ILOs, AMP, Strategic Plan if that is what you want everything to link to. Then based on those assessment and data items and perhaps referencing them, (2) list strengths and weaknesses. Then based on strengths and weaknesses, (3) list action items. Then, (4) list budget items and link them to an action item.	Jan 13, 2014 11:15 PM
4	For the most part, the template was more helpful this year than in the past. However, it still feels like the template was created for instructional programs, and then modified (terms changed) to create the unit template.	Jan 13, 2014 9:23 AM
5	They are very complex.	Jan 9, 2014 5:18 PM
6	In some ways, the templates were very good because they were fairly explanatory and it was easier to determine what was expected in each section. The major drawback to the templates is they only allowed for the input of text. All graphics, tables, charts, etc. had to be put in a separate appendices, which forced the writer and the reader to constantly move back and forth between the template and the appendices. This caused me to have to spend far more time on the document than I had time for.	Jan 9, 2014 3:12 PM
7	The annual template seemed to have a lot of non-value added items in it this year. The alignment to AMP, strategic plan, ILO's etc. do not seem to really root out whether the program is operating as it should be or if it is improving. One	Dec 20, 2013 2:30 PM

**Q2. For those units that used a template this year (either comprehensive or annual), did the templates suit your needs?**

wonders what will become of all of the additional information that is being requested in the new templates. Seems like a lot of busy work. I think most people would be glad to do more in their reviews if it appeared that something would become of the additional work we are putting into it. More is not necessarily better. I would suggest forming a group to evaluate the templates, cut the junk out, and make them more useful and practical.

- |   |   |                       |
|---|---|-----------------------|
| 8 | Again, I chose yes, but there can still be improvements (maybe). The template did not allow me to paste in excel charts or MS word charts. It converted them in another format with tabs that was not readable. The cursor did strange things if you did not get it *just* right. (like it would jump to the next field) Also I felt constrained by the drop down menus. I did not understand (even after the training) how to fill in some sections. Sometimes things come up only by doing. I would have been helpful to get a recommended word count for the fields. I never knew how much or little I should write. It was unclear how to deal with supporting data. To what extent was it expected and in what form? | Dec 20, 2013 11:38 AM |
|---|---|-----------------------|

**Q3. All program review presentation material, templates, and documentation are made available to you through the Hawaii Community College websites. Do you find this method of delivery useful?**

- |   |  |                       |
|---|--|-----------------------|
| 1 | F2F Most participants felt that the website was fine for housing all of the documentation. Some found that having to go to the program and unit review website for most information, then to the planning website for the annual review and budget process was confusing. Suggestions to house all of the program and unit review documentation under one site for next year.  | Jan 30, 2014 2:20 PM  |
| 2 | Please add the AMP items in a spreadsheet or checklist. Please provide the Strategic Plan items in a spreadsheet or checklist. It is difficult to reference them when having to read through the entire AMP or Strategic Plan document. While providing the information online IS useful, the organization of the online information is not user friendly. Difficult to navigate through all the different pieces. All the pieces (assessment, annual reviews, comprehensive reviews, institutional effectiveness) should be logically linked together, and it seems as though there should be a logical flow to how everything works together. But the way the information is organized is mixed up with the many links taking me back and forth. Maybe there are too many links to it - if everything is technically falling under "Institutional Effectiveness and Planning," then from the hawaii.hawaii.edu homepage, there should be one link to "Institutional Effectiveness and Planning," and from there you select assessment or program reviews or accreditation. Right now, there are links to all of those on the homepage, the same links are on the Institutional Effectiveness and Planning page, and perhaps the links are also on other pages. | Jan 13, 2014 11:15 PM |
| 3 | I did not like having to go to the IEP page to get to the new documentation, then have to go back to the program and unit review site to get the rest of it. Why can't all the program review stuff be on the same site? What is the point of having them in separate locations?   | Dec 20, 2013 2:30 PM  |

**Q4. This year we provided three separate training sessions (one for CTE programs, one for the Liberal Arts program, and one for Units) to better fit your individual needs. Was this helpful?**

1	Most participants expressed a desire to have more training opportunities available to them. Who should be participating in the training and when the trainings need to take place is still up for grabs. There seems to be a desire for more "unit specific" training. IR and the Assessment Coordinator are both open to finding out what works best for the college and supporting any additional training. Our current Comprehensive program and unit review process does have a step where Unit VC's and Directors should be providing unit specific training. We need to determine where the gaps are, and then move to fill them.	Jan 30, 2014 2:20 PM
2	Yes	Jan 21, 2014 2:43 PM
3	Answer to first question (Was this helpful?)--didn't attend. Answer to second question (Should we continue this practice?)--YES!	Jan 14, 2014 1:47 PM
4	Yes continue the practice, but maybe separate academic support units and student affairs units and administrative affairs units, since the requirements and expectations are different.	Jan 13, 2014 11:15 PM
5	I think it was helpful, but feel within units, there is such a broad range, and crossing administrative sectors. The conference room was "packed to the gills" and yet, I'm pretty sure there were still some who didn't attend. I think it would be helpful to offer more sessions for units, breaking them down a little more.	Jan 13, 2014 9:23 AM
6	Yes.	Jan 10, 2014 3:36 PM
7	yes	Jan 9, 2014 3:12 PM
8	yes	Dec 20, 2013 2:30 PM
9	I would rather that units be divided by those with system data and those without.	Dec 20, 2013 11:38 AM

**Q5. For units that submit their annual reviews on the system annual reports of program data (ARPD) website, did you encounter any issues this year with this form of delivery?**

1	F2F Not any significant issues reported this year by units.	Jan 30, 2014 2:20 PM
2	Not applicable	Jan 21, 2014 2:43 PM
3	NA	Jan 14, 2014 1:47 PM
4	ASU is always a little tricky, with data and narratives required from multiple sub-units. However, the solution employed was do-able.	Jan 13, 2014 9:23 AM
5	Student Services units don't submit these to the website, but directly to the VCSA.	Jan 9, 2014 3:12 PM
6	I didn't have to go there...	Dec 20, 2013 2:30 PM
7	na	Dec 20, 2013 11:38 AM

**Q6. In general terms, what can be done to improve the existing unit review process?**

1	F2F Many participants expressed a desire to have a day where their office is closed and they can dedicate the time to dialog about their unit review. Resources should be made available to enable same.	Jan 30, 2014 2:20 PM
2	Please provide clarification on how all of the parts are working together as a whole - we write assessment reports, annual reviews, comprehensive reviews. We take the time to lookup the AMP items and Strategic Plan and connect our action plans to them and our budget items to them. We make recommendations on new AMP items or Strategic Plan items. We need feedback on these reports and updates on what the overall plans are. We saw the layout of how the annual reviews will flow from our programs/units to our deans, to our VCs/Admin team, to the college council. When do we get an updated AMP with the added suggestions? Is the college council approving the overall budget? Is it for 2014-2015, because by the time they review it, the 2013-2014 fiscal year will be almost over.	Jan 13, 2014 11:15 PM
3	The data on the Annual Reports are not accurate. It was impossible to change the health indicator.	Jan 10, 2014 3:37 PM
4	change it	Jan 10, 2014 8:46 AM
5	As a campus, we need to make everything we do more collaborative. [REDACTED] has taken a top down approach to their role as [REDACTED] and in so doing, they are destroying our campus. We are living in fear; we are afraid to disagree.	Jan 9, 2014 3:12 PM
6	None	Jan 9, 2014 2:55 PM
7	More involvement from the VCs	Dec 23, 2013 5:30 PM
8	It seems like we've gone from a very detailed presentation to a 3 pager. Is 3 pages really enough to provide everyone with what they need?	Dec 20, 2013 2:30 PM
9	Make it clearer what the stakes are, what is the purpose and use for the data. Who reads it, where it will be stored, and how it will be followed up. For example, we are asked to document exhaustively on financial asks. At the same time I feel fairly certain that there is no way that I will get these asks. I do it every year, and I have NEVER had a response/feedback or follow up. If I did it wrong, no one has told me. I feel like I am wasting my time with this part.	Dec 20, 2013 11:38 AM

**Q7. Do you feel that appropriate resources are allocated to conduct a unit review of meaningful quality?**

1	F2F Having the time to create the report with the additional burden of having to wade through the strategic plan and other documentation this year was an issue. Suggestions to simplify the existing templates so that they are more specific to the units and to remove unnecessary requests for information that do not lead to program improvement should be considered.	Jan 30, 2014 2:20 PM
2	Unsure	Jan 21, 2014 2:43 PM
3	Don't understand the question.	Jan 14, 2014 1:47 PM
4	We need manpower - faculty and staff are being asked to add this very important task to our workload, which we realize is an important part of the colleges success. To conduct a meaningful review, we need to spend time and energy on this. Nothing is being taken OFF our plates, so we are adding this substantive workload to an already overloaded person. We need help.	Jan 13, 2014 11:15 PM
5	I think we need more help with tying the assessment and strategic planning pieces. While the Assessment retreat was a great exercise, I think follow up sessions would help.	Jan 13, 2014 9:23 AM
6	Maybe individual units can meet one-on-one with facilitator/assessment coordinator/IR/consultant or point person to go over their unit review to make sure it is being filled out properly.	Jan 10, 2014 3:49 PM
7	Hold the training sessions earlier. Have some show and tell examples.	Jan 9, 2014 5:18 PM
8	Time is an important resource that has not been factored into this process. There was a serious lack of timeliness on the part of admin to give us pertinent information, including the templates. The templates were reworked and not even given to us until about 2 weeks before the report was due. Even though the report was due on Nov 27, Student Services had to submit theirs by the 15th, so there was literally only 2 weeks, which is not enough time. There is no compensation given for all of the time spent on conducting the research, implementing and conducting the assessments, compiling the data, and writing the report. This takes a lot of time and that takes us away from the students. There is no release time granted to work on this.	Jan 9, 2014 3:12 PM
9	Support and resources to conduct assessment activities, such as focus groups.	Dec 23, 2013 5:30 PM
10	I said yes, but I do not know how to really answer this. I think we have plenty of smart people on our campus (resources) who are in place to ensure a meaningful review but I do not know how you define "meaningful." It would be helpful to have examples of reviews to look at that have been deemed meaningful by those in a position to say so. Also getting some kind of response to the review would make it more meaningful to me.	Dec 20, 2013 11:38 AM

**Q8. Is there anything else that you would like to add that you feel would create a more inclusive and positive environment to develop your unit review?**

1	F2F Simply form, simplify process. Provide feedback to all submitters including annual reviews. Establish a mechanism to elicit feedback on the annual review and budget process. Develop an actual step by step process for the annuals to enhance what is already in place (like we have for comprehensive reviews).	Jan 30, 2014 2:20 PM
2	Who is assessing the annual review and annual budget process? We keep talking about assessments and outcomes ... what is the outcome of the annual reviews and the institutional effectiveness process? What is the overall outcome and what are the operational outcomes? How will we know when or if it is working? Providing this kind of information to the entire campus community will help to create a more inclusive and positive environment.	Jan 13, 2014 11:15 PM
3	I think it would help if the units can start the process earlier, during the summer.	Jan 10, 2014 3:49 PM
4	this program is dysfunctional and cumbersome at least.	Jan 10, 2014 8:46 AM
5	The new budgetary process forced down our throats is a complete Sham designed by ██████ to put monetary decisions in the hands of a few. It is just one more way that they are seeking to make us cogs in the wheel, rather than important and valuable members of the college community. They have forgotten why they are here and who they are serving. Trying to control people in the long run will only lead to an uprising. Don't forget what happened to our last Provost.	Jan 9, 2014 3:12 PM
6	No	Jan 9, 2014 2:55 PM
7	Yes. I have never had anyone come back to me and say anything about my unit review. Without the feedback it seems like our reviews are going into a black hole. If it is so important every year to expend the resources it takes for everyone to complete these reviews, where is the follow up? Closing the loop? Rich and rapid feedback? We are always asking our people to deliver more, yet we never take the time to dialog with them about the finished product. No one will take these program reviews seriously until we begin to receive feedback on our work.	Dec 20, 2013 2:30 PM
8	Getting timely feedback on the content, and hearing specific ways in which my review can be improved next year. I would also appreciate little reminders from the admin on due dates sent to the listserve.	Dec 20, 2013 11:38 AM