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In January 2003, the ACCJC reviewed a request by the University of Hawai‘i Community Colleges to approve a UHCC system reorganization. As part of its review of the proposed substantive change, the Commission examined the structure and functioning of the UHCC system. The Commission continued to require institutional reports, and to send visiting teams, for the fall 2003, spring and fall 2004, and spring 2005 semesters. In the course of working with the UHCC System, and with individual colleges, Hawai‘i Community College was found to lack an institutionalized process for examining institutional quality and student outcomes, planning and continuous improvement. This deficiency at the College was linked to system-wide inadequacies in governance structure and resource planning. In January 2005, the Commission acted to require a report on progress in developing a process and practice of continuous improvement from Hawai‘i Community College.

In its June 2005 meeting, the Commission reviewed the Progress Report submitted by Hawai‘i Community College and acted to place the College on Warning status and require a progress report by October 15, 2005, to be followed by a visit of commission representatives. The warning was issued regarding the concern about the lack of a program review process, as follows:

Hawai‘i Community College needs to provide evidence that demonstrates that a conscious effort to improve student learning is occurring at the institution and that the college organizes its key processes and allocates its resources to support student learning. Furthermore, the institution needs to demonstrate its effectiveness by providing evidence of the achievement of student learning outcomes and evidence of institution and program performance through ongoing and systematic evaluation and planning and improvement (1996 Standards III. A, all, III.B, all, III.C, all).

In addition, the college was asked to respond to the University of Hawai‘i system recommendations 2, 6, and 7. The University of Hawai‘i system office provided the response to these recommendations and the report regarding them is provided separately.

A two-person team visited the college on November 14, 2005 to review the team report and other evidence provided to satisfy the recommendations. The college was well prepared for the visit, with an appropriate schedule and an adequate team room with suitable documentation. During the visit, the team met with the Chancellor, the Administrative Team, the Budget and Finance officer, Assessment Committee and a
selection of faculty and staff responsible for program reviews of their areas. The team found the college enthusiastic and responsive in addressing the issue of program review and the concerns of the Commission. Beginning with the Chancellor and continuing throughout the visit, the college demonstrated excitement, about their progress and repeatedly showed their willingness to use program evaluation to improve Hawai‘i Community College. As the following report will explain, the college responded quickly and effectively to address the Commission concern and has made substantial progress in a short period of time.

**College Response to the Commission Recommendation**

In response to the June action of the Commission, the college took immediate action to respond. A task force was formed during the summer months to begin work on program reviews of the first non-instructional areas that were scheduled for completion in November 2005. When faculty returned in August, the Assessment Committee and chairs of the Academic Senate and College Council coordinated the program review process to assure completion of the academic program reviews in a timely manner to coincide with the progress report and team visit. Examination of minutes and other documents confirmed appropriate early involvement of college constituency groups and also showed a growing awareness of the importance and use of program review to improve effectiveness throughout the institution.

The college adopted the UHCC System template for program review but then modified it to include only the 13 elements for which data was immediately available. In so doing, the college provided a common base set of data from which to build over the next three years of assessment activity. The institutional researcher provided a common set of data for college use and also provided assistance by instituting “Unit Review Preparedness Meetings” in which the units were asked to begin by creating a mission statement for the unit. The meetings provided an overview of the review process, a discussion of the data elements and a venue for questions and concerns. The schedule of program reviews provides for a complete review of all programs in three years. The programs will receive annual data reports to assist them in trend analyses. The college researcher has also developed an assessment website which provides a central place for information of all kinds and links to data sites that support assessment and program review activities.

As the college stated in its progress report, it has begun the process of program review while simultaneously designing the overall planning and review process. The college has adopted an interim planning and review process that is now in progress, but untested. The first twelve program reviews were due the day of the Commission visit and all were available for review. These reviews will be sent to the College Council and the Academic Senate for review and approval. The College Effectiveness Review Committee (CERC) will create four teams of one administrator and one faculty to initially review the program reviews for completeness, then forward the program reviews simultaneously to the Council and Senate. The final composition of the CERC was undecided at the time of the visit. To add reality to the first round of reviews, the
Chancellor has made the sum of $25,000 available for distribution based on program review priorities. This commitment by leadership has been well received by the college.

The Academic Senate, while fully engaged in the present effort, wishes to view this current program review process as a one year pilot subject to modifications to perfect the process. The college will need to pay special attention to ensure that the ultimate structure of the program review process, once established and tested in its first year, is incorporated in the governance structure.

Hawai‘i Community College has been active in establishing Student Learning Outcomes at the program and course level. The team saw examples of student learning outcomes that were being used in the program review process to assess effectiveness. The college has utilized a consultant to develop “program maps” and the faculty is enthusiastic about their development of student learning outcomes using this approach. The team saw evidence of comprehensive program mapping and development of student learning outcomes at the course and program levels.

The team spent considerable time with units who had just completed their program reviews. Evidence was provided in the reports and through discussions that the program review process had been incorporated into the program planning of these units. The faculty and staff were enthusiastic about the results of their reviews and how they might be used in the upcoming review and budget allocation process. The team was convinced that the faculty was genuinely engaged in discussions and activities that will yield evidence of program effectiveness and student learning. In the team’s opinion, the college has developed an approach to planning and assessment that is integrated and systematic. It features common data elements in program review, adoption of student learning outcomes that are integral to the review, and a program mapping process that graphically and in reality represents all elements of the program. In all, the college is well positioned to use systematic evaluation and planning to improve Hawai‘i Community College.

**Conclusion**

Hawai‘i Community College has demonstrated substantial progress in initiating a program review process that has yielded the first set of program reviews according to schedule. There is an interim review process in place that has yet to be fully utilized to review, prioritize and recommend actions that will affect college budget and planning decisions. The college reports and the team saw evidence that the program review process has been embraced by the college and will be used in the manner intended. The college has made significant progress in addressing this concern of establishing program review and should be able to demonstrate further progress during the comprehensive evaluations scheduled for fall 2006.