

March 28, 2011

TO: Dorinna Manuel-Cortez

FROM: College Effectiveness Review Committee (CERC)

RE: Admission and Registration Comprehensive Unit Review

The process of Unit Reviews 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 comprehensive program review for the Admission and Registration unit. This is not an end in 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?

Part I. Report Summary

1. Mission and History were clearly and concisely written; they were easy to follow and understand.
2. Mission included mission of Student Services as well as the unit.

Part II. Program

1. Thorough explanation of staff, facilities, and equipment.
2. Though not explicitly required per template an explanation of funding sources of each staff member would have been helpful.
3. Though not explicitly required per the template, because writer was asking for student worker funding, it would have been helpful to see how many student workers are currently employed in the unit and for how many total hours per week.
4. In the last review, writer requested and received a faculty position—Admissions Counselor. How do the Admissions Counselor's duties and responsibilities interrelate with the functions of the unit? Should this position have been included or at least discussed in the review?
5. The Facilities and Equipment section was too specific. Limit the report to items valued at \$1,000 or more.

Part III. Quantitative Trend Data Table

1. A possible data table that identified the amount of staff and student employees to accepted applications would have been helpful, i.e. the ratio of employees to applicants.
2. The first table was difficult to read because of the use of codes and order in which the semesters were reported. It would have been helpful to list the semester and year in lay terms for readers who are unfamiliar with the Banner system. It would also have

been helpful to list them in date order from left to right, with Fall 2010 appearing last instead of first.

3. The data include the number of applicants, those accepted, average processing time, and those that registered for classes. The amount of time spent on processing increased dramatically over the past two years and specifically in Fall 2010. In addition, the % of processed applicants who actually registered also seemed to decrease. Is there a reason for this? Addressing this would have been helpful.
4. Is enrollment a specific function of the unit? It seems that this largely happens outside of the unit and while data is helpful for the college, it does not seem to be attributed to the efforts of the A&R unit.
5. Trends in enrollment were noted and compared to other colleges; did not see comparison of processing time at HawCC to processing times at other colleges as a means of comparison. Data showing how unit processing times and the number of staff to processed applications compare to other campuses in system would have been helpful comparative data.
6. Other helpful data could have included information that specified how many resident versus nonresident applications the unit processed and how this has changed over time.

Part IV. Quantitative Data Analysis

1. The majority of the listed trends do not seem to be related and /or attributable to the operations of A&R.
2. While it is interesting and important data for the college to use in reporting, how is enrollment growth attributable to the efforts and functions of the unit?
3. Native Hawaiian population data is mentioned throughout the document. While it is interesting and helpful data for the college, it does not seem to be relative and/or attributable to the operations of the unit.

Part V. Other Data

1. Native Hawaiian enrollment is up, but is this relevant to the operations of the unit?
2. Writer reported that HawCC exceeded the UHCC strategic goals for enrollment, but there was no analysis of this or supporting details to substantiate the claims.
3. Have the increasing numbers of applicants created any special needs for the unit?

Part VI. Unit SLOs and How Assessed

1. Is SLO2 measurable?
2. Recommend that unit develops SLOs that are more specific to the unit and that are more measurable.
3. With the elimination of green cards, explain how this might have impacted the unit, i.e. was workload reduced, and by how much?
4. Unit measured SLI2 anecdotally. Recommend that the unit have students complete a satisfaction survey as do most programs and units on campus.
5. Recommend that unit consider pulling data from Continuing Student and Graduating Student Surveys as well as CCSSE.

Part VII. Unit Summary

1. Goals are not relative to the function of A&R. Recommend that unit select goals related to function of unit and to the narrative. If unit selects goals that are not clearly related, then unit should explain the relevancy of the goal.
2. Excellent accomplishment of goals set in 2005 Unit Review, i.e. IEP students' ability to move from IEP non credit to credit courses, reduction in the use of green cards, and improving the length of time to process applications.
3. Unit strengths are articulated anecdotally and based on the perceptions of the writer; more concrete evidence would make for a stronger analysis.
4. Survey data would help support unit strengths. It would be helpful to develop a survey to measure student employee morale, possibly an evaluation of supervisor.
5. Committee applauds the unit's recognition of the need to develop methods of data collection.
6. What does the web developer have to do with the functions of Admissions and Registration? Even without the web developer, unit should be able to disseminate usable data.
7. Action plan was clear.
8. What is Lehua Lei o Hilo? Unit needs to explain what it is, how it ties in to our current outreach efforts, and how it will improve our current admissions process.

Part VIII. Budget Implications

1. Unit did not explain what is meant by "more space is needed." Additional details would have been helpful.
2. Unit is requesting funding for an APT, student employees and an office assistant. How do these budget amounts translate to services, i.e. ratio of worker hours to workload? There appears to be no justification to substantiate the need for the requests without an explanation of what will be improved, or what isn't getting done right now.

These recommendations are intended as suggestions for improvement to be considered in the next unit review. The CERC Reviewers commend you for presenting a strong review that explains the needs of the department and its budgetary requests.

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

c Mike Leialoha
Noreen Yamane