

**COLLEGE EFFECTIVENESS REVIEW COMMITTEE (CERC)
Evaluation Tool for Comprehensive UNIT Reviews**

Purpose: This tool is used to evaluate Comprehensive Unit Reviews for the 2010-2011 academic year. Each CERC member will be completing one of these for each of the unit reviews.

Part I. Report Summary

Evidence:	Is evidence included? (✓)	
	YES	NO
Mission	18	
History	18	
Organizational Chart	17	1
Recommendations/Comments: <i>Since this is a unit review, maybe the Student Services Mission Statement does not need to be included. The Student Services Mission Statement needs to be rewritten.</i> <i>The Organization Chart is of Student Services which the Admissions & Registration unit is a part, but maybe there also need to be staffing included in the organizational chart for the unit.</i> <i>Clearly written, easy to follow and understand</i> <i>Includes Student Services and Admissions & Registration mission, doesn't explain how unit implements mission.</i> <i>Do units really need a history section?</i> <i>Concise, well-written summary</i>		

Part II. Program

Evidence:	Is evidence included? (✓)	
	YES	NO
Services provided by unit	18	
Top 3 or more goals of unit for review period	18	
Faculty & staff listing	18	
Funding source of faculty & staff	15	3
Brief description of facilities & equipment	18	

Recommendations/Comments:

Evaluator unsure if Pos. No. Indicates funding source.

Funding source not identified for APT B & Office Asst III positions. Student employees, mentioned later in the review, not included here.

Goal 1 does not appear to be appropriate for the unit as there is a specific process for all adult applicants so how can one adult group have a streamlined process while another can't.

Thorough explanation of all staff and funding sources and of the facilities and equipment.

Succinct and easy to read.

Goals are based on ADP 2002-2010, which was used to establish the initial goals. Concern that position #43857 was submitted to HR for redescription in May 2007 with no decision or response heard as of time CPR was filed (Nov. 2010)

Part III. Quantitative trend data table

Evidence:	Is evidence included? (✓)	
	YES	NO
Identify what specific data is appropriate to its function	18	
<p>Recommendations/Comments:</p> <p><i>Relating the number of employees & student workers to accepted applicants would provide a more meaningful analysis</i></p> <p><i>Data includes number of applicants, those accepted, average processing time, and those that registered. The amount of time spent on processing increased dramatically in Fall 2010 and the % of processed applicants who actually registered also seemed to decrease.</i></p> <p><i>First table was difficult to read because codes were used instead of dates.</i></p> <p><i>First table based on HawCC applicants received, accepted, processed and registered shows consistent percentage of accepted and registered but processing time in days has increased in past two 2 years (200810 was higher).</i></p>		

Part IV. Quantitative Data Analysis

Evidence:	Is evidence included? (✓)	
	YES	NO
Trends noted over the review period, comparisons to any applicable standards, such as college, program or national standards	14	4
Recommendations/Comments: <i>There is no comparison of data to applicable standards.</i> <i>Some of the listed trends do not seem to be related to the operations of Admissions & Registration.</i> <i>Good data and information.</i> <i>Trends in enrollment were noted and compared to other colleges; did not see a comparison of processing time at HawCC to processing time at other colleges as a means of comparison</i> <i>No comparison made.</i> <i>Explanation for processing time that dropped after June 2010 from 4 weeks to 3 days for Fall 2010 applications.</i> <i>Use of UH System data to show HawCC's continued high increase in enrollment is excellent. Also pointed out the Native Hawaiian percentage of student population and persistence.</i>		

Part V. Other Data

Evidence:	Is evidence included? (✓)	
	YES	NO
i.e. Satisfaction survey results and any external factors affecting the program. Special studies and/or instruments used (NCHEMS New and Continuing Student Surveys, etc.)	15	3
Recommendations/Comments: <i>Native Hawaiian enrollment is up – not sure if this is relevant to operations.</i> <i>Writer reports that HawCC exceeds UHCC strategic goals for enrollment but analysis ends there. Have these increasing numbers created special needs for the unit?</i> <i>Nothing to explain what the connection is to the increase in Native Hawaiian enrollment. What about the other data provided in this report?</i> <i>HawCC has exceeded SP performance indicator of 3% annual increase in Native Hawaiian students enrolled!</i>		

Part VI. Unit SLOs and How Assessed

	(✓)	
	YES	NO
Unit has SLOs	18	
<p>Recommendations/Comments: <i>The Admissions & Registration Unit is non-instructional and service-oriented so establishing Student learning Outcomes then attempting to develop appropriate assessment instructions are virtually impossible. Has adopted two SLOs developed by Student Services. SLO1 is intended for students or unit members? Both. Is SLO2 Measurable? Rewrite SLOs to be in measurable terms.</i></p>		

	(✓)	
	YES	NO
Unit Assesses SLOs	16	2
<p>Recommendations/Comments: <i>The unit did the best they could under the circumstances. SLO2 is measured anecdotally. Recommend that Admissions & Registration have students complete a satisfaction survey as do most other units in Student Services. SLO2 was assessed by observation? Who did the observing? How often? Perhaps statistics do need to be kept. Need some mechanism to assess SLOs; not sure what is meant by "investigation" Yes, assessment of 2 SLOs was based on data collected and analyzed. Appears to be appropriate to look at # of applications received and registrations processed including the increase in use of MyUH for override and the eventual discontinuation of green card use. SLO #2 is harder to assess but progress has been made on the use of staff training and how many times a staff member has had to intervene at the counter (this has dropped) and the # of complaints fielded by VCSA has dropped.</i></p>		

	Priority Ranking			Score
	1 = Low	2 = Medium	3 = High	
Unit SLOs and How Assessed	Assessment not present or Weak explanation	Adequate explanation	Very thorough and strong explanation	2.500

Part VII. Unit Summary

Criteria	1 - Does Not Meet	2 - Meets	3 - Exceeds	Score
1. The narrative describes the unit and how it supports the College's mission and alignment with Strategic Plan.	Not present or no connection to mission and strategic outcomes, goals, and performance measures.	Adequate description and connection to mission and strategic outcomes, goals, and performance measures.	Very thorough and strong connection to mission and strategic outcomes, goals, and performance measures.	2.556
Recommendations/Comments: <i>Very clear alignment with Strategic Outcomes mentioned. Immensely helpful having the Strategic Outcome Goals listed that the Unit addresses.</i> <i>Lists goals in Strategic Outcomes, but does not explain how the unit supports alignment with them.</i> <i>Great accomplishment in helping the non-credit IEP participants to streamline the transfer process via BANNER access.</i> <i>Specifics might help to indicate areas for improvement; for instance, a staff member's desire to continue and renew employment is not an indicator</i> <i>Excellent connection to specific SP outcomes and performance measures, especially in Goals A, B and E.</i>				
2. Progress on unit goals since last comprehensive unit review.	Not present or no progress.	Adequate progress.	Substantial progress.	2.722
Recommendations/Comments: <i>Did well in meeting goals: IEP students able to move more seamlessly to credit courses and the elimination of green cards.</i> <i>Application processing time remains a challenge.</i> <i>Excellent connection made between goals set for 2005 Unit Review, the ADP and the current SP. IEP transfer from non-credit to credit process has been streamlined. IEP students are now part of Banner, as of 2007. Big improvement. Reducing the use of green cards goal was met by Fall 2010. Goal 3 of increasing processing timeliness for applications was met after June 2010; down to less than 3 days!!</i>				
3. Unit strengths.	Not present or weak analysis.	Adequate analysis and perceptions.	Very thorough and substantial analysis and perception.	2.556
Recommendations/Comments: <i>Anecdotal and based on perceptions of writer; more concrete evidence would make for a stronger analysis.</i> <i>Specifics might help to indicate areas for improvement; for instance, a staff member's desire to continue and renew employment is not an indicator of high morale, nor is a staff meeting discussion about customer service evidence of improved customer service.</i> <i>High morale in office; visible participation of staff in campus governance while maintaining high productivity for increased enrollment and applications processed. Very much an asset to campus and to students and potential students</i>				

Criteria	1 - Does Not Meet	2 - Meets	3 - Exceeds	Score
4. Unit weaknesses.	Not present or weak analysis.	Adequate analysis and perceptions.	Very thorough and substantial analysis and perception.	2.444
Recommendations/Comments: <i>What does the web developer have to do with Admissions – failed to make a connection. Realistic description of weaknesses and how to improve.</i>				
Part VII. TOTAL				10.278
Part VII. AVG (TOTAL divided by 4)				2.569

	(✓)	
	YES	NO
Unit Goals included	18	
Action Plan included	18	
Recommendations/Comments: <i>Clear action plan. Chart helps to identify the tasks to complete to accomplish the goals. Articulated several meaningful goals and Action Plan was well developed to implement and accomplish goals. What is Lehua Lei O Hilo? Yes. But would like to see UH System HR follow up on position # 43857 to redescribe it to Office Assistant IV. This would help in addition to the request for APT A permanent position.</i>		

Part VIII. Budget Implications

	(✓)	
	YES	NO
Budget Implication section completed	18	
Chart 1 completed	18	
Recommendations/Comments: <i>Discussion on-going re: air condition unit for building Unit is scheduled to be replaced through campus repair and maintenance next fiscal year Facilities request should be directed to POM and Vice Chancellor of Administration. Does not explain what is meant by “more space is needed.” The \$155,000 costs need to be incorporated into College's budget for health/safety of workers.</i>		

Chart 2 completed	18
Recommendations/Comments: <i>Small items should be covered by B budget</i>	

What does the unit need in order to meet its goals over the next review period?

Cost Item (may be on Chart 3)	Part VIII	Part VI Pg 3	Part VII Pg 4	Total VIII+VI+VII
Evaluator's Priorities, Top 3	Score	Score	Score	
FT APT A	2.889	2.500	2.569	7.958
Secure general funds for student employees OR Office Assistant III *A specific explanation of how these positions would help might add more weight to the request	1.722	2.500	2.569	6.792
Office Assistant III OR general funds for student employees	1.389	2.500	2.569	6.458