

MEMORANDUM

Date: March 28, 2011

To: Gayle Cho, Clyde Kojiro

From: College Effective Review Committee (CERC)

Subject: 2009-2010 Architectural Engineering and CAD (AEC) Technology 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 program review for the AEC Technology Program. 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 like we expected them to work?
- 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

As a result of your team attitude and effort, the AEC Technology program continues to be progressive for the benefit of the students. Your leadership is very much appreciated.

Demand: Unhealthy

This element is based on the number of majors to annual new/replacement positions. The number of majors decreased by 3 students to 59 with only 3 new and replacement positions in the County. This equates to 19.7 majors per job, an Unhealthy call. The Blueprint Reading courses are "housed" with AEC causing the non-majors in program classes to be at 34%. Incorporating Green Building Designs into your curriculum should expand the employment opportunity base. You will need to revisit the SOCs you've identified for your program.

Efficiency: Healthy

This element is based on two criteria – class fill rate and student to faculty ratio. Number of majors to the 2 FTE BOR appointed faculty is 29.5, a Healthy call. The fill rate increased by 4% to 88%, a Healthy call. Continue your recruitment efforts.

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 23.8%, a Healthy call. However, the ratio of degrees awarded to new and replacement positions in the County is 4.7, an Unhealthy call. The 71% Persistence (Fall to Spring) is a decrease of 4% and is a Cautionary call. This needs to be addressed.

Other elements:

- Two students transferred to UH 4-year which is a plus for the program.
- The AEC program met all Perkins IV Core indicators.

The following is feedback from the Comprehensive Program Review.

Part A. Program Effectiveness

1. Program mentions the college's mission and ILOs; however, to improve this section it is suggested a stronger connection with the mission and ILOs with specific alignment program elements be developed.
2. Summary of changes was made and explained. Program changes are aligned with national initiative to support sustainable green construction industry.
3. Good analysis of program strengths and weaknesses with plans to improve.
4. The program needs to explain their progress in achieving their overall goals to provide a clearer understanding for the Reviewers.
5. Program goals are aligned with industry needs.

Part B: Action Plan for Program Improvement

You have committed the architectural engineering and CAD technology program to an ambitious goal of moving towards green and sustainability practices. Gayle's willingness to pursue "green" certifications in sustainable building practices is admirable and encouraged. Set specific benchmarks of your goals so you can monitor the program's progress throughout the year. Concrete outcomes should be reported in your next review.

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. 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 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. Continue developing assessment strategies to assess student learning outcomes that lead to program improvement.

Part C: Action Plan Support Budget Priority

Program priorities 1 and 2 will be submitted as CERC priorities. Priority 3 will be considered in CERC and will be recommended to the Planning and Operations Maintenance unit to be included in Repair and Maintenance schedule.

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

c Jim Yoshida
Noreen Yamane