

MEMORANDUM

Date: March 28, 2011

To: Susan Horimoto

From: College Effectiveness Review Committee (CERC)

Subject: 2009-2010 Business Office 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 Business Office. This is not an end into 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?

CERC commends the writer for a well written document addressing each area specifically and clearly.

Part I. Report Summary

The comment in the CERC Comprehensive Summary (see attached), "The statement about being committed to serving ...," is irrelevant because the writer of the CPR refers to the actual HawaiiCC mission.

Part II. Program

Clear and concise

Part III Quantitative Trend Data table

See attached CERC Comprehensive Summary of responses

Part IV Quantitative Data Analysis

More analysis in this area would be needed. See attached CERC Comprehensive Summary for recommendations.

Part V Other Data

It would have been helpful to discuss and analyze results of the survey and not just response rate.

Part VI Unit SLOs and How Assessed

The comments in the CERC Comprehensive Summary (attached) indicate confusion regarding goals and SLOs. It should be clearer in the next Review since Units are being asked to identify Unit outcomes rather than Student Learning Outcomes.

Unit Assesses SLOs – The Business Office needs to improve its assessment process. For example, an analysis of survey results needs to be included in the narrative. See comments on CERC Comprehensive Summary.

Part VII Unit Summary

Evidence of alignment of the Unit with the Strategic Plan's outcomes was unclear. The Comprehensive Unit Review template indicates the specific kinds of performance indicators, etc. that could be included in an alignment.

Unit action plan was weak. Although 6 goals were listed, it was not clear what tasks, as part of an action plan, would be used to achieve the goals. Security and safety of employees due to cash collection should be the first priority, i.e. first goal.

Part VIII. Budget Implications

Renovation of counter and installation of security cameras are top priority for safety of staff.

These recommendations are intended as suggestions for improvement to be considered in the next program review. The CERC Reviewers commend Business Office 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