

**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	18	
Recommendations/Comments: <i>Chart provides clarity</i> <i>The statement about being committed to serving all segments of the Hawai`i Island community being aligned with the UHCC system's mission does not appear to be appropriate. Business Office operations do not serve all segments the island community except for students and vendors rather than the general public.</i> <i>Very clear. Well done.</i> <i>Addressed each area specifically and clearly.</i> <i>Good connection to Mission. Need better connection to support specific Strategic Plan Action Strategies.</i> <i>Connection to ILOs a little weak</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	18	
Brief description of facilities & equipment	18	

Recommendations/Comments:
Clear and concise
Straight forward and each area was concisely addressed.
To the point.
Was the year 2007 singled out on page 8, and how does it relate to overall period?
Excellent assessment of customer service focus and need for safety for staff

Part III. Quantitative trend data table

Evidence:	Is evidence included? (✓)	
	YES	NO
Identify what specific data is appropriate to its function	18	
Recommendations/Comments: <i>The quantitative trend data showing documents processed shows an increase in the number of documents. Comparing the percentage increases with enrollment and/or funding increases or determining the relationship of the number personnel to number of documents seems warranted. Drawing conclusions from the number of documents processed is not possible without some sort of corresponding data.</i> <i>Reported amount of transactions processed for each document type over a four year period.</i> <i>Table of data elements has appropriate items to be considered. Trend is going up for amount of checks and noted in the narrative as to why.</i>		

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	15	3

Recommendations/Comments:
There is no comparison of data to applicable standards.
No comparisons made
Need to be expanded upon to a very large extent.
Analysis of results should be included and tied to the goals
Transaction accounts could be compared to other colleges to identify areas for improvement.
Responsibilities and processing have steadily increased over the four year period. Could have conducted analysis on the time frame to process transactions to measure efficiency.
Did not see any comparison to natl. standards but trends noted showed definite increase internally to HawCC.

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.)	18	
Recommendations/Comments: <i>Survey conducted with the results showing far greater satisfaction with the Business Office than dissatisfaction.</i> <i>Survey had low response number, especially for students.</i> <i>Good attempt in gleaning information from the HawCC ohana.</i> <i>Would have been helpful to discuss and analyze results in narrative.</i> <i>Yes. Surveys to faculty, staff and students were used via e-mail and Survey Monkey. Results analyzed and incorporated into the narrative.</i>		

Part VI. Unit SLOs and How Assessed

	(✓)	
	YES	NO
Unit has SLOs	9	9

Recommendations/Comments:
Written in goals/plans
Unit seemed to be using goals as learning outcomes.
Clear illustration.
Quality of customer service and financial well-being of the college may be outcomes, but may be difficult to objectively assess or measure.
SLOs were identified on program map only. Would have been helpful to see them written in SLO language and to see how unit assesses them.
Goals are included; no SLOs found
SLOs not clearly labeled; I marked yes as I am assuming the statements in the right arrow are the SLOs.
More appropriate to use Unit Learning Outcomes as much of the work this unit does not involve direct contact with students.
No discussion of SLOs. Only Program Map provided with no narrative.
Rewrite SLOs in measurable terms
Yes, on program map but more description of them should be included in the narrative and tied into the surveys that were done. Next Comprehensive should be easier because units will be asked to identify UNIT outcomes, not student learning outcomes.

	(✓)	
	YES	NO
Unit Assesses SLOs	6	12
<p>Recommendations/Comments: <i>Assessment done according to goals</i> <i>Unit needs to improve assessment of efforts; for instance, the “brown bag series” on page 8 was called a success but no information was given as to how that success was determined.</i> <i>The survey results do not accurately assess or measure the outcomes and no narratives about how the outcomes were specifically assessed/measured was addressed.</i> <i>No assessment or discussion of SLOs; no information about progress on them.</i> <i>Once SLOs developed, assessment can be created.</i> <i>See comment above</i> <i>Are the survey results assessing SLOs? No narrative to explain analysis and potential improvements.</i> <i>Use of surveys for faculty, staff and students and analysis included in narrative</i></p>		

	Priority Ranking			Score
	1 = Low	2 = Medium	3 = High	1.444
Unit SLOs and How Assessed	Assessment not present or Weak explanation	Adequate explanation	Very thorough and strong explanation	

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.	2.333
Recommendations/Comments: <i>Good training and handouts on the various policies and procedures for faculty/staff. Discussion focused on how the Business Office's mission aligns with the UHCC's mission but did not mention HawCC's mission. A discussion of alignment with Strategic Outcomes was present, but evidence of the alignment was questionable. As mentioned before, need a stronger connection to specific HawCC SPlan outcomes, goals and performance measures.</i>				
2. Progress on unit goals since last comprehensive unit review.	Not present or no progress.	Adequate progress.	Substantial progress.	2.278
Recommendations/Comments: <i>Good progress made inc. the renovation since the robbery</i>				
3. Unit strengths.	Not present or weak analysis.	Adequate analysis and perceptions.	Very thorough and substantial analysis and perception.	2.111
Recommendations/Comments: <i>Good explanation of the unit's strengths and what needs improving.</i>				
4. Unit weaknesses.	Not present or weak analysis.	Adequate analysis and perceptions.	Very thorough and substantial analysis and perception.	2.111

Criteria	1 - Does Not Meet	2 - Meets	3 - Exceeds	Score
Recommendations/Comments: <i>Safety for the staff is an Top Priority for meeting</i>				
Part VII. TOTAL				8.833
Part VII. AVG (TOTAL divided by 4)				2.208

	(✓)	
	YES	NO
Unit Goals included	18	
Action Plan included	14	6
Recommendations/Comments: <i>There were six unit goals identified but here was no Action Plan or discussion of how the goals will be accomplished, except in a general statement under the Budget Implications sections.</i> <i>Action plan could be outlined or numbered to make for ease of reading. Specific plans for staff development would help, especially since so much of work is customer service.</i> <i>Action plan not clear; reader must infer based on goals presented.</i> <i>Action plan weak or non-existent.</i> <i>A little confusing because 6 goals for next period did not include the installation/renovation of the counter to improve security and safety for the staff but this was mentioned in the Budget Implications part. It should be a Top Priority!</i>		

Part VIII. Budget Implications

	(✓)	
	YES	NO
Budget Implication section completed	18	
Chart 1 completed	1	
Recommendations/Comments: <i>Clear and easily understood need.</i> <i>Division Carryover budget can cover this project</i> <i>This would be a renovation project, request should go to POM.</i> <i>This seems to be a necessary expenditure as it involves the safety and well being of staff as well as the security of the college itself.</i> <i>Security/safety should be top priority</i>		

Chart 2 completed	18	
Recommendations/Comments: Items can be covered by Department B budget Recording 3 rd priority ask on Chart 3, should come from unit's B-Budget? Is this the only equipment and property the office has? Computers are not counted? Does the office have a copy machine?		

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	
Cashier Counter	2.500	1.444	2.208	6.153
Kuali Training	2.167	1.444	2.208	5.819
Staff Development	1.333	1.444	2.208	4.986