

Program being evaluated: *IT*

Date: 3/8/11 CERC Name: *Comprehensive Summary*

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

Purpose: This tool is used to evaluate Comprehensive Program Reviews for the AY 2010-11. Each CERC member will be completing one of these for each of the program reviews.

Part A. Program Effectiveness

Criteria	1 - Does Not Meet	2 - Meets	3 - Exceeds	Score
1. The narrative describes the program and how it supports the College's mission and Institutional Learning Outcomes (ILO).	Not present or no connection to mission and ILO.	Adequate description and connection to mission and ILO.	Very thorough and strong connection to mission and ILO.	1.944
Recommendations/Comments: <i>I'm pondering how to make the IT program more appealing to students. Program supports 2 of the college's imperatives. IT mission stated and connection to 3 imperatives. more description of the program needed and support of the College's mission Very Good course and program level narrative but little mention of ILOs No connection to ILOs.</i>				
2. Summary of changes was made and explained.	Not present or weak explanation, and/or changes unsupported by evidence.	Adequate explanation and substantiated.	Very thorough and well substantiated.	2.222
Recommendations/Comments: <i>I applaud the fact that there is now a Certificate of Completion for students finish up this program. Modified course prerequisites to facilitate faster entry into ICS courses; introduced a new course upon the recommendation of the advisory board. Change in MATH prerequisites should lead to increase in # of majors. analysis and presentation of data was helpful Is lowering the math pre-requisite a realistic trade off to attract more majors? Will these students be prepared for the next levels? Do the updates of courses go through CRC so description/information in catalog can be updated?</i>				

Criteria	1 - Does Not Meet	2 - Meets	3 - Exceeds	Score
<p>3. Program strengths and weaknesses.</p> <p>Recommendations/Comments: <i>Should consider including information on course completion rates; determine if there are gatekeeper courses within the program. Excellent discussion of PLOs and analysis of strengths and weaknesses. No plan given on how to address weaknesses of recruitment of students and completing their degree within a 2-3 year period. List of strengths and weaknesses available but no survey to analyse S!-- "High success rate of graduates in workforce"; S2--no survey of S2-- "Great satisfaction with student interns y local businesses". A3.b. Assessment of PLOs--(Appendix A) had 4 assessments that included external team input. Student "meet" or "exceed" expectations for all courses. 99% of assessments were "meet or "exceeds" during Spring 2010 showing excellent progress during 4 precedin assessments. evidence based on assumptions not facts no concrete evidence to substantiate Strengths.</i></p>	<p>Not present or weak analysis.</p>	<p>Adequate analysis and perceptions.</p>	<p>Very thorough and substantial analysis and perception.</p>	<p>2.000</p>
<p>4. Progress on program goals since last comprehensive program review.</p> <p>Recommendations/Comments: <i>"this is a continuous process" is not a report of progress Why did the electronic portfolios program fizzle and what kind of support does IT need to un-fizzle it? Some progress on some and limited progress on others -- largely due to circumstances beyond control of program. Certificate of Completion started and implemented. Urge continuing the creation of a computing literacy course given January 2011 VP Morton Summit results. Do not understand goal 4.c. "Review similarities..."; strongly urge investigation of e-portfolios. Odd and vague comment concerning fizzling initiative Except for #1, the rest don't show what progress was made since last CPR</i></p>	<p>Not present or no progress.</p>	<p>Adequate progress.</p>	<p>Substantial progress.</p>	<p>2.028</p>
<p>5. Program's top three goals are based on evidence.</p> <p>Recommendations/Comments: <i>Four ongoing goals does not constitute one goal for purposes of top three goals. I encourage you to offer a computer literacy course for students other than IT students. Many of my students are not computer literate, even now in 2011. Good evidence for first two.</i></p>	<p>Not present or unsupported by evidence.</p>	<p>Adequate and supported by evidence.</p>	<p>Well substantiated by evidence.</p>	<p>2.111</p>

Criteria	1 - Does Not Meet	2 - Meets	3 - Exceeds	Score
Evidence are assumptions. See W3 -- shouldn't developing new initiatives, such as 2+2 programs be a goal?				
Part A. TOTAL				10.306
Part A. AVG (TOTAL divided by 5)				2.061

Part B. Action Plan for Program Improvement

Summary Evaluation of Action Plan. (Reference: Table 1)

Reference Table 1	Does not meet = 1	Meets = 2	Score
Recommendations/Comments: <i>Only one of tasks coincides directly with top three goals. Confused about task #2. Isn't there already a lab in Bldg. 346 for IT classes? Isn't there already an IT lab in Building 346? What are students doing now?</i>	Incomplete table or unclear.	Complete table.	1.944

Part C. Action Plan Supports Budget Priority

Cost Item (Table 2)	Priority Ranking		Part C	Part A Pg 2	Part B Pg 2	Total C+A+B
Program Priority	1 = Low	2 = Medium	Score	Score	Score	
1. Hire 1 FTE faculty	Action plan does not support budget request nor does it support Strategic Outcomes Goals.	Action plan partially supports budget request and supports some Strategic Outcomes Goals.	2	2.061	1.944	6.006
Comments:	<i>There is nothing in table one to support this; it is one of the top three goals for the program. Does 15 credits justify a FT faculty? Can classes e taught by lecturers until # of majors justify another FT faculty? Program numbers do not justify another faculty member at this time. A recent retirement in this program found the college choosing to not</i>					

<p>hire another IT faculty member at this time. There are programs with greater need awaiting their first faculty or second if needed. Need maybe revisited in a few years as the demand changes.</p> <p>Action Plan and entire review supports this request</p> <p>Specific action strategies from the Strategic Plan were not referenced. Goal A is for Native Hawaiian Student Success. IT is not focused only on Native Hawaiian. Where are Goal B action strategies?</p> <p>Reallocation of a position to the IT program or request for a new position?</p> <p>Are lecturers available until future of program can be determined?</p> <p>The low number of majors and low average class size and fill rate doesn't justify another FTE faculty. Aren't classes still being offered with lecturers teaching?</p>							
2. Replace instructional computers (21 for student use in general IT courses, 12 used for students to create networks and other special uses)	Action plan does not support budget request nor does it support Strategic Outcomes Goals.	Action plan partially supports budget request and supports some Strategic Outcomes Goals.	Action Plan completely supports budget request and fits specific Strategic Outcomes Goals.	1.861	2.061	1.944	5.867
<p>Comments:</p> <p>Are these computers for the lab or classroom? Does not the college's ACU have money for replacing computers?</p> <p>Is this for the IT lab in Bldg 346? No equipment and depreciation information provided in Table 4. What does the program have at present and how outdated?</p> <p>Computers quickly become obsolete and in a course that teaches this skill, it seems like a high priority.</p> <p>Computer upgrades and replacements should already be on the master list and timeline from ACU for HawCC.</p> <p>Does not mention age of computers or why they need to be replaced.</p> <p>Specific action strategies from Strategic Plan were not referenced.</p> <p>Part of ACU replacement schedule?</p> <p>Aren't these computers on the computer replacement cycle?</p> <p>Classroom already in the replacement cycle so not part of an action plan. Computers systems for lab work do not need to be acquired and can be obtained from systems replaced in the cycle.</p>							
3. Continue subscription to MSDN Academic Alliance Program	Action plan does not support budget request nor does it support Strategic Outcomes Goals.	Action plan partially supports budget request and supports some Strategic Outcomes Goals.	Action Plan completely supports budget request and fits specific Strategic Outcomes Goals.	1.833	2.061	1.944	5.839

Comments:

B-budget item?

Should be covered from program B Budget.

Specific action strategies from Strategic Plan were not referenced.

Why is this not part of the existing budget allocation for the program?

Action plan doesn't mention infrastructure, but supported by Strategic Outcomes Goals

This should be covered with "B" budget.