

HAWAI`I COMMUNITY COLLEGE COMPREHENSIVE PROGRAM REVIEW REPORT

LIBERAL ARTS

November 28, 2011

Assessment Period: July 1, 2008 to June 30, 2011

Initiator: Guy Kimura

Writer(s): Marilyn Bader, MNS Dept. Chair

Trina Nahm-Mijo, SSCI. Dept. Chair

Taupouri Tangaro, HUM. Dept. Chair

Lou Zitnik, ENG. Dept. Chair

Program Review at Hawai'i Community College is a shared governance responsibility related to strategic planning and quality assurance. It is an important planning tool for the college budget process. Achievement of Student Learning Outcomes is embedded in this ongoing systematic assessment. Reviewed by a college wide process, the Program Reviews are available to the college and community at large to enhance communication and public accountability.

Part I: 2011 Annual Program Review:

<http://www.hawaii.edu/offices/cc/arpd/collectanalysis.php>

Part II:

A. Program Effectiveness

1. Write a brief narrative describing how the program supports the College's mission and Institutional Learning Outcomes (ILOs).

In the spirit of E`Imi Pono, the Associate in Arts Degree program supports the College's mission by offering a wide range of instructional courses designed to help students achieve course, program, and institutional learning outcomes.

The program is divided into four departments: English, Humanities, Math and Natural Science, and Social Science. The Department chairs meet regularly to coordinate efforts and to ensure that students are being prepared for success as continuing students, family members, employers, employees, and citizens of local and global communities.

To achieve these goals, the program offers college-level and remedial developmental courses designed to help students acquire the skills necessary to succeed in college and their community.

2. As a result of a five year review of the program and preparing to write this program review, summarize:
 - a. Economic impacts and/or community needs:
 - Course offerings island-wide have increased to meet enrollment demands. From AY 08-09 through AY 10-11, there was a 35% increase in enrollment (FTE) and a 30% increase in numbers of classes taught.
 - ENG. 19: Writing Essentials was added to the English Dept. curriculum in response to community need. It has grown from one section a semester in AY2008-09 to two sections a semester in AY 2010-11, and four sections in AY 2011-12.
 - MATH faculty had four UH system-wide summits with DOE representatives to develop an Algebra II exit exam, to create a seamless pathway into math courses at HawCC, and to create a higher achievement level for students attaining the Board of Education Recognition Diploma;
 - English faculty had four UH system-wide reading summits with DOE representatives to refine alignment between DOE and College curriculum;

- Review and assessment of ESL curriculum has been underway for last two years, resulting in a curriculum redesign to be completed this AY.

b. What changes have been made based on assessment results:

- Departments inventoried course content to assess acquisition of CLOs and PLOs. They developed common key assignments, and final questions which align to PLO and course related outcomes to measure acquisition of LOs and to evaluate the need for curricular or course changes or redesign.
 - For English, writing instructors are implementing an assessment project that collected key assignments from approximately 20 sections of English 100 in the AY2010-11 and will collect again in the AY 2011-12; the project is being used to improve instruction, assess outcomes, and align curriculum with DOE and UH-Hilo.
 - For Math 100+ courses, instructors developed common questions to include in the final exam.
 - For Humanities, Liberal Arts Program LO were pulled down into the course-level LO, with alignment to GELO and ILO
 - For Social Sciences, in highly enrolled courses: IS 101, PSY 100, FAMR 230, ANTH 200, SOC 100 inventory of key assignments and alignment with Course and Program LO
 - For Natural Sciences, Course LO reassessed and revised based on significant contributions to PLO Matrix.
- Developed pathways/bridges between high school and college, and 2 year to 4-year institutions.
- PLO matrix was reassessed by Liberal Arts to identify significant contributions to Liberal Arts PLO.

c. Other pertinent information.

None

3. Program Effectiveness Strengths and Weaknesses

Enumerate the top three strengths and weaknesses

- S1: High demand based on number of classes taught, student semester hours for program majors, and student semester hours for non-program majors at a low per student cost (\$96 per SSH) demonstrates that LBRT is great value for the college.
- S2: Transfer rate to UH 4-year from AY 09-10 to AY 10-11 increased by 41%, far exceeding the system goal of 3%.

S3: Engagement, retention, and graduation rates are high within the UHCC system

W1: High increase of students in the last 3 years, with limited increases in resources. Sections taught in AY 2008-2009 increased from 352 to 457 in AY2010-2011. The increase of 105 courses resulted in only a \$6 increase per SSH.

W2: High lecturer dependence, in all four departments with increased demand for report and assessment work. UH system commitments to Hawaiian and Asian-Pacific advantage is not being met due to lack of full-time faculty to coordinate the system initiative.

W3: Lack of adequate facilities including office space and equipment for increased number of lecturers; lack of a unified campus “home” due to split location and shared UH-Hilo facilities.

4. Discuss the progress the program has made in meeting the goals set in the last Comprehensive Program Review.

➤ For assessment, the Program achieved the following:

- Built a culture of assessment involving assessment plans, strategies, and evaluations of Program Learning Outcomes.
- As planned, assessed four of the eight PLOs.
- Created a common rubric for each program learning outcome and collected a random sampling of artifacts (tests and key assignments) which were assessed by each department’s team.
- Summarized and posted results on the College’s assessment website.

➤ In its last Comprehensive Review, the program asked for 8.5 positions. The following were filled:

- 1 ENG. - .5 Tanya Dean (WHI), 2010
- 1 MATH – .5 Toni Cravens (WHI), 2010
- 1 SCI. – Roberta Brashear-Kaulfers, 2007
- 1 SSCI. – Claudia Wilcox Boucher, 2008
- 1 ART – Meidor Hu, 2007
- 1 HIST. – Gabriel James, 2009

The following were not filled but are still needed.

- 1 SOC.
- 1 PHIL./REL.
- 1 JPNSE

- The program continued establishing articulation agreements with UHH, UH, Chaminade, OSU, the DOE and charters schools to increase seamless alignment through the P-20 Initiative.
5. List the program's top 3 goals/plans for the next Comprehensive Review period. Briefly describe evidence that supports these goals/plans.
- a. Request 9 FTE positions to be filled in the following priority order based on the highest lecturer dependent areas documented over the last academic year. * Some are carry over "asks" from the 2007 Comprehensive Program Review. The total sections and credits taught by lecturers over the last academic year are in parenthesis.
 - 1) 1 ENG (83 sections, 249 credits)
 - 2) 1 SCI (39 sections, 83 credits)
 - 3) 1 MATH (29 sections, 107 credits)
 - 4) 1 SSCI/PS crossover (30 sections, 90 credits)
 - 5) 1 PHIL/REL (22 sections, 66 credits)
 - 6) 1 MATH (see above)
 - 7) 1 ENG (see above)
 - 8) 1 GEOG (18 sections, 54 credits)
 - 9) 1 ASIAN STUDIES/JAPANESE LANGUAGE (10 sections, 33cr credits)
 - b. Continue efforts to assess course LOs to align with Program and ILOs, resulting in program improvement. Accreditors expect the college to be at the Proficiency level in assessment of SLOs by 2012.
 - c. Continue efforts to assess Remedial/Developmental curriculum to increase success rates, thus increasing degree completion rates and persistence rates.

B. Action Plan for Program Improvement: Complete Table, 1-4 to provide justification for program budget requests

Table 1—Top 3 Non-Cost Items
(examples are given in italics; delete & replace with Program’s items)

***Strengths/Weaknesses are numbered (S1, S2, S3; W1, W2, W3) and taken from A.3**

Task:	Academic yr.	Who is responsible	Justifications	
			How does it improve program effectiveness?	Addresses which strength or weakness*
<i>1. Adopt General Education LOs as PLOs and institute an alignment process</i>	<i>2011-2012 To 2015-2016</i>	<i>Faculty</i>	<i>Will streamline the assessment process and create a common foundation for the program</i>	<i>S3, W2</i>
<i>2. Continue efforts to assess course LOs to Align with PLOs and ILOs</i>	<i>2011-2012 to 2015-2016</i>	<i>All faculty and lecturers</i>	<i>Sustainable Quality Improvement of Learning Outcomes</i>	<i>S1</i>
<i>3. Utilize the program review process to evaluate developmental education enrollment and completion to determine effectiveness; meet once a year as a program.</i>	<i>2011-2012 To 2015-2016</i>	<i>All faculty and lecturers</i>	<i>Improve persistence, retention, completion and transfer rates</i>	

Table 2 —Prioritized Top 3 Cost Items (“G” funded requests only)

(examples given in *italics*; delete & replace with Program’s items)

*Budget Categories: P=Personnel; S1x=College Discretionary Fund; SE=Supplies Enhanced; Eq=Equipment (>= \$5K)

**Strategic Outcomes Goals and Performance Measures are: A1.1, B4., C1., D3., E2., etc.

		Justifications		
Priority	\$ amount & budget category* Except R/M	Best fits which Action Strategy in the Strategic Plan and how? If it doesn’t match to any of the existing Action Strategy, you may write a new one for recommendation.	Addresses which strength or weakness?	If currently grant funded, please explain: put date when funding ends and indicate HawCC commitment to support, if any
9 FTE Positions	\$360,000 P	<i>Hire qualified full-time instructors to meet the increased demand for classes and to contribute to the integrity of the curriculum by participation in SLO evaluation and improvement of the teaching/ learning environment.</i>	W2	
1 English Computer Classroom	Computers and furniture for 20 stations = \$30,000 Eq.	<i>A2.3.d. Will help in the development of literacy skills in areas such as writing, computer and technology.</i>	W1	
1 15 Passenger Van	\$30,000	<i>A2.5: Increase HLS, Social Sciences, Humanities program offerings in underserved areas; increase participation in service learning</i>	W1, W2	

Table 3.--Repair and Maintenance

Nature of Problem	Describe Location: e.g. Building(s) & Rooms(s)

Table 4—Equipment Depreciation, if applicable

(examples given in *italics*; delete & replace with Program's items & add rows as needed)

Key to abbreviations:

CP=Controlled Property w/item value \$1K-\$5K

E=equipment w/item value >\$5K

Program Assigned Equipment (E) and Controlled Property (CP) (List in order of chronological depreciation date)	Category: CP or E	Expected Depreciation Date	Estimated Replacement Cost
<i>11 Video Projectors: K123, 124, 125,129 , 101,102,103, 104 & 388-101,102,103</i>	<i>CP</i>	<i>AY2013-14</i>	<i>11 x \$2,000 = \$22,000</i>