

January 26, 2012

TO: Noreen Yamane, Chancellor
FROM: Mary Goya, Assessment Committee Chair
RE: 2011 Program/Unit Review Process Improvement Summary

As Assessment Committee Chair, IPRC Member, and participant in the 2011 Program/Unit Review process improvement Summary Meeting I would like to bring specific attention to feedback reoccurring in two areas:

- 1) HawCC Vice Chancellor and Director Involvement**
- 2) UHCC System Issues with Annual Reports and reporting via the IPRC**

1) After gathering feedback from initiators and writers involved in the Fall 2011 Program and Unit Reviews and compiling feedback into the 2011 Program/Unit Process Improvement Summary (attached; also electronically delivered by Shawn Flood on 1/25/12) reoccurring feedback emerged.

On the Summary Report under Instruction #4, 6 and Units #2, 3, 4, 5 an emerging theme for our campus was the request for more direct involvement, understanding, and guidance to staff and faculty from the appropriate Vice Chancellor and Director. Programs and Units felt if their Vice Chancellor or Director started taking on the responsibility, guidance, and training for their area program/unit reviews and assessment the process might improve and feel more integrated into their ongoing work. As Joni, Guy, and Joyce attended the Process Improvement Meeting they could assist with a dialogue at an Administrative Team Meeting related to this issue.

2) The other concerns are related to providing feedback to the System Office about conundrums writers and initiators encountered with system data and online submittal process. Instruction #4, 5, 6 and Units #2. Issues are:

-Instructional Online Submittal Tool requires a writer to continually press the SAVE button, often as much as after every sentence. Even narrative copied and pasted from a WORD document sometimes does not save appropriately. This became frustrating for writers using the tool.

-BOR Appointments are still not accurate when the system pulls the data. Our campus has attempted to correct the problem yet the errors appear not to be corrected in all necessary locations to ensure accurate data.

-Where or whom should our campus go to for assistance in improving this process? Is this the IPRC? Is the IPRC responsive?

-The Qualitative Language of the Health Calls (Unhealthy, Cautionary, Healthy) does not seem to reflect quantitative analysis and often make faculty and staff feel disheartened. Should the language be changed? Should the numerical values or formulas for making the calls be reviewed? Should a numerical value be assigned instead of a qualitative term since the report is on quantitative data? Or are there additional possibilities?

Thank you for your attention to these suggestions for improvement. Please provide some insight into how you feel we might move forward or what is important to address at this time.

Cc: Summary Meeting Participants: Shawn Flood, Joyce Hamasaki, Susan Horimoto, Guy Kimura, Joni Onishi