

# 2011 Program/Unit Process Improvement Summary

19Jan12

<u>Group</u>	<u>Program</u>	<u>Feedback Date</u>
Group 1:	Units	1-10-12
Group 2:	Liberal Arts	meeting scheduled for 1-11-12—no LA personnel in attendance
Group 3:	Instruction	1-18-12

## Summary Meeting Participants:

Shawn Flood (Institutional Analyst)

Mary Goya (Assessment Committee Chair)

Joyce Hamasaki (Interim Dean, CTE)

Susan Horimoto (Admin Officer, Business Office)

Guy Kimura (Interim Dean, Lib Arts & Public Svcs)

Joni Onishi (Interim Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs)

Instructional Program Question	Summary	Improvements	Responsible Party
<p>1. Did you find the annual program review training presentation and materials helpful? If not, what could be done differently to better suit your needs?</p>	<p>Helpful, useful, reassuring. Not everyone is making it to training, then they need direction when it comes time to write the report.</p>	<p>Shawn will send meeting requests to VC's /Directors when training is ready. VC's /Directors will be responsible for disseminating meeting day/times to the writers and program initiators. VCAA will ask Secretary to assist with scheduling.</p>	<p>Shawn VC's/Directors VCAA Secretary</p>
<p>2. All program review presentation material, templates, and documentation are made available to you through the Assessment website. Do you find this method of delivery useful? If not, what could be done differently to better suit your needs?</p>	<p>Website needs to be updated to make things easier to find.</p>	<p>Daniel will be working on website going forward.</p>	<p>Daniel</p>
<p>3. This year we provided three separate presentations (one for instruction, one for liberal arts, and one for units) and 3 separate training sessions to better fit your individual needs. Was this helpful and should we continue this practice?</p>	<p>Current practice works.</p>	<p>Continue practice.</p>	<p>Shawn</p>
<p>4. Again this year, your annual instructional program review was delivered to you completely on-line. Did you encounter any issues with this form of delivery?</p>	<p>Not user friendly. Have to save too often. Too many</p>	<p>Joni will send email to Cheryl asking her to please have her team look at these suggestions</p>	<p>Joni Mary</p>

	links/tabs.	for fixes to the online tool.  Mary and Noreen will bring to UHCC IPRC at their next meeting.	Noreen
5. In general terms, what can be done to improve the existing program review process?	Issues with BOR appointments, issues with health calls, issues with data, issues with CIP/SOC codes, purpose of an annual review, inconsistencies.	We will continue to address these issues within the narrative of our reviews. This will help to explain the inconsistencies.	
6. Do you feel that appropriate resources are allocated to conduct a program review of meaningful quality? If not, what resources do you need?	Not enough time, reduce number of data elements, who do we go to for our issues with annual unit reviews?	On campus, the go-to person will become the VC's/Directors.  Reducing the number of data elements will be added to the list of suggestions to be taken to the UHCC IPRC once we have prioritized the issues. Is the UHCC IPRC the appropriate group to take suggestions for change?	Noreen/Joni

<b>Unit Question</b>	<b>Summary</b>	<b>Improvements</b>	<b>Responsible Party</b>
<p>1. For those units that used the generic templates this year (either comprehensive or annual), did the templates suit your needs?</p>	<p>Clarify ACU deliverable. Form fill able templates</p>	<p>Joni will work with ASU to develop an addendum to the system template to ensure that there are no gaps between what the system template requires, and what we need to report locally.</p> <p>CERC will evaluate the comprehensive templates and make suggested changes to the Assessment Committee (AC). AC will update comprehensive review templates and will turn comprehensive and annual templates into form fill able documents.</p>	<p>Joni CERC AC</p>
<p>2. What would you like to add to or remove from the generic templates that would help you to better write your unit review?</p>	<p>Some subunits would like to have unit outcomes and assessments of outcomes on the annual review.</p>	<p>Joni will work with Admin team about how this might work on our campus.</p>	<p>Joni</p>
<p>3. All program review presentation material, templates, and documentation</p>	<p>Some people are having a hard time finding what they are looking for.</p>	<p>Daniel will be revamping assessment website containing the program review page to make it easier to find things.</p> <p>Daniel may want to review the graphic of the integrated planning</p>	<p>Daniel</p>

<p>are made available to you through the Assessment website. Do you find this method of delivery useful? If not, what could be done differently to better suit your needs?</p>	<p>A graphic with relationships between program review, assessment, and accreditation, needs to be created that is linked to documentation.</p>	<p>process and create links to the documentation.</p>	
<p>4. Do you find the annual program review training presentation and materials helpful? If not, what could be done differently to better suit your needs?</p>	<p>Apparently, not all of the VC's and Directors are holding training for the system unit reviews.</p>	<p>Each VC or Director needs to take responsibility for their unit training on campus. Joni will work with Admin team to accomplish this for our campus.</p>	<p>Joni</p>

<p>5. This year we provided three separate presentations (one for instruction, one for liberal arts, and one for units) and 3 separate training sessions to better fit your individual needs. Was this helpful and should we continue this practice?</p>	<p>The number and type of training sessions works.</p>	<p>Continue current practice and include the unit specific training by VC's and Directors as in #4 above.</p>	<p>Joni</p>
<p>6. Do you feel that appropriate resources are allocated to conduct a unit review of meaningful quality? If not, what resources do you need? Please be specific.</p>	<p>Focus groups are planned for OCET this semester.</p> <p>There is a need for a banner tech on campus.</p>	<p>Banner Tech position is in committee.</p>	<p>Joni</p>

<p>7. In general terms, what can be done to improve the existing program review process?</p>	<p>Moving in right direction.</p>	<p>None.</p>	
<p>8. Is there anything else that you would like to add that you feel would create a more inclusive and positive environment in which to create your unit review?</p>	<p>Assessment Fair this year was fun. Perhaps we could do something for program/unit review?</p>	<p>Mary will bring idea to AC for discussion.</p>	<p>Mary</p>