

# 2012 Program - Unit Review Process Improvement Summary

11Mar13

<u>Group</u>	<u>Program</u>	<u>Feedback Date</u>
Group 1:	Units	12-13-12
Group 2:	Instruction	12-13-12

## Summary Meeting Participants:

Noreen Yamane (Chancellor, UHCC IPRC Rep)

Joni Onishi (Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs)

Jim Yoshida (Vice Chancellor for Administrative Affairs)

Deborah Shigehara (Interim Director, Office of Continuing Education and Training)

Beth Sanders (Interim Director, University Center at West Hawaii)

Joyce Hamasaki (Interim Dean, CTE)

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

Joel Tanabe (Construction Tech Dept. Chair/ Carpentry, UHCC IPRC Rep)

Shawn Flood (Institutional Analyst)

James Kiley (Institutional Assessment Coordinator)

Jason Santos (IT Support)

<b>Instructional Program Review Process Question</b>	<b>Summary</b>	<b>Improvements</b>	<b>Responsible Party</b>
<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>Need reminders for training. Scheduling improvements. The issue from last year about saving work in the online tool seems to have been corrected.</p>	<p>Develop a Program/Unit Review Communication Plan that will be followed every year to include reminders and a new scheduling strategy. A scheduling tool will be used to ensure that the availability of all faculty, lecturers and staff are taken into account. Add an instruction to training materials to print grey scale if a black and white copy is preferred, and to print data sheet if needed. Liberal Arts and CTE Deans will coordinate printing needs with division secretaries.</p>	<p>Institutional Research  Liberal Arts and CTE Deans  Division Secretaries</p>
<p>2. All program review presentation materials, templates, and documentation are made available to you through the Program Review website. Do you find this method of delivery useful? If not, what could be done differently to better suit your needs?</p>	<p>Trouble finding assessments. Website is very useful.</p>	<p>The intranet will be made accessible to all who need access to it.</p>	<p>Web Developer  Institutional Assessment Coordinator</p>

<p>3. This year we provided three separate training sessions (one for CTE programs, one for the Liberal Arts program, and one for units) to better fit your individual needs. Was this helpful and should we continue this practice?</p>	<p>Yes, separate training sessions work better.</p>	<p>Continue Practice.</p>	<p>Institutional Research</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>Worked much better this year with the saving issue. There are still some lingering issues with formatting within the tool.</p>	<p>Continue use of tool and ask our UHCC IPRC Representatives to take a look at the formatting issue and see if it can be corrected.</p> <p>Add to training presentation suggestion to spell check in Word prior to copying and pasting into the online tool.</p>	<p>UHCC IPRC Reps</p> <p>Institutional Research</p>
<p>5. In general terms, what can be done to improve the existing program review process?</p>	<p>Want to have input into scheduling day/time. Timely feedback once reviews are turned in.</p>	<p>The use of a scheduling tool will be reinstated going forward to allow us to reach the largest audience possible.</p> <p>Feedback is currently being provided by the VCAA.</p>	<p>Institutional Research</p>

<p>6. Do you feel that appropriate resources are allocated to conduct a program review of meaningful quality? If not, what resources do you need? Please be specific.</p>	<p>Uncertainty about how the EMSI data is derived from #1 and #2 data elements.</p>	<p>Our UHCC IPRC Reps will take this forward and try to determine if this data is meaningful in the program review, and if it can be adjusted to account for current economic conditions.</p>	<p>UHCC IPRC Reps</p>
<p>7. Is there anything else that you would like to add that you feel would create a more inclusive and positive environment to develop your program review?</p>	<p>Process is sufficient.</p>	<p>Some have asked that an outside party be brought in to complete their program review for them.</p> <p>Writing of the program reviews are the responsibility of each program on campus.</p>	<p>n/a</p>

<b>Unit Review Process Question</b>	<b>Summary</b>	<b>Improvements</b>	<b>Responsible Party</b>
<p>1. For those units that used a template this year (either comprehensive or annual), did the templates suit your needs?</p>	<p>The online Academic support template would not accept CCSSE data due to a formatting issue. Templates used by others worked fine.</p>	<p>VCAA and IR will be working closely with the Academic Support Group this year to ensure that the template used suits the needs of the group.</p> <p>Also working with our UHCC IPRC Reps who will take Academic Support template issues back to UHCC IPRC. We should be using a fully functional template.</p>	<p>VCAA Institutional Research UHCC IPRC Reps</p>
<p>2. What would you like to add to or remove from the current templates that would help you to better write your unit review?</p>	<p>Academic support template online—Library data does not fit nicely into template.</p> <p>Include standard dollar amounts for common items like APT, faculty, casual hire, furniture, etc.</p>	<p>VCAA and IR will be working closely with the Academic Support Group this year to ensure that the needs of the Library and other areas are addressed in the new improved template.</p> <p>Institutional Assessment Coordinator will look into standardizing dollar amounts for the comprehensive template and will ensure that the instructions in the template are clear.</p>	<p>VCAA Institutional Research  IAC</p>

<p>3. All program review presentation material, templates, and documentation are made available to you through the Program Review website. Do you find this method of delivery useful? If not, what could be done differently to better suit your needs?</p>	<p>Website works well.</p>	<p>Continue use of website.</p>	<p>HawCC Web Developer  Content contributors.  Institutional Research</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>Presentation works.</p>	<p>Continue Practice.</p>	<p>Institutional Research</p>
<p>5. This year we provided three separate training sessions (one for CTE programs, one for the Liberal Arts program, and one for units) to better fit your individual needs. Was this helpful and should we continue this practice?</p>	<p>Need more individual training for unit's i.e. Academic support.  Training is helpful.</p>	<p>Academic Support Unit will expand upon meeting times to ensure that template is working and that the needs of the unit regarding their unit review are taken into consideration.  Other units may consider spending more time in this area as well.</p>	<p>VCAA  Institutional Research</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>What is the mechanism for ensuring that the data requested in the review is of use i.e. Academic Support</p> <p>Have someone else collect data for my unit i.e. University of Hawaii Center at West Hawaii</p>	<p>The mechanism to request new data elements in our system required unit reviews is to take your suggestions to the UHCC IPRC through our campus representatives.</p> <p>Our UHCC IPRC reps will work with the UHCC IPRC to see if the system will support the development of a unit review specific to the Centers.</p>	<p>UHCC IPRC Reps</p>
<p>7. In general terms, what can be done to improve the existing unit review process?</p>	<p>Needs to be done earlier. Perhaps meeting over the summer.</p>	<p>This suggestion is being considered for the Academic Support Unit. It is also suggested that other units take advantage of this opportunity to invest more time with their groups as well. Administrators will determine the most appropriate time to develop their unit reviews.</p>	<p>All Units</p>

<p>8. Is there anything else that you would like to add that you feel would create a more inclusive and positive environment to develop your unit review?</p>	<p>Receiving feedback would be helpful.</p>	<p>It was noted that units that do not use a system mandated template for their reviews would like to have some feedback on the suitability of the data collected, and the information contained within their reviews.</p> <p>The Chancellor will provide feedback to University of Hawaii Center at West Hawaii and OCET.</p> <p>All VC's, Dean's and Director's will provide feedback to their respective groups.</p>	<p>Chancellor VC's Dean's Director's</p>
---	---	---	--