

2013 Program - Unit Review Process Improvement Summary

4Mar14

<u>Group</u>	<u>Program</u>	<u>Feedback Date</u>
Group 1:	Units	28Jan14
Group 2:	Instruction	28Jan14

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)

Dr. Marty Fletcher (Director, UH Center West Hawaii)

Joyce Hamasaki (Interim Dean, CTE)

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

Shawn Flood (Institutional Analyst)

James Kiley (Institutional Assessment Coordinator)

Donnalyn Kalei (comprehensive instruction template/process)

Larissa Leslie (comprehensive unit template/process)

Trina Nahm-Mijo (annual instruction template/process)

Steve Schulte (annual unit template/process)

[Note: Those listed above attended one or more of the 3 meetings we held on campus in support of this work on March 4th, 12th, or 21st.]

Instructional Program Review Process Question	Summary	Improvements	Responsible Party	Status
<p>1. Did you find the annual program review training helpful? If not, what could be done differently to better suit your needs?</p>	<p>Numerous requests for feedback on the annual reviews. Currently there is no mechanism in our existing process to support this.</p> <p>Lack of clarity about steps within the annual process. Currently there is no mechanism in our existing process to support this.</p> <p>Some writers expressed a desire to have more time to write their reviews.</p>	<p>The Dean of Liberal Arts and the Dean of CTE programs will ensure that prompt feedback is given to each program that submits an annual review.</p> <p>Joyce will create an annual review process that includes a description of each step in the process, along with its corresponding due date.</p> <p>All training will now be conducted in the month of October to allow everyone extra time for their reviews.</p>	<p>Dean of Liberal Arts Dean of CTE</p> <p>Joyce</p> <p>All Trainers</p>	<p>Deans will decide how best to provide feedback and will begin with 2013-2014 reviews.</p> <p>In progress.</p>

<p>2. For those programs that used a template this year (either comprehensive or annual), did the templates suit your needs? If not, what can we do to improve them?</p>	<p>Some writers expressed frustration that the templates were requiring more information than what was needed for their reviews and that the templates were too complicated.</p>	<p>Joni will organize a team charged with modifying/simplifying ALL templates. The published feedback from the program review questionnaire will be used as a guide to ensure that the needs of the organization are being met.</p>	<p>VCAA CERC</p>	<p>Implementation of PATH should make inputting easier.</p>
<p>3. All program review presentation material, templates, and documentation are made available to you through the Hawaii Community College websites. Do you find this method of delivery useful? If not, what could be done differently to better suit your needs?</p>	<p>Some writers expressed concern that not all of the information they needed for their review on the college's website was in the same place.</p>	<p>IR will work with the web developer to see if there are some opportunities to alleviate this concern.</p>	<p>IR Web Developer</p>	
<p>4. 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? Should we continue this</p>	<p>Some commented that they were unable to attend their training at the day and time scheduled.</p>	<p>A scheduling tool is currently in use to ensure that the day and time that most folks are available is taken into consideration when planning the training. It is impossible to set a day and time that everyone can</p>	<p>IR</p>	

<p>practice?</p>		<p>make. We will continue to seek out the most convenient scheduling for everyone.</p> <p>Additionally, we will have 2 training sessions scheduled for instruction. (Units scheduling will remain the same.)</p>	<p>All Trainers</p>	
<p>5. Again this year, your annual reports of program data (ARPD) were delivered to you completely on-line. Did you encounter any issues with this form of delivery?</p>	<p>Data was entered for instruction by the VCAA's office so no one on campus from instruction interacted with the tool this year.</p>	<p>No issues reported</p>		
<p>6. In general terms, what can be done to improve the existing program review process?</p>	<p>There is currently no evaluation step for the new annual and budget review process, and there has not been a full evaluation of CERC published.</p>	<p>There will be an evaluation step added to the annual and budget review process. This evaluation will encompass all areas of the review (ARPD, Assessment, Comprehensive and Annual Reviews, and CERC. The Faculty Senate in</p>	<p>IR Assessment Coordinator VCAA Admin Team Faculty Senate</p>	

		<p>conjunction with the Admin Team will ensure that the entire instructional program review process is evaluated every year, once the review process has ended. The evaluation needs to take place prior to Summer break, and feedback from campus will drive the plan for next year's review. IR will develop the survey and will ensure that a summary of this work is published every year. Joyce will add this step to both the comprehensive and annual review processes.</p>	Joyce	
<p>7. 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>Some writers indicated that they did not have appropriate resources (people, time, etc) to conduct their reviews. We are currently not using campus resources as effectively as we should.</p>	<p>The training for the reviews will now take place in October to allow extra time to write the reviews.</p> <p>The Chancellor will consider inviting the Faculty Senate to the table to share in the governance</p>	<p>All Trainers</p> <p>Chancellor</p>	

		<p>and evaluation of the current instructional program review process on campus.</p> <p>Joyce will add this additional step to both the annual and comprehensive review processes.</p>	<p>Faculty Senate</p> <p>Joyce</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 program review?</p>	<p>Suggestions from the face to face group feedback were; since we have beefed up the annual review template to the point that it is as detailed as the comprehensive review, why not get rid of the entire comprehensive review process on campus and just have one review. If a program or unit is due for a comprehensive review, they simply write "comprehensive review" on their title page prior to submission.</p>	<p>Joni can evaluate the possibility of making this change when she brings her team together to evaluate the templates.</p>	<p>VCAA</p> <p>CERC</p>	

Unit Review Process Question	Summary	Improvements	Responsible Party
<p>1. Do you find the annual unit review training helpful? If not, what could be done differently to better suit your needs?</p>	<p>Lack of clarity about steps within the annual process. Currently there is no mechanism in our existing process to support this.</p> <p>Some units would like more time to write their reviews.</p> <p>Numerous requests for feedback on the annual reviews. Currently there is no mechanism in our existing process to support this.</p>	<p>Joyce will create an annual review process that includes a description of each step in the process, along with its corresponding due date.</p> <p>All training will now be conducted in the month of October to allow everyone extra time for their reviews.</p> <p>VC's and Directors will ensure that prompt feedback is given to each unit that submits an annual review. Joyce will add this to both the annual and comprehensive review processes.</p>	<p>Joyce</p> <p>All Trainers</p> <p>VC's and Directors</p> <p>Joyce</p>

	Several writers are still indicating that they are not receiving any training specific to their units.	This is already part of the comprehensive review process (step #7). VC's and Directors need to work more closely with their constituencies to ensure that unit specific training is being provided on campus. Joyce will add this step to the annual and budget review process.	VC's Directors Joyce
2. For those units that used a template this year (either comprehensive or annual), did the templates suit your needs? If not, what can we do to improve them?	Some units thought that the template was geared more towards instruction in the way that it was developed.	Joni will organize a team charged with modifying/simplifying ALL templates. The published feedback from the program review questionnaire will be used as a guide to ensure that the needs of the organization are being met.	VCAA CERC
3. All program review presentation material, templates, and documentation are made available to you through the Hawaii Community College websites. Do you find this	Some writers expressed concern that not all of the information they needed for their review on the college's website was in the same place (i.e. spread across various websites)	IR will work with the web developer to see if there are some opportunities to alleviate this concern and improve web navigation.	IR Web Developer

<p>method of delivery useful? If not, what could be done differently to better suit your needs?</p>			
<p>4. 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? Should we continue this practice?</p>	<p>Some commented that they were unable to attend their training at the day and time scheduled.</p>	<p>A scheduling tool is currently in use to ensure that the day and time that most folks are available is taken into consideration when planning the training. It is impossible to set a day and time that everyone can make. We will continue to seek out the most convenient scheduling for everyone.</p> <p>We will have 2 sessions for instruction. Units scheduling will remain the same.</p>	<p>IR</p> <p>All Trainers</p>

<p>5. For units that submit their annual reviews on the system annual reports of program data (ARPD) website, did you encounter any issues this year with this form of delivery?</p>	<p>No issues reported</p>	<p>N/A</p>	
<p>6. In general terms, what can be done to improve the existing unit review process?</p>	<p>There is currently no evaluation step for the new annual and budget review process, and there has not been a full evaluation of CERC published.</p>	<p>There will be an evaluation step added to the annual and budget review process. This evaluation will encompass all areas of the review (ARPD, Assessment, Comprehensive and Annual Reviews, and CERC). The Faculty Senate in conjunction with the Admin Team will ensure that the entire instructional program review process is evaluated every year, once the review process has ended. The evaluation needs to take place prior to Summer break, and feedback from campus will drive the plan for the next year's review. IR will develop the survey and will ensure that a summary of this</p>	<p>IR Assessment Coordinator VCAA Admin Team Faculty Senate Joyce</p>

	<p>In the face to face feedback session there was an idea brought up that all offices could work one day on their unit reviews. This would be in place of their regular duties, i.e. offices would, in effect, be closed (or provide limited services) on Program/Unit Review Day, so that appropriate time to write and dialog can take place for the units. Some similar agreement should also take place for instructional programs as well.</p>	<p>work is published every year. Joyce will add this step to both the comprehensive and annual review processes.</p> <p>Providing time for programs and units to dialog about their reviews, would show commitment in regards to making the program and unit review process on campus “real”. It would also show that we are in fact allocating resources appropriate for this work to be completed on campus.</p> <p>It is requested that the Chancellor, with the input of the Admin Team, determine if this could be instituted on campus going forward.</p>	<p>Chancellor Admin Team</p>
<p>7. Do you feel that appropriate resources are allocated to conduct a unit review of meaningful quality? If not,</p>	<p>Some writers indicated that they did not have appropriate resources (people, time, etc) to conduct their reviews. We are currently not using</p>	<p>The training for the reviews will now take place in October to allow extra time to write the</p>	<p>All Trainers</p>

<p>what resources do you need? Please be specific.</p>	<p>campus resources as effectively as we should.</p>	<p>reviews.</p> <p>The Chancellor will consider inviting the Faculty Senate to the table to share in the governance and evaluation of the current instructional program and unit review process on campus.</p> <p>Joyce will add this additional step to both the annual and comprehensive review processes.</p>	<p>Chancellor</p> <p>Faculty Senate</p> <p>Joyce</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>Suggestions from the face to face group feedback were, since we have beefed up the annual review template to the point that it is as detailed as the comprehensive review template, why not get rid of the entire comprehensive review process on campus and just have one review. If a program or unit is due for a comprehensive review, they simply write "comprehensive review" on their title page prior to submission.</p>	<p>Joni can evaluate the possibility of making this change when she brings her team together to evaluate the templates.</p>	<p>VCAA</p> <p>CERC</p>