**Institutional Planning Processes**
Standard I.B.3 and Rubric for Evaluating Institutional Effectiveness

Does the college have planning processes that incorporate evaluation of programs and services (i.e., Annual Program Review), improvement planning, implementation, and re-evaluation? Are these processes ongoing and systematic? Is data analyzed, interpreted, and used for evaluation and planning? Improved student learning and achievement? Institutional effectiveness?

There is a need to simplify and better explain the Annual Program Review process. The current process seems to be cumbersome and time consuming. There are recommendations to create an APR document that is more reflective of the overall goals for the division/unit and for the college. This revised APR document could create more effective review. Some feel that there is a need to provide training on the process and use of data for faculty and staff. There is also a lack of information on the final Institutional Plan and how it is determined. Some want clearer procedures for how requests are processed. There is also a lack of understanding of how “big picture” plans are conceived and processed through campus.

**Participation in the Planning Processes**
Standard I.B.4, III.D.1.d, and Rubric for Evaluating Institutional Effectiveness

What mechanisms exist for participation in the college’s evaluation and planning processes? Do these mechanisms allow for broad-based involvement? Robust dialogue? How does the budgeting of resources follow evaluation and planning? Does evaluation and planning lead to improvements?

For this topic, participants feel there is a need for more communication and transparency regarding the college’s planning processes and what happens beyond the division or unit level for the Annual Program Review (APR). They would appreciate more communication from their division chair and/or unit head. Most participants understand there is a planning process, but their role is limited. Some feel that not everyone is participating in the planning processes.

Some faculty and staff have the perception that decisions for planning and budgeting are made by administration without a thorough understanding of micro-level needs. Better communication of decision-making process could alleviate negative perceptions.

**Budget Planning Process**
Standards I.B and III.D.1.d and Rubric for Evaluating Institutional Effectiveness

Do people know how budget decisions are made? Are the processes for financial planning and budget recorded and made known to the campus community?

For this topic, participants feel there is a need for more communication and transparency regarding the budgeting process and how decisions are made. There is participation in the process, but there is a lack of information on how funds are actually allocated and spent. There
was also an issue with release time and how it is determined. End of year reports are informative.

**Course Assessment**  
Standard II.A.1.c and Rubric for Evaluating Institutional Effectiveness

How and by whom are student learning outcomes for courses assessed? How are the results used for improvement?

For this topic, participants feel there is a need to review the quality of course assessments on campus. A lot of data is collected, but it is unclear what improvements are occurring. Some participants would like feedback on their submitted assessments.

There is also a need for more communication on current assessment process and procedure. There is a suggestion to provide models and templates. Support in some disciplines is needed as they rely heavily on lecturers.

**Program Assessment (Career and Technical Education)**  
Standard II.A.1.c and Rubric for Evaluating Institutional Effectiveness

How and by whom are student learning outcomes for courses assessed? How are the results used for improvement?

For this topic, participants feel we are meeting the standard. There is some concern on how to collect data on students once they leave or graduate. There is a recommendation to use a capstone course for program assessment.

**Associate Arts (AA) Degree Assessment (General Education)**  
Standard II.A.1.c and Rubric for Evaluating Institutional Effectiveness

How and by whom are student learning outcomes (General Education) for the A.A. degree program assessed? How are the results used for improvement?

For this topic, participants had a lack of understanding of what the AA program outcomes are and whether we assess Gen Ed outcomes. There is also a need for clarification of the relationship between ILOs, Gen Ed outcomes, and course SLOs. There is some concern about adding another assessment process to what is already being done.

**Distance Education - Instructional Programs**  
Standard II.A.2 and Rubric for Evaluating Institutional Effectiveness

How does the college ensure the quality of its instructional courses and programs offered through distance education (for example, course design, peer evaluation, curriculum review, program review, course assessment, and so forth)?

For this topic, participants felt the college ensured the quality of its instructional courses and
programs offered through Distance Education by providing quality training and support mainly through the Educational Media Center. There are peer and student evaluations in place although they should undergo continuous revision and improvement. Teaching squares was an effective program which allows DE instructors to share and see each other’s courses. Faculty thought Technology Boot Camp and summer training was good. We have model classes that others can view. Participants appreciated the one-on-one support received from the EMC.

Suggestions:

1. Professors should teach F2F until they reach high quality then transform courses in DE.
2. Create and enforce polices for developing and teaching DE courses.
3. Have competency tests of student enrolling in DE course.
4. Have constant courses for students to develop computer skills open/rolling enrollment.
5. Hire instructors with online experience.
6. Create a process to ensure the development of quality courses and faculty.
7. Improve the peer evaluation process.
8. Increase opportunities for faculty/staff to share/discuss DE.
9. Peer evaluations by faculty who don’t teach D.E. is unhelpful and harmful. Instructors who teach DE should only get peer evaluations from other faculty who teach DE.
10. Develop DE guidelines for instructors to follow (like no broken links, respond within 48 hours on week days, etc.)
11. Increase administrative support. Currently support is nonexistent.

Assessment of Support Areas
Standards I.B.7, II.B, II.C, and Rubric for Evaluating Institutional Effectiveness

What mechanisms does the college use to gather evidence about the effectiveness of programs and services? How effectively do evaluation processes and results contribute to improvement in programs and services?

For this topic, there seems to be a lot of discussion about closing the loop. Participants are interested in getting feedback from students and alumni, and they question whether the college gets representative feedback from these groups. Some support areas have surveys available that they would like to use to get feedback from clients, but these are not always distributed, as they do not know how to get the surveys out.

There is a recommendation to train people in the various units on how to collect data and what kind of data to collect. There is also a need to understand how to measure the data effectiveness. One recommendation is to provide models of units that have been successful in using data to improve services.

It was also suggested that there should be dialogue between support areas on their assessment methods, processes, and results. It would be helpful if units shared how they were assessing performance and using that information to improve.
There is a request for formal training for faculty and staff involved in annual program review. They would like training on creating outcomes, assessing outcomes, and analyzing the data collected from those outcome measures. It is also recommended that information on SLOs and assessment be provided in one accessible location.

The need for more direction from administration came up several times. It is good that units are given latitude to develop their own methods and measures for assessment, but units need guidance on which measures to use and how to analyze the data.

**Distance Education - Student Support Services**
Standard II.B and Rubric for Evaluating Institutional Effectiveness Outcomes

How does the college ensure that its student support services for distance education are of high quality and comparable with the college’s face-to-face offerings?

For this topic, participants felt that a systematic process is needed to ensure student support services are of high quality and comparable to face-to-face services. There is a concern that Student Services may not have the skills to perform these services electronically.

Suggestions:

1. Prequalify students or have prerequisites before allowing students to take online classes.
2. Develop and implement a system-wide coordination plan.
3. Require online students to have counseling & advising.
4. Ensure a certain DE student to counselor ratio
5. More information about distanced learning services to instructors (so can point students in correct direction for help/resources).

**Distance Education - Learning Support Services**
Standard II.C and Rubric for Evaluating Institutional Effectiveness

How does the College ensure that Learning Support Services for Distance Education are of high quality and comparable with the College’s face-to-face offerings? (Learning Support Services include the Library, Learning Resource Center, Educational Media Center, KI Office, Test Center, Computer Labs, etc.)

For this topic, participants felt that the learner support services on campus were outstanding. The support services mentioned include library, tutoring, and faculty support and training. Participants thought it was good to incorporate Laulima training into the New Student Orientation. Students lack the skills needed for online learning which leads to low success.

Participants were very pleased with DE Committee’s efforts to promote DE Best Practices through round table discussions. There was support for the use of Blackboard Collaborate as a tool that promotes communication with students in an online class.
Suggestions:

1. Library has many online resources. Would be nice to be able to access online from home. Also need to make students aware of these services.
2. The limited hours of the KI office makes it difficult for DE students to take advantage of the services.
3. LRC should have more online (DE) tutoring for DE courses.
4. Increase the Testing Center capacity and space.
5. Need division oversight to ensure quality.
6. Increase institutional and administrative support for developing high quality DE courses.
7. Distance education website list of DE support services so instructors can point students to them.
8. Create a competency test for student enrolling in DE courses.
9. Provide help to students with installation and configuration of software required for classes.
10. Increase student support on how to learn online, not just how to use the tools.
11. Offer open/rolling enrollment for #11.
12. Institutional support so that DE courses developed are of high quality.

**Distance Education - Resources**  
Standards I.B, III.A, III.C, and III.D and Rubric for Evaluating Institutional Effectiveness

How are the needs for financial, technology, and human resources required for teaching distance education learning programs identified, integrated in the planning process, and accessed?

Participants felt that there were resources available, but there is no planning process for DE. Additionally, there is no formal protocol for DE. Currently, there are no official requirements to teach DE courses. Faculty’s experience with online courses is not taken into consideration in the hiring process. A faculty member is told by the division chair that he or she is going to teach an online course. Some faculty attend DE training, but some do not. There are no requirements or process for teaching DE courses. Some participants suggested that the DE committee might want to include representation for resources since currently the committee’s focus is on technology and teaching. Another idea was to create a DE program in which an administrator is focused on DE-centralized coordination such as resources, the selection of instructors, and requiring training. A third suggestion was to add DE to all APRs where each division answers questions for both face-to-face and DE for areas such as resources.

**Campus Communication**  
Standard IV.A and Rubric for Evaluating Institutional Effectiveness

Is there effective communication at the college that is clear, understood, widely available, and current?

Current Positives
• There is a lot more information on college website
• Creation of campus Intranet
• Variety of communication vehicles:
  ○ Campus Bulletin, Fac/Staff Emails, Laulima, Intranet, Website, Division meetings, Convocation, Bulletin Boards

Ways that communication can be improved:

• More training on use and resources of the Intranet
• Improved organization of website content
• More frequent 2-way communication between administrators & campus and between governance groups & constituents
• Making Campus Bulletin articles easier to access
• Procedures to insure that everyone is on facstaff listserv

**Governance and Decision-Making Processes**

Standards I.B and IV.A.1 and Rubric for Evaluating Institutional Effectiveness

Do institutional planning efforts provide opportunity for appropriate participation? How do individuals and groups at the college use the governance and decision-making processes to enhance student learning and institutional effectiveness?

For this topic, many participants believe that we have participatory governance. Through discipline/division meetings, campus groups, committees, Campus Council, and Faculty Senate, there are opportunities to participate in decision-making processes.

While opportunities to participate are available, there is a feeling that people “opt out” because they are too busy or not interested, and more effort to communicate and encourage participation is needed.

People also believe that committees and groups have input through the planning process of the college for needs (e.g. space, funds for repair, maintenance, etc.). There are some who feel that it is still unclear how decisions are made with the input received. The need for transparency and improved communication (via email, webpage, bulletin) on decisions made may help to improve shared governance at the college.