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Subject: Midterm Report: Program Review/Health Indicators

I. Summary of Original Problem

According to the Leeward Community College (LCC) 2000 Self-Study Report, the UH Community College system began to use Program Health Indicators (PHI) to evaluate academic programs in 1992-93 (p 32). Some of the outcome indicators were the same across the system to allow for comparisons while other outcome indicators were individually selected to represent needs and functions of specific units (p 79). In addition, funding sources such as the Carl D. Perkins Vocational and Applied Technology Education Act mandated use of particular outcome indicators. This PHI model categorized data in three areas—demand, efficiency, and outcome (p 67); streamlined the six-year review process; and enhanced institutional decision-making.

The following problems were associated with the PHI review model at LCC:

A. The PHI model was intended to review all academic programs, but was primarily used to review vocational-technical programs granting certificates and degrees.
B. The PHI model had a vocational slant that might require modification for needs of specific academic programs.
C. Some outcome information was not readily available—after graduation job placement.
D. The PHI model has been used successfully to collect outcome indicators, but this model lacked the systematic structure and process necessary for campus personnel to review the data and use it for better evaluation, planning, decision making, and program improvement.

The ACCJC Evaluation Report (dated 1/19/01) (p 7) recommended "that the college reexamine and adapt the application of the Program Health Indicators (PHI) model (or other appropriate program review model) to all its programs, and especially to student services, so that a structure, process, and culture are developed for its effective use in planning, decision making and program performance improvement."

II. Present Status of the Problem

Currently, the PHI model is being used to review vocational programs. Since the Accreditation Team's visit in October 2000, the college has taken a more holistic
approach to program review and student learning outcomes. A combination of college-related experiences can affect and influence students’ learning outcomes; therefore, the focus of the review model has shifted to include services as well as all academic programs.

III. Possible Solutions to the Problem

The AIC on Program Review/Health Indicators submitted the final version of their policy on unit/area reviews (program reviews) to the Provost for approval on March 24, 2003. The policy was developed in response to the accreditation team’s recommendation. It was extensively researched and debated by the committee members themselves (10 drafts), received broad-based input from a campus-wide open forum, and was reviewed by the Faculty Senate on February 12, 2003 and the Campus Council on March 6, 2003.

The unit/area review (program review) policy supplements the University of Hawaii, Executive Policy – Administration, E5.202 Review of Established Programs, June 1987 and modifies the PHI model. This policy provides the structure and process for review of all programs and services regarding performance improvement and student learning outcomes and develops a basis for decision-making.

In addition to the accreditation team’s recommendation, the LCC 2000 Self-Study Report also identified several other action plans that deal with the area of assessment and the PHI model:

1) “The Student Services Division will review the PHI to determine if measures identified and the criteria established are appropriate for each of the programs evaluated.” (Self Study, p 142, 5.10)
   - The Student Services unit began to identify student learning outcomes for their unit in Spring 2003. (Midterm Report, V. 2. Shift from Planning to Implementation, p 4)

2) “The College will investigate the present Program Health Indicators in relationship to the College’s mission and institutional evaluation and planning and insure that faculty are informed about and participate in this process.” (Self Study, p 104, 4D.1)
   - PHIs are successfully used to fulfill reporting requirements for funding sources such as the Carl D. Perkins Vocational and Applied Technology Education Act.
   - LCC's mission is in the process of being reviewed and the relationship between PHIs and the College’s mission will be covered during this review process.
   - The new Unit/Area Review (Program Reviews) Policy modified the existing PHIs to establish a direct relationship process between unit/area/college mission, evaluation, and planning.

3) “As stated in Standard 3.C.1, the College will form an Institutional Assessment Committee to develop methods to measure and document the achievement of intended
outcomes in Student Services as well as academic and non-academic areas." (Self Study, p 142, 5.10)

* See Unit/Area Review (Program Review) Policy (part I. 7, p 2). A subcommittee of the Faculty Senate will oversee the review process for the Instruction area because of its complexity. What happens in this area will be determined by the Instruction units, the Faculty Senate, the Dean of Instruction, and the Provost.

* See Unit/Area Review (Program Review) Policy (part I. 6, p 2). Non-Instructional areas/units will be modeled according to the approved organizational structure. The units within one area will be reviewed at the same time. What happens in the area is determined by the units and the Dean/Director, and/or Provost who is ultimately responsible.

* Since the Unit/Area Review (Program Review) Policy and the Curriculum Revision and Review Policy have been created, the role of the Assessment Committee in Program Review and Curriculum Review needs to be clarified.

4) "The College will identify the time frames for conducting reviews, identifying specific offices of responsibility, and developing outcome measures for the systematic review of programs and services for all of its activities." (Self Study, p 69, 3.A.3)

* See Unit/Area Review (Program Review) Policy (part III., p 3) for review procedures that include developing outcome measures, data collection for annual reviews, and template-format reporting.

* See Unit/Area Review (Program Review) Policy (part I.5, p 1) for person responsible for each area.

5) Make sure that all affected constituencies are informed about and participate in the assessment of these academic and non-academic areas and activities.

* See Midterm Report (IV, Review of Proposal by Campus Community, p 3).

6) "The College will develop methods to measure and document the achievement of its intended institutional outcomes in areas outside of academics." (Self Study, p 77, 3C.1)

* See Midterm Report (III.3, p 2).

IV. Review of Proposal by Campus Community

After the policy was extensively researched and debated by the committee (10 drafts), the proposed review policy received broad-based input from a campus-wide open forum. The policy was reviewed by the Faculty Senate on February 12, 2003 and the Campus Council on March 6, 2003.

V. Shift from Planning to Implementation

1) For the Instructional unit of the college:
After the Unit/Area Review (Program Review) Policy has been approved by the Provost, the Dean of Instruction will work with the Faculty Senate to form a Program Review Committee. This committee will be similar to the current Curriculum Committee (with representation from each division) and carry out the policy regarding instructional program reviews.

Under the direction of the Dean of Instruction, the committee will determine the areas of instructional programs to be assessed, the order of assessment, and timelines.

Previous faculty assessment committee members have designed assessment instruments for writing, speech, and math. To recognize these efforts and the work that has already been accomplished, the committee will incorporate these assessment instruments into the instructional program review process, to the extent possible.

In Spring 2003, the college will administer the Academic Profile from Educational Testing Service (ETS) to a random sample of students to establish benchmarks for reading, writing, math, and critical thinking. (See Bernadette Howard or Andy Rossi for additional information on this testing.)

2. For the Non-instructional units of the college:

The policy states that administrators will be responsible for assessment of their units. In Spring 2003, the Student Services units began identifying outcome measures for their units. Data collection will begin for these units in the summer of 2003. Individual units will establish procedures and timelines for their program reviews that comply with the policy and fit their unit needs.

Other administrative support units/areas will begin to develop outcome measures for their units at the discretion of the Provost and unit Dean/Directors. Individual units will establish procedures and timelines for their program reviews that comply with the policy and fit their unit needs. Data collection will begin in Spring 2004.

3. Campus-wide (See Bernadette Howard regarding the following information.)

In the summer of 2003, the College will develop an assessment website where each unit will be able to post its assessment information using the template approved with the policy.

A draft of an assessment handbook (currently in process) will be reviewed by all units with a projected completion date for a final approved handbook in Spring 2004.

In Spring 2005, the administrative team and the Faculty Senate will evaluate the progress of the College in achieving the aims of the review policy and make recommendations for altering the process if necessary.
STUDENT SERVICES PROGRAM REVIEW
Status Update

The unit heads of each of the functions within the Student Services division met with the Dean of Student Services and Andy Rossi, Institutional Researcher to lay out the process for accomplishing our program reviews. The units included: Admissions and Records, Financial Aid, Counseling and Advising, Student Activities, Health Center, Hawaii Upward Bound, and Upward Bound Math Science.

A general discussion was conducted by Andy Rossi to describe the new program review policy developed by the Accreditation Implementation Committee. Andy also described how the process could be accomplished. The DOSS shared copies of Professional Standards for each unit, developed by the Council for the Advancement of Standards in Higher Education, as samples of possible measures to be used in the program reviews.

At the end of the session, it was determined that the first task would be for each unit to develop a mission statement for the unit. This mission statement can then serve as a guide to the rest of the process. The DOSS and/or division chairperson now needs to follow-up on the mission statement progress.
I. Introduction

1. The overall purpose of the unit/area review process is to provide the College with a formal and systematic method for conducting ongoing assessment and the collection of data that provides valuable feedback to the campus community. The feedback or assessment process is instrumental to the decision-making for all units/areas and at all levels throughout the Campus and is an integral part of the College’s planning, implementation, and budgeting process.

2. The main focus of the unit/area review process is to provide evidence that each unit/area of the College is providing quality support of student learning and related student outcomes. Each individual unit/area has the integral responsibility for establishing this evidence.

3. This policy was developed to supplement the guidance provided by the University of Hawaii, Executive Policy – Administration, E5.202 Review of Established Programs, June 1987. The purpose of this document is to clarify and further define the existing UH program review policy to better fit the organizational structure, culture, and institutional programs of Leeward Community College.

4. For the purposes of this unit/area review process, a unit/area is defined as any one, or set of degree/certificate programs or areas of instruction, and/or administrative support activities that are deemed by the Campus to be sufficiently related in terms of objectives, clients served, resources used, or other common identification for the purposes of evaluating performance, determining accountability, and improving quality.

5. A list of review units, modeled after the approved organizational structure (Appendix A), is provided below.

Units/Areas
a. Office of the Provost (Provost responsible)
   i. Marketing
   ii. Fund Development
   iii. Institutional Research
b. Academic Support (Asst. Dean of Academic Support responsible)
   i. Educational Media Center
   ii. Grants Writing
   iii. Information Technology Group
   iv. International Education
   v. Learning Resource Center
   vi. Library
vii. Staff Development

c. Student Services (Dean of Student Services responsible)
   i. Admissions & Records
   ii. Counseling
   iii. Financial Aid
   iv. Job Placement
   v. Student Health Center
   vi. Student Life
   vii. Student Publications

d. Community Services (Director of OCET responsible)
   i. Contract Training
   ii. Facilities Use
   iii. Non-Credit Instruction
   iv. Theatre

e. Administrative Services (Director of Administrative Services responsible)
   i. Business Office
   ii. Human Resource Office
   iii. Operations & Maintenance
   iv. Security

f. Instruction (Dean of Instruction responsible)

Note: The approved organizational structure divides instruction into divisions, but the complexity of this unit/area may require other subdivisions according to location (Pearl City and Waianae), method of instruction (distance education and face-to-face), and degrees and certificates (AA & Gen Ed/AS/AAS). The subdivisions of this unit/area will be determined by the Faculty Senate and Dean of Instruction.

6. Several units may be included in one area. For example, the Business Office, Human Resources Office, Operations and Maintenance and Security are units in the Administrative Services area. These units will be reviewed at the same time and the Director of Administrative Services will be ultimately responsible. What happens in this area is determined by the units, the Dean of Administrative Services, and the Provost.

7. A subcommittee of the Faculty Senate will oversee the review process for the Instruction area because of its complexity. What happens in this area is determined by the units, the Faculty Senate, the Dean of Instruction, and the Provost.

8. Excluded from the purview of this policy are the programs or activities that receive special funding through grants. Examples of these are: Title III, Ka Hanauna Project (Native Hawaiian Program); the Carl Perkin’s Vocational and Technical Education Act; and the Housing and Urban Development (HUD) Waianae Coast Telecommunications Institute. These grants/projects are unique in that they have different reporting/evaluation timetables, different reporting format requirements,
and have mandated outcomes measures. In effect, the assessment processes for these unique programs are mandated by the granting agency. This significantly hampers the College from modifying the review process in order to increase the efficiency and effectiveness of the assessment vehicle. While assessment of these programs is important, these reviews are viewed as separate initiatives and do not come under this policy.

II. Policy Objectives

1. To provide Program Managers, Administrators, Faculty, and Staff with important information that is used for “internal” control and assessment within units/areas and for the Campus’s integrated planning, implementation, and assessment process.

2. To establish a model or method for conducting unit/area reviews that facilitates the efficient evaluation of all units/areas (instructional programs and administrative support activities).

3. To identify key positions and specific responsibilities that are essential to the unit/area review assessment process.

4. To identify the organizational units/areas to be assessed and a time frame for conducting the reviews.

5. To prescribe an administrative reporting format that is prescriptive, yet generic enough, to accommodate the different organizational units/areas and the variety of data that will be collected.

6. To help assure that each functional unit/area of the College is providing quality support of student learning and related student outcomes.

III. Review Procedures: At a minimum, annual reviews will include the following information utilizing the template (Appendix B).

1. Develop a list of unit/area goals and/or objectives as they relate to the College’s mission statement and strategic plan.

2. Develop outcome measures based on unit/area goals and/or objectives.

   A. Each unit/area will have the option of selecting outcome measures that provide quantitative/qualitative data useful for managing the unit/area and evaluating student learning or related student learning outcomes. Appendix C is a list of potential outcome measures that may serve as a starting point from which to choose. However, each unit/area is not
restricted to this list but rather should select outcome measures that provide meaningful feedback.

B. The selection of outcome measures requires a joint perspective of all affected persons within the unit (in addition, including student input where appropriate) and the immediate supervisor as well as upper level supervisors of units/areas who should be involved in the selection of outcome measures. Additionally, each level of the College hierarchy (Division Chairs, Deans, Directors, Provost) may select other quantitative measures that present them with valuable information relative to their perspectives.

3. Review data annually. Data (based on outcome measures) will be collected and provided to Administrators, Division Chairs, Program Managers, and the unit/area so that frequent, on-going feedback to and management of these units/areas can proceed efficiently. Data may be centrally collected by an Institutional Researcher or others depending on the specific outcome measures selected.

4. Assess whether or not the unit/area is meeting its goals and/or objectives.

5. Identify any present or potential problems plus a description of any action plans that may lead to unit/area improvement.

6. Follow up on results.

IV. **Policy Change:** In the event that a review unit/area requests a change or adjustment to this review policy, the Provost and the administrative team will become the Program Review Oversight Committee. Units/areas should contact their immediate supervisors through the College hierarchy until the request reaches the Dean/Director of the unit/area. The request for policy change would become an agenda item on the regularly scheduled meeting of the administrative team.
**EXAMPLE**

### Unit/Area Review: Title III Grant

**Goal 1: Improving the college enrollment figures of native Hawaiian students**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Outcome Measure</th>
<th>Definition</th>
<th>Method of Collection &amp; Source</th>
<th>Expected Level of Performance</th>
<th>Actual Level of Performance</th>
<th>Intended Use of Results</th>
<th>Previous Year's Actual Results &amp; Actions Taken</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. The percentage of Hawaiian students enrolled at LCC.</td>
<td>The total number of Hawaiian students enrolled at LCC at the end of the Fall semester, divided by the total number of students attending LCC during the same time period.</td>
<td>Data collected using the Banner System. Source: Title III Enrollment Report.</td>
<td>Using the previous 5-year average as a baseline, the percent of Hawaiian students will increase by $\frac{1}{2}$ %, each succeeding year. <strong>Baseline:</strong> Fall 95 to Spring 00 (10 semesters) = 13% Hawaiians and 87% non-Hawaiians</td>
<td>Fall 2001: 13.7% Hawaiians and 86.3% non-Hawaiians</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## REPORT TEMPLATE

### Unit/Area Review:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Goal 1:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Outcome Measure</th>
<th>Definition</th>
<th>Method of Collection &amp; Source</th>
<th>Expected Level of Performance</th>
<th>Actual Level of Performance</th>
<th>Intended Use of Results</th>
<th>Previous Year’s Actual Results &amp; Actions Taken</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Potential Outcome Measures

1. **Total Student Registrations**: The total number of students registered in all liberal arts classes. (Source: Aldrich)

2. **Percentage of Student Registrations by Academic Division**: The total number of student registrations by academic division, divided by total student registrations. (Source: Aldrich)

3. **Student Semester Hours**: The sum of the semester hours taken by all students registered in liberal arts classes. (Source: Aldrich)

4. **Number of Classes**: The total number of liberal arts classes offered by the college. (Source: Aldrich)

5. **Average Class Size**: Total Student Registrations divided by the total number of classes. (Source: Aldrich)

6. **Occupancy Rate**: The Total Student Registrations divided by the total seats available (class capacity). (Source: Aldrich)

7. **Student Faculty Ratio**: FTE Students divided by FTE Faculty. (FTE Students equals the Total Student Registrations divided by 15, and FTE Faculty equals the Number of Semester Hours Taught divided by 15). (Source: Aldrich)

8. **Number of Small Classes**: The number of classes taught with an enrollment lower than 10 students. (Source: Aldrich)

9. **Cost per Class**: Total program costs (Direct Instructional Costs) divided by the number of classes taught. (Source: Aldrich)

10. **Credits Earned Ratio**: Student registrations, which earned the credits attempted, divided by the total students registrations (% of Grades “D” and above). (Source: Aldrich)

11. **Number of Transfer Students**: The total number of students enrolling at another college or university having previously attended Leeward Community College. (Source: MAPS, Transfer Patterns of Undergraduate Students, UH, Fall 1999)

12. **GPA of Transfer Students**: The grade point average of students who attended LCC and transferred to UH-Manoa, and UH-West Oahu. Note: These data are not available as yet but action is being taken to obtain this information.
13. **Student Satisfaction**: Responses obtained through the administration of the LCC Student Satisfaction Survey.

14. **Faculty/Staff Satisfaction**: Responses obtained through the administration of the LCC Faculty/Staff Satisfaction Survey.

15. **Number of Degrees Awarded (A.A., A.S., A.A.S.)**: The total number of approved degrees awarded between July 1st and June 30th. (Source: MAPS, Degrees & Certificates Earned, UH Community Colleges)

More examples of potential outcome measures will be added as they are identified through unit/area reviews.