1. 5-year self-study report based on program review Parts I – IV.
2. Yearly assessment based on Parts I, II, and V.
3. Include Parts III and IV as program needs dictate.
MAUI COMMUNITY COLLEGE
SELF-STUDY OUTLINE FOR PROGRAM REVIEW
(DRAFT)

Outline and Instructions for writing your program review document. (Instructions are in bold.)

I. OVERVIEW OF THE PROGRAM

A. Mission and Vision of the College
The mission and vision of Maui Community College are on the first page of the MCC Strategic Plan.

B. Mission and Vision of the Program
1. Program vision for the next five years
2. Contribution of the program to the Mission of MCC
3. Goals of the program (See Appendix A)
4. Student Learning Outcomes (SLOs) of the program (See Appendix B)

Write your program’s mission and vision for the next five years and discuss how they contribute to the MCC mission and vision. Explain the connection between the goals of your program and the student learning outcomes of the program.

C. Relation to MCC Strategic Plan
Read over the MCC Strategic Plan Action Strategies, paying special attention to those chosen as priorities for this past year, and describe the relationships your program has to any of them.

D. Program Faculty (full and part-time)
1. Faculty by rank
2. Faculty by length of service
3. Faculty qualifications or credentials
4. Faculty areas of expertise
5. Faculty turnover during the past seven years
6. Faculty appointments and attrition
7. Faculty’s currency in the field of study

Give the information listed in 1-7 about each faculty member (full and part-time) in your program. Describe how the teachers in your program keep updated on any changes in your field of study. Tell how this affects student learning outcomes.

E. Ways in which program interacts with:
1. Community groups
2. Professional associations
3. PCCs
4. National accreditation bodies
5. Other key organizations

Describe the interactions your program has with external groups or organizations. Tell who the members of the groups are, giving names, professions, and qualifications, when applicable. In each instance, tell the goal of the interaction and the outcome. Tell how these interactions affect student learning outcomes.

II. CURRICULUM AND STUDENTS

A. General Education Standards (COWIQs), program goals, and student learning outcomes (See Appendices C, A, B)

Discuss the five standards currently in place (COWIQs) to assess students in your program. (Critical thinking, oral communication, written communication, information technology, and quantitative reasoning.) Tell which ones are assessed as student learning outcomes for your program. Tell which ones may be taught and practiced but not assessed. Connect program goals with student learning outcomes.

B. COWIQ and program goals curricular grids (See Appendix D)

Explain the step-by-step development of the curricular grid for your program. Tell how many faculty members were involved and how you gained consensus. Tell how you use this assessment strategy to enhance student learning outcomes. Tell what you learned about your program while constructing the grid.

C. Student Achievement
   1. PHI’s
   2. Perkins
   3. Other student achievement measures

Describe your program’s progress, using data from PHI’s, Perkins, and any other student achievement measures available. Explain the significance of the information and what actions you plan to take because of it.

D. Changes made in accord with the recommendations of the previous program review for Program Health Indicators (PHIs)
   1. Recommendations followed
   2. Recommendations not followed
   3. Reasons for not following recommendations
   4. Implementation timeline for changes

Describe any changes recommended by a previous program review for PHIs, covering 1-4. Describe the outcomes of any changes made.

E. Changes made in accord with the recommendations of the previous program review for Perkins measures
   1. Recommendations followed
   2. Recommendations not followed
   3. Reasons for not following recommendations
4. Implementation timeline for changes
Describe any changes recommended by a previous program review for Perkins measures, covering 1-4. Describe the outcomes of any changes made.

F. Measurable Benchmarks
   1. Value added
   2. Achievement
      a. Internal criteria
      b. External criteria
   3. Peer college benchmarks
List and describe all measurable benchmarks, 1-3, in your program. Tell how you know that your students have achieved the benchmarks. Describe your assessment of each benchmark. Describe any changes recommended by a previous program review of benchmarks. Describe the outcomes of any changes made.

G. Program/Certificate/Degree Standards and their SLOs (See Appendix C)
List your program certificates and connect them with program standards and student learning outcomes.

H. Program trends, including student goals, enrollment trends, retention, and time of completion
Describe the goals of students who are enrolled in your program. Tell what percentage of your students earn certificates or degrees and if some may enroll to take specific classes to upgrade their skills. Use data to discuss current and past enrollment, retention, and average time of completion.

I. Changes in field; resources; shifts to respond to changes
   1. No additional resources
   2. Moderate additional resources
   3. Major additional resources
Describe any changes in the field of study for your program. Tell what you have done or plan to do to adjust to these changes and what additional resources, if any, are or will be required. Tell any plans you have to find external resources.

J. Major curricular changes since last review
Describe any major curricular changes since your last review. Tell why a change was made and how the curricular grid and other assessment strategies influenced the decision. Discuss any support courses that are needed for your program and how readily available they are.

K. Student advising and the degree to which faculty participate in the mentoring of students
Describe how accessible faculty in your program are to students, both inside and outside the classroom. Tell how many and to what degree faculty members advise and mentor students. Describe any effort to encourage faculty mentoring activities. Discuss any data you have on the effectiveness of faculty mentoring.
L. Opportunities for student involvement in program-related organizations, clubs, and governance
Describe how much and to what degree students in your program are involved in organizations, clubs, student government, and the governance of the program. Tell how students are encouraged to attend meetings and planning sessions.

M. Use of lecturers to teach courses; related concerns
Describe the number and qualifications of lecturers who teach in your program. Identify any concerns about how this might affect student learning outcomes.

N. Admission policy
Describe the admission policy for your program and any prerequisites students must complete before being admitted. Discuss how well this is working and if you plan to make any changes.

O. Job placement, including job prospects, procedures for placing graduates, and success in placing graduates
Describe any program or College job placement procedures in existence for graduates of your program. Tell what they are and how successful they are. Describe the future job prospects for your graduates. Tell where your information comes from and how often it is updated. For instance, tell how often you survey local business and industry and what local and state government job predictors you use to gather your evidence.

P. Articulation with high schools, community colleges, and four-year institutions
Describe your articulation agreements with high schools, community colleges, and four-year institutions. Tell how these came about and what your program regularly does to support them.

Q. Centers or Institutes
Describe any Centers or Institutes on campus. Tell what kinds of relationships, e.g. articulation, that you have with them. Tell how easy or how difficult it is for your students to enroll in classes or programs offered.

III. STAFF SUPPORT AND FACILITIES

A. Professional and Clerical staff
List any professional and/or clerical staff positions that serve your program. Describe their duties and tell how each position’s responsibilities support student learning outcomes.

B. Space and equipment for instruction
Describe the space and equipment used for the instruction of students in your program. Tell if this is adequate for the present and long-term goals of the program. Give data
and evidence to back up any need for additional space and/or equipment. Discuss any external funding possibilities (grants, Perkins funds, RDP funds), and any fund-raising activities your program has been, is, or will be involved in.

C. Space and equipment for research, e.g. institutional
Describe the space and equipment used by students for research in your program. Tell if this is adequate for the present and long-term goals of the program. Give data and evidence to back up any need for additional space and/or equipment for research. Discuss any external fund-raising possibilities and activities.

D. Space and equipment for external grants
Describe the space and equipment used by students for projects funded by external grants in your program. Tell if this is adequate for the present and long-term goals of the program. Give data and evidence to back up any need for additional space and/or equipment for external grants. Discuss external fund-raising activities.

IV. DISTANCE DELIVERED OFF-CAMPUS PROGRAMS

A. Description of programs delivered off-campus or via distance delivery modes
Describe any courses in your program that are delivered off-campus or via distance delivery. Describe the mode of delivery, the number of students served, and the success of students taking the courses in this manner. Cite data to compare with the success of students taking courses on campus.

B. Faculty, student support, and facilities
1. Qualifications of distance faculty (full and part-time)
   a. Faculty by rank
   b. Faculty by length of service
   c. Faculty qualifications or credentials
   d. Faculty areas of expertise
   e. Faculty turnover during the past seven years
   f. Faculty appointments and attrition
   g. Faculty’s currency in delivering distance education courses
Give the information listed in a-g about each member of the full-time and part-time faculty teaching either off-campus or distance delivery classes in your program. Compare their qualifications with faculty who teach courses on campus. Tell how the teachers are trained in distance education skills and practices.

2. Available Student Support
   a. Access to faculty
   b. Academic advising
   c. Financial aid advising
   d. Library materials and resources
   e. Tutorial support
f. Media and/or computer tech

g. Clerical support

h. Proctoring

Give information, a-h, about support for students in your program taking classes either off-campus or by distance delivery. Use evidence and data to confirm your information. Describe assessment strategies for student support for your program, a-h. Compare the student support offered to students taking classes on the campus to that offered to distance students.

3. Space and equipment for instruction
   a. Sending site
   b. Receiving site

Describe the space and equipment available for instruction at each distance education sending and receiving site. Discuss adequacy of both; tell how this affects your SLOs.

C. Evidence that the educational student learning outcomes of each program are being met

Tell how you and your faculty know that the student learning outcomes of your program are being met for your distance students.

D. Evidence that the educational effectiveness of off-campus or distance delivered programs is comparable to on-campus programs (including assessment of student learning outcomes, student retention, and student satisfaction).

Cite the data that you use for evidence to prove that the educational effectiveness of off-campus or distance courses in your program is comparable to that of on-campus courses in your program.

V. ANALYSES OF PROGRAM – TYING IT ALL TOGETHER

A. Summary statement

Tell whether or not your program goals, general education standards, and student achievement measures were met. If they were, you have validated your program. If they were not, tell why not.

B. Plans for next year

Describe your plan of action for next year. Tell how you plan to meet goals and SLOs not yet attained. Describe your plans for setting any new goals and SLOs and implementing them. Describe your assessment strategies.

C. Budget for next year

Describe the budget that will be needed next year in order to implement the program’s new goals and SLOs. List any possible sources for revenue.

D. BOR questions

The following questions are those asked by the UH Board of Regents about all
established programs. Use the checklist to be sure that you have addressed each one in your Program Review.

☐ Is the program organized to meet its objectives (student learning outcomes?)

☐ Is the program meeting the student learning outcomes?

☐ Are program resources adequate?

☐ Is the program efficient?

☐ Does your review provide evidence of a quality program?

☐ Are the program outcomes compatible with the student learning outcomes?

☐ Are the program student learning outcomes still appropriate functions of the college and university?
VI. UNIVERSITY OF HAWAII REQUIREMENT
Executive Policy E5.215 requires a review of all centers within the University of Hawaii at Manoa. Describe and provide an evaluation of any center housed within the program.
A. Mission and student learning outcomes of the Center. Relation to the two University strategic planning documents. Evidence that student learning outcomes are being met.
B. Constituents served by each Center.
C. Recommend whether or not to renew each Center.

VII. REQUIRED APPENDICES
A. Goals of the Program
B. SLOs of the Program
C. General Education Standards
D. COWIQ Curricular Grid
E. PHIs
F. Perkins Performance Indicators
G. Program Map
University of Hawai‘i Executive Policy E5.202 mandates the periodic examination of academic programs by faculty and administration to determine the extent to which the programs are meeting their objectives and if these objectives remain relevant to the missions of the unit, campus, and University.

Maui Community College’s program review process involves continuous and systematic evaluations of established programs or units on a yearly basis with a comprehensive self-study and external validation study every five years. The review of all aspects of a program’s or unit’s instructional offerings and campus/community service are undertaken at the same time. The validation process involves two steps. The first step is the validation study by a three-member committee made up of on-campus and/or off-campus members as established by the Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs (VCAA) and academic chairs/directors. The second step is the confirmation of the validation study by the Maui Community College Executive Committee (CEC) led by the Chancellor.

To the extent possible, program reviews are coordinated with accreditation reviews for those departments, schools, or colleges that are evaluated by external accrediting associations. When possible, a self-study report will serve for both external and internal review purposes with information being added as needed to address campus criteria not covered by accreditation standards.

Validation of program reviews are carried out over a three-year period and generally adhere to the following timetable.

**Year 1**

**Fall**

The Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs (VCAA) confirms with academic chairs/directors which program will be reviewed in the upcoming academic year

Validation teams (with on-campus and/or off-campus representatives) are formed

Academic chairs/directors notify program coordinators to be reviewed
Spring

Programs prepare a self-study document according to guidelines distributed by the VCAA

Year 2

Fall

Self-study reports are completed and submitted to the VCAA by the deadline: 3rd Friday in September.

VCAA gives self-study report to the assigned Program Review Validation Team by the deadline: 4th Friday in September.

Fall

Validation teams review the self-study documents, confirms content through interviewing personnel, reviewing of documents, etc. and completed validation reports are submitted to the VCAA by the deadline: 1st Friday in October.

Validation teams report findings to CEC. CEC holds discussions of findings on 3rd Friday in October. It may accept the report or request more information.

Year 3

Spring

VCAA prepares report summarizing program reviews completed during the previous year and submits report to the Chancellor by January 31. Chancellor then submits report to the President and Board of Regents. Department’s one-year program report is due to the OVCAA through the academic dean/director.

The Vice Chancellor then prepares a report on program reviews completed during the year for the Chancellor. The report is submitted to the President and is usually sent to the Board of Regents. A year after the program review, departments submit a written progress report to the VCAA addressing recommendations made by the validation team, CEC, and the Vice Chancellor.
Validation of program review teams should generally follow these guidelines. The format can be adapted to fit the needs of the program being reviewed.

PHI’s of the vocational programs during the past five to seven years is available to review by team members. This information should be supplemented by reading the original program description and previous program reviews.

Each review team should interview (a) student, (b) faculty, and (c) the department chair(s). The team should also tour departmental facilities and observe their usage. The results of these interviews and observations will form a key part of the report.

GENERAL OVERVIEW

Relevance: How well does the program meet the MCC Strategic Plan?

Suggested Questions:

1. Is the mission of the program aligned with MCC’s mission?

2. How effectively does the program advance the core commitments of the MCC Strategic Plan?

3. Is there evidence that the program is implementing the strategic action strategies of the MCC Strategic Plan?

Comparison: How does the general quality of the program compare with that of similar programs at mainland universities? In the analysis, consider such factors as staff, students, physical facilities, fellowship, scholarships/assistantships, admissions standards, etc.

Suggested Questions:

1. Are the courses of degree-related activities appropriate to the level at which they are offered (i.e., 100-level, 200-level)?

2. Are the courses intellectually challenging and rigorously comprehensive?

3. Does the field of study have a thoughtfully-designed program for its students?
CURRICULUM

Consider the quality of the curriculum and its appropriateness to the program’s educational objectives.

Suggested Questions:

1. Are educational objectives of the program articulated?
2. Is there sufficient evidence that educational objectives are being met? Are students learning outcomes articulated and achievement assessed?
3. Are assessment results used to continuously improve the program?

STUDENTS

Note length of time needed to complete degree requirements, attrition rate, ratio of international to American students and the effect, if any, this may have on the program’s quality.

Current students as well as students who have completed the program should be surveyed.

Suggested Questions:

1. Is the program selective in its admission of students?
2. Are students admitted conditionally? What sort of deficiencies do incoming students have?
3. Is written information delineating program and graduation requirements provided to each entering student?
4. Is there a coordinated program of courses and faculty advising to help students reach thei goals?
5. Is the program consistent for all students?
6. Do students feel they have an adequate voice in departmental affairs?
7. Will the field of study take effective action to remedy legitimate student complaints? For example, what is the result if students report a badly-taught course?
8. Are there any problems with harassment or coercion?
9. Is student morale high?

**FACULTY**

Assess the quality of the faculty using traditional measures of productivity, teaching, excellence and service.

**Suggested Questions:**

1. What is the reputation of the program and its faculty? Where do faculty exhibit or perform their works? What awards have they received?
2. Are the faculty accessible to students both inside and outside of the classroom?
3. Are the faculty dedicated in their roles as mentors to their students?
4. Are the faculty available, to student and, providing academic advisory?
5. What is the faculty workload and is it equitable?
6. How is teaching evaluated? What priority does the department place on the quality of teaching?

**DISTANCE DELIVERED PROGRAMS**

Review the distance- or off-campus delivery of programs. Consider whether “distant” students are receiving programs and services of comparable quality to on-campus students.

**Suggested Questions:**

1. What are the qualifications of faculty who are teaching in distance- or off-campus programs? Are their qualifications comparable to faculty teaching in on-campus programs?
2. Do students in distance- or off-campus programs have adequate access to faculty, academic advising, financial aid advising, library materials and resources, etc.?
3. Is there sufficient evidence that educational objectives and student learning outcomes in distance- and off-campus programs are being met?
PROGRAM ACHIEVEMENTS

Employing reasonable criteria of achievement (e.g., number of graduates, success in obtaining employment, etc.), describe how the program has met its objectives during the review period. Where has it failed? Does the program meet local, national, and international needs?

FACILITIES AND SUPPORT FUNDING

Consider the quality and extent of the department’s relationship to other units of the university; its funding from state, federal, and private sources, including funds obtained for various elements of the program; and physical facilities, e.g., laboratories, computers and word processing equipment, library holdings.

CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

The final written report should address these broad questions:

- What have been the objectives of the instructional program during the review period?
- In what ways has the program succeeded in achieving these objectives?
- In what ways has it fallen short of these goals?

Comment on both positive and negative aspects of the program. Include recommended actions that should be taken. Pertinent problems and deficiencies that were observed during the review should be noted.

The completed report should be checked with the unit/program coordinator chair for factual accuracy before it submitted. A hard copy and an electronic version of the team report (Word format) should be provided to the OVCAA.

If you have any questions at any stage of the review, please feel free to raise them with the Office of the Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs. Thanks in advance for your help in this very important task.