#### Letter from ACCJC January 31, 2005

- The Commission is concerned that the UH Community Colleges continue to lack an integrated system-wide program review, assessment and improvement process that sets the expectation that campuses develop a culture and practice of assessment and that supports improvement in campus practice at the system decision-making level.
- Furthermore, confusion continues about the respective roles of campus and system administrators in determining campus priorities, and this lack of distinction continues to challenge the ability of each college to meet accreditation standards.

### **UHCC System Program Review**

#### ACCJC found

- Uneven progress in developing program review policies and practices among the campuses
- Inconsistent use of data across campuses
- Uneven support among campus constituencies for program review
- Unclear links between program reviews and budget requests and allocation decisions at the campus and system level

- Fundamental system question from ACCJC is
  - "How can the system make rational planning and allocation decisions if the assessment information coming from the colleges is so inconsistent?"
- It is important to note that the question is a system question. Even campuses with acceptable program reviews in place were put on warning

## **UHCC System Program Review**

- CC Chancellors met to develop and agree on common principles that, when fully implemented,
  - Meet UH BOR and Executive Policy requirements on program review
  - Address ACCJC concerns
  - Provide system consistency but also enough local control to make reviews meaningful at the campus level

#### **Principle 1**

Each instructional and non-instructional program should undergo a comprehensive review at least once every five years.

# A Major Effort at Each Campus

By Program Classification	Number of Reviews by Campus							
	HAW	HON	KAP	KAU	LEE	MAU	WIN*	Total
Instruction	26	23	C < 38	16	9	22	11	145
Academic Support Services	5	4	8	7	1	8	2	35
Student Services	8	8	2	8	1	10	1	38
Public Services	1	5	0	1	1	1	1	10
Institutional Support Services	3	5	5	2	2	2	2	21
							d	210
Total	43	45	53	34	14	43	17	249

\* Includes ETC

# Planned Review Cycle

		Number of Reviews by Campus							
By Academic Year	HAW	HON	KAP	KAU	LEE	MAU	WIN*	Total	
2004-05	11	5	>>>	11	0	9	0	33	
2005-06	10	11	53	4	2	10	17	107	
2006-07	11	10	0	7	6	10	0	44	
2007-08	18	9	53	4	4	9	17	61	
2008-09	14	6	0	2	2	8	0	85	
2009-10	11	4	0	5	0	0	17	37	
			5		0				
Total	75	45	106	33	14	43	51	367	

\* Includes ETC

# **UHCC System Program Review**

### **Principle 2**

Program reviews shall result in improvement plans that are linked to the campus strategic plan.

- Program review analysis should lead to action plans
- Where appropriate, strategic plan goals should be reflected in program plans and program review
- Progress toward achieving planned results should be part of program review

## **UHCC System Program Review**

### **Principle 3**

There shall be an annual report of program data which is analyzed, reviewed, and, where appropriate, reflected in updated action plans.

- Annual analysis is required by Perkins for technical programs; also good business practice
- Annual review should focus on progress toward planned improvements
- Annual review should consider unexpected changes in the program measures or in events external to the program
- Annual review should focus on updates or modifications of the agreed upon plans

# **UHCC System Program Review**

#### **Principle 4**

There shall be an overarching commitment to continuous quality improvement.

- Program review should be evidence driven
- Evidence is benchmarked against
  - Best practice
  - Desired goals and/or
  - Incremental change
- Achieving standards "raises the bar"

## **UHCC System Program Review**

#### **Principle 5**

The program review process shall be collegial.

- Program faculty and staff are involved in establishing the measures, analyzing the evidence, and developing the improvement plans
- The broader college community acts as quality control to ensure analysis and plans are well done, to ensure alignment with college-wide strategic goals and directions and to examine areas of overlap or consequence for other programs
- Exact process and structure will vary by local college governance.
- Faculty must provide leadership and commitment to a culture of evidence

# **UHCC System Program Review**

#### **Principle 6**

Program review information shall be publicly available.

- Program reviews and related action plans should be published through the campus intra-net
- BOR should be informed of significant actions taken as a result of program reviews

## **UHCC System Program Review**

#### **Principle 7**

Comparable measures shall be used consistently across campuses.

- Common system definition and language
- Creation of additional measures to complement "standard" measures
- Selected system-based benchmarks
- Creation of "tools" that reflect the measures and make data retrieval easy
- Continuous quality improvement applied to measures and outcomes

# **UHCC System Program Review**

#### **Principle 8**

Program reviews and resulting plans for improvement shall be used in decisions regarding resource allocation at the campus and system level

- College budget requests should be based on program review and plans
- Internal college reallocations should be based on program review and plans
- Internal program budget expenditures should reflect program review and plans

# **UHCC System Program Review**

- The same consideration applies to other decisions such as the development of policies, curriculum actions, and changes in practice.
- The same consideration applies to other resources in addition to money - time, attention, communication

Possible BOR/UH System Related Actions

- Review of BOR policy, E5.202, and E5.210 to bring into alignment with ACCJC standards
- Discussion of how colleges and BOR engages in a discussion of program review related actions