Context

The Program Review process at Maui Community College occurs within the context of our Mission Statement, Strategic Plan, Community College Survey of Student Engagement Reports, Banner (student and program information) data, and legislative and UH Community College System as well as UH System guidelines. The MCC Budget Process/Relationships Overview (See Attachment #1) identifies the Program Review as one of the “Budget Drivers/Parameters” in the Biennium Budget appropriations and annual budgeting process. The UH-MCC Detailed Tactical/Operational Planning Process (See Attachment #2) describes the context within which Strategic Plan implementation and Program Reviews interface and permit recommendations from the “review” process to inform the strategic and annual planning and budgeting needs. The influence of the WASC Jr. and Sr. Commission Standards; the County, State, national and regional economic environment; native Hawaiian issues; demographic shifts,

Introduction

In fulfilling Maui Community College’s commitment to continuous improvement and advancing our mission, the 2003-04 cycle of annual and comprehensive program review reports for instruction were submitted, analyzed, and completed with priorities and recommendations in October 2005. The comprehensive reports have undergone the process of analysis and evaluation by two review teams, one composed of internal and external members, and the other composed of campus Executive Committee members. Individual program plans of action will be implemented, and results based on data from the program reviews will be integrated into the college’s planning, budgeting, and decision-making processes. The comprehensive and noninstructional program reviews as well as the 2004-05 Annual Program Health Indicators are on file and available. After the analyses, recommendations and Program Review Summary are completed, program coordinators will again meet with the Dean and Assistant Dean of Instruction to discuss the feedback from the program reviews and data in terms of program effectiveness, demand, efficiency, budget, outcomes, and plans for this and the next year.
Program Reviews

The Comprehensive Program Reviews on a five-year cycle (See Attachment #3) that were reviewed this year include Accounting, Nursing, and Continuing Education. Additionally reviews of non-instructional programs included Administrative Services, and Student Services. In our second cycle of Program Reviews, the review processes further consisted of each degree program’s annual program health indicators (In subsequent years, UH System parameters for Program Reviews under current discussion among the UHCC Chancellors, the Interim Vice President for the UHCCs, Senior Administration and the UH Board of Regents will undoubtedly refine MCC’s approach to Program Reviews.)

Through Executive Committee (EC) presentations by each program leader beginning in March 2005 and continuing through the summer, each of the Comprehensive and Non-Instructional Program Reviews was assessed to have met the general requirements and expectations of the Program Review process. Each of these dialogues were taped for the record and subsequent review. This included faculty and staff involvement, external input (program advisory committees), data collection, mission statement development (where they did not exist before, e.g., business office and Operations & Maintenance), analysis accomplishments, identification of program needs and priorities, and plans for improvement.

The Accounting and Nursing and non-instructional Administrative Services Program Reviews were excellent and established a clear benchmark for future program reviews. In the Administrative Services arena, national metrics were unsuccessfully sought. UHCC System criteria are now under discussion. The Office of Continuing Education comprehensively addressed most of its metrics. However, the EC noted that relationships and data regarding program decisions and its financial deficits in some of its programs would benefit from more analysis and more assertive financial and programmatic leadership. The Student Services program ambitiously identified the Council for the Advancement of Standards in Higher Education as its template for criteria against which to measure its progress in meeting its program and service goals. While there now exists more data than ever regarding the services and programs in Student Services, the Admissions and Records review has not been completed. Data related to academic advisement and counseling resources connection to student success were also recommended. Assessing the consistency, availability and quality of student services to outreach center and online students were also identified as a challenges to be reported back to the EC as part of the next annual and comprehensive reports.

Additionally, Annual Program Assessments based on Program Health Indicators were completed. The Dean of Instruction provided data and analysis for each program. While there were discussions about each program, a summary of the entire instructional program priorities based on the data would be useful. Such a summary would include program needs; academic actions (including termination, stop-out, revisions, etc.), and faculty, personnel priorities, and overall resource development and deficit reduction plans. Overall, there seemed to consistent data regarding each program’s achievement
metrics. However, data and analyses regarding efficiency and effectiveness were uneven. Importantly, it was noted that Student Learning Outcomes have been developed for each course and program…which was a first and monumental step. Additionally, involvement by the Program Advisory Committees in the Program Review process appeared to be uneven and in need of a more systematic scheduling of dialogues regarding a data-based program performance review.

Program Review Conclusions and Recommendations:

The above programs were generally performing satisfactorily in fulfilling their respective missions. The reviews of data were generally very thorough and in all cases presented a comprehensive reprise of each program’s performance. However, there are areas of focus that will preface next year’s and future program reviews:

Accreditation Standards:

1. Although Comprehensive and Annual Program Review data were presented, a summary of all instructional programs is required. Such a summary should minimally describe program priorities within the instructional and academic support programs, identify any program changes, and rationalize allocation of resources with community demands for the program and its performance.

2. Additionally, a longitudinal view of each program’s number of majors, graduates, etc. was requested and provided to inform the discussion. The longitudinal graphs were helpful and should be part of all future program review presentations. A specific recommendation to separate the data in Human Services to permit a clear view of Early Childhood Education should be completed in this academic year. Recommendations for program terminations and combinations should also be identified for construction-related curricula. Annual data presentation on the Liberal Arts program is also necessary. Data and analysis related to developmental programs should be included as well.

3. While all instructional programs and courses have student learning outcomes, preparation for a review of SLOs next year should be considered with workshops for faculty on evidence collection, storage, analysis, and reporting.

4. Additionally, the efficiency dimension of Continuing Education, a number of instructional and non-instructional programs, and a variety of services did not indicate sufficient attention and require more financial detail and perspective in the future.

5. Follow-through on prior year plans and the feasibility of realistic future plans with measurable steps appeared to be problematic in several programs.

6. Student continuation and transfer rates additionally require investigation to determine strategies for improvement.

7. As the learning support services and programs (developmental programs, distance education, library, etc.) were viewed to be important to student learning, an annual summary of academic support programs should be also be considered in the future.

8. A prior dialogue with program coordinators regarding the department chair and Dean’s preliminary reviews will be suggested to assure that the relevant accomplishments and challenges are identified.
Major Institutional Conclusions:

Overall, Maui Community College appears to be fulfilling its mission.

On affordability: through significant infusions of Research and Training Revolving Funds and gifts, a robust schedule of classes was offered and 2,998 students were enrolled in Fall 2004. In the prior years’ patterns, the college these funding sources and special fund reserves to address resource deficiencies in electricity, lecturer, and overall institutional support resources. Although the college developed over $1.2 million in extramural RTRF resources over the last two years, proposed tech fees, Health Center Fees, and Tuition increases over the last year, the college’s overall resources came uncomfortably close to exhausting all of its resources in the service of its mission.

Response:

Privately funded Housing,
On Quality: through feedback from the Community College Survey of Student Engagement, five of seven benchmarks exceeded national benchmarks. The areas of improvement identified the college’s aging computing technology and inadequate financial aid services

Process: Continuous Improvement active, internal review committee and validation committees will benefit from refinement and more detailed training in assessment if the same process is repeated. A more direct process is being suggested that would combine the two (internal and validation) committees into one.

Implementation Council

Reorg

Degree Programs: Accounting and Nursing Instructional Programs assessed to be vital, active and reasonably efficient. The non-credit OCET program Non-instructional Institutional Support and Student Services programs

Recommendations

The college’s response to the convergence among program reviews, data analyses, Strategic Plan priorities, and resource availability enlists a combination of strategies and resource applications:

- Creating more revenues to meet needs through program credit and noncredit resident and nonresident enrollment increases;
- Accessing Rural Development Project grant funds through identifying sustainable revenue generation possibilities that coincide with instructional and institutional mission;
- Improving efficiency through class scheduling, class sizes, cost controls, and general more productive instruction-revenue generation relationships are all under examination;
• Considering less services within a finite budget;
• Leveraging extramural grants and gifts to meet mission critical needs;
• Forwarding Electricity restoration as MCC’s top priority Supplemental Budget request, with other priorities including WASC Program Review support staffing, Workforce Development (Oral Health, Biotech, and Early Childhood faculty positions), and Hawaiian Studies requests;
• Maintaining a high level of indirect cost grant contribution to college operational needs, and
• Constructing a 400 bed privately funded Student Housing facility to address resident and nonresident student needs.

Process Refinement

The Strategic Plan Implementation Committee is presently reviewing refining this and other analytical processes. As the tuition fee revenues have slightly exceeded our budget projections, the campus instructional priorities will generally maintained. Budget challenges faced by some instructional and non-instructional programs have revealed that efficiency metrics require special attention Culinary, Oral Health, and the Office of Continuing Education and Training. Adjustments to address budget requirements in each program have been requested and will be integrated to reverse downward trends in the imbalance between cost of services and revenues. The escalation of electricity and other costs have additionally challenged all facets of the college.
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Administrative Services
2004 - Program Review Summary

The 2004 Administrative Services Program Review consisted of a comprehensive review of the Business Office and three annual reviews by Computing Services, Operations and Maintenance and Personnel Office.

Program Review Conclusions and Recommendations:

Comprehensive Review - Business Office
The Business Office undertook a comprehensive review and analysis of its mission, functions, qualitative data, quantitative data, human, financial and physical plant resources and determined their strengths, weaknesses, and
developed action plans, timelines and resource needs to address any areas that were needing improvement.

The comprehensive review revealed tremendous growth in MCC’s total financial resources, which are processed by the Business Office, with a disproportionate lack of growth in the Business Office staffing to support the increased workload. As result, it has inhibited the staff’s ability to provide careful, accurate and patient advice, guidance and overall service to the college staff, faculty and students. Overall morale of the office is a concern as well as frustration from the college abroad.

In order to address these concerns, the Business Office recommended an action plan, which required immediate filling of all vacant staff positions, increased training of Business Office staff including customer service sessions, increased training for the campus, having breakfast and special Business office staff meetings to allow for staff bonding, and to provide adequate storage space and sufficient funds for general operating costs.

Annual Program Reviews

Computing Services
The Computing Services conducted an annual review of their mission, goals, functions, qualitative data, quantitative data, financial and human resources and determined strengths and weaknesses and a plan to implement improvements. The Computing Services review indicates a unit experiencing increasing workloads in terms of a growing number of computer labs, computers, networking equipment along with the implementation of the Banner Student Database system. Staffing for the department remained level, but an extended leave of absence for a permanent staff member, exacerbated the workload issues. Despite the heavy workload, the department’s overall satisfaction survey results improved from 2003 to 2004, with the department’s quality of service and courteous staff resulting with the higher marks. Also, the average turnaround to complete work orders decreased in 2004.

Computing Services recommended action plan is to fill already funded but vacant positions to support IT Specialist Shibano’s Banner responsibilities and a vacant hardware support IT Specialist. This support would then allow the department to service students needing passwords, WebCT and UHUNIX problems and also implement the Maximo workorder system for campus wide usage.

Operations and Maintenance
The Operations and Maintenance Department conducted an annual review of their mission, goals, functions, qualitative date, quantitative data, financial and human resources and determined strengths and weaknesses and a plan to implement improvements. Similar to the Computing Services unit, Operations and Maintenance experienced overall improvement in its campus satisfaction survey. Courteous and service oriented staff is indicated in the surveys. These
improvements are achieved despite, increasing workloads, which places MCC custodians and groundskeepers covering substantially more area than their Community College counterparts. Vacant positions have been unfilled for extended time periods further exacerbate the workload problems. A lack of equipment replacement funds, have impacted the department, as mowers, carts and vehicles are constantly inoperable and requiring repair.

The recommended action plan is to fill vacant positions immediately. Focus on higher quality work and highly visible areas. Purchase equipment and tools that are better suited for the staff and department. Increase staff training and development. Phase out campus vehicle fleet.

Personnel Office
The Personnel Office conducted an annual review of their mission, goals, functions, qualitative date, quantitative data, financial and human resources and determined strengths and weaknesses and a plan to implement improvements. The Personnel Office received very high ratings from the campus satisfaction surveys in both 2003 and 2004. The quantitative data reflects a high volume, which have decreased slightly in 2004. This may be a result of the college’s financial constraints, coupled with the increased use of RCUH personnel system, which is managed by RCUH HR. The major area of focus for the Personnel Office is to increase campus training and to streamline the overall process.

The recommended action plan is to provide funds for a permanent Personnel Clerk, along with funds to support BRIO software, staff development, storage and supplies.
Administrative Services Departmental Priorities:

The results of the Administrative Services Program reviews were analyzed and a prioritized matrix of each department’s action plans and resource needs was created. Each action item was discussed and a means of financing was identified (in brackets).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Business Office</th>
<th>Personnel Office</th>
<th>O&amp;M, Mailroom, Security</th>
<th>Computing Services</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Account Ckt Civil Service</td>
<td>(convert to Gfunds/perm)</td>
<td>Foreman</td>
<td>(.60 to 1.00)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institutional Support (Banner)</td>
<td>(internal reallocation)</td>
<td>(currently funded)</td>
<td>(Shibano/Harding/Bohn Support)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Banner Support (currently only</td>
<td>(Biennium Budget Req)</td>
<td>(Biennium Budget request)</td>
<td>(Biennium Budget request)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>to June)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Operating Funds ($20,000)</td>
<td>3. Operating Funds ($4,000)</td>
<td>3. Convert Existing General</td>
<td>3. Implement Maximo Workflow Module ($2,000)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Budget reallocation if possible)</td>
<td>EUTF, Training, Airfare, copying costs</td>
<td>Laborer to Maintenance Mechanic.</td>
<td>(release for Bohn)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(Budget reallocation)</td>
<td>(funds for increase salary)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(no cost)</td>
<td>(Budget reallocation)</td>
<td>(Supplemental Budget request)</td>
<td>(Budget reallocation)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multi-Purpose Bldg</td>
<td>On-line Training</td>
<td>(Supplemental Budget request)</td>
<td>(funded g-funds FY05)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Budget reallocation)</td>
<td>(Budget reallocation)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. RDP - Institutional Support (Fed)</td>
<td>6. Website, Policies Calendar</td>
<td>6. Security Guard (1.00)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(funded by RDP)</td>
<td>(no cost)</td>
<td>24 hrs/7 days</td>
<td>(Partially Funded by Leg FY 2007)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(Partially Funded by Leg FY 2007)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(no cost)</td>
<td>(no cost)</td>
<td>(Budget reallocation)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(no cost)</td>
<td>(no cost)</td>
<td>(Budget reallocation)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
9. Brio (on order)  
   (Budget reallocation)  
9. New pick up truck (small) and van OR ask Dept's to rent

10. Timely Salary Payments  
   (no cost)  
10. Brush Chipper/Mulcher

11. Asst with Hiring Hi-Quality  
11. Storage Equipment/Furniture  
   (Swap meet/Drive in funds)

12. Stream Line process
12. Re-institute Staff Development  
   (Internal)

**Administrative Services Overall Priorities:**

The Director of Administrative Services along with the department heads formulated an overall Administrative Services priority of resource needs. Also identified, were high priority cost items, which were not identified during program review.

**FY 2006**

**New Item which occurred after the Program Review Process**
New - Fill Vacant Electronics Tech Position (B. Harding)

**Program Review Priorities**

1. Fill Vacant Grounds Foreman Position (OM)
2. Fill Vacant Account Clerk (Civil Service) Position (BO)
3. Fill Vacant Institutional Support APT Banner Position (BO)
4. Hire Full-time IT Specialist Position (Shibano/Harding/Bohn Support (.40) (CC)
5. Asst Personnel Officer (Convert to G-Funds/Perm, reallocated H. Lee salary, need diff) (Pers)
6. Personnel Clerk (Hollis Lee)
7. Computing Services Office Clerk (.50 FTE) (CC)
8. O&M Office Clerk (OM)
9. Ka'a'ike UPS Maintenance (CC)
10. Operating Funds (BO - $20,000/Pers - $4,000/CC - $2,000) $26,000
Institutional Support Cost Increases in FY 2006 (Non-Program Review)

1. Increase Electricity
2. Security Guard
3. Paina Hood Cleaning
4. Ka'aike and Paina Front Glass Treatment
5. Campus Postage

Student Services
2004 – Program Review Summary

Comprehensive Program Reviews

In AY 2004-05, Admissions & Records, Student Housing, and Student Life were scheduled for comprehensive reviews. External review teams formed for each area.

Admissions & Records did not complete the required self-study for the comprehensive review. The external team noted that this requirement was not met and recommended that Admissions & Records be rescheduled for a comprehensive review in AY 2005-06 with a self-study deadline of September 30, 2005. The Dean of Student Services accepted this recommendation. The Dean met with the Registrar to review the team’s report and recommendations and sent a follow-up letter summarizing the program review results and recommendations.

The external review team for Student Housing noted that this self-study sets a basic “baseline” for ongoing program improvement and review. The team also noted that the housing program is meeting the basic needs of students. The team stated that the revenue generated by the limited number of beds (44) seriously handicaps a self-support program. The major recommendation noted by the team is that the College considers supporting personnel with State General funds. Doing so would free up funds for development of more co-curricular programming. The Dean accepted this recommendation. The Dean will submit this recommendation for consideration in future budget planning.

The external review team commended the Student Life program for making progress in budget management and addressing ethics related campus issues. The team also noted that Student Life is understaffed and recommended more institutional support for staffing. The team’s major recommendation spoke of the need of Student Life to be more proactive in it’s campus activities. Specifically, the team recommended that Student Life be more active in engaging faculty, staff, and students in developing and promoting “creative” activities on campus especially given the development of increased student housing in the near future. The Dean accepted this recommendation and will work with
the Student Life program to address this and other recommendations in on-going program improvement initiatives and reviews.

Annual Program Reviews

Except for programs scheduled for comprehensive reviews, all student services programs submitted annual reviews. The annual reviews consisted of programmatic functional statements, data over the past two years, assessment, and programmatic improvements implemented based on the assessment.

The annual program reviews have provided the College with substantially more data in an organized format than ever before. The Dean met with all student services program directors to review the report and to discuss specific programmatic areas. In future program reviews, the Dean will work with the program directors to strengthen the area of assessment and data analysis, which is then must be more clearly linked to programmatic improvements.

Priorities

Priorities were only developed for those programs completing comprehensive program reviews; specifically Student Housing and Student Activities.

Priority 1. Support Student Housing Director with general funds (currently self-supported).

Priority 2. Create new Student Life position with general funds.

Instruction

Comprehensive Program Reviews

In AY 2004-05, Accounting, Nursing, and the Office of Continuing Education and Training (OCET) conducted comprehensive program reviews. Each of the programs conducted a self-study, which was then reviewed by a review team (another program coordinator, community person, student, and program-related faculty member) and then validated by three members of the campus’s Executive Committee.

Accounting

The Accounting program identified seven goals, and its review team found that each goal had been met with four of the goals still needing attention of some kind. The campus’s Executive Committee identified some mechanical areas of improvement, however, were very impressed with the quality and health of the Accounting program and the caliber of the faculty and curriculum
Nursing
The Nursing program’s comprehensive program review was cited by the Nursing Program Review Team and the campus Executive Committee team as being a model program review. According to the review team, nursing has succeeded in meeting the program’s four goals and identified the support needed to ensure continued success and program growth.

Office of Continuing Education and Training
OCET has faced a number of challenges this past year, including budget and personnel issues. There was a dramatic drop in funding from the state’s Department of Labor & Industrial Relations Employment and Training Fund (ETF), followed by severely decreased funding for Workforce Initiative Act. However, to assist in counteracting these funding decreases, each program has developed a business plan, which will help to move the program towards self-sufficiency. The campus’s Executive Committee also expressed some concern about the fiscal management. Therefore, a consultant (retired UH system fiscal officer) was hired to review OCET’s fiscal management. He provided an analysis and made recommendations for improvement. OCET has incorporated all recommendations in its fiscal management system. Due to long-term illness and resignation, two full-time positions remain unfilled, and the present staff has taken on additional responsibilities.

Annual Program Reviews
Fifteen instructional programs submitted annual program reviews; two did not. The annual review consisted of an overview of the program, the curriculum and its impact on students, and the analysis of the program activities. The Dean of Instruction and the Interim Assistant Dean of Instruction met with the program coordinators to discuss the program’s effectiveness and the means to provide continuous improvement. From these conversations, workload issues were clarified and program modifications moved from a conceptual framework to a draft of the revised program map.

Program reviews will serve as one source of dialogue for budget preparation.

In AY 2005-06, the academic support programs and outreach sites will also submit either an annual assessment or a comprehensive program review.
Budget Requests

After discussion at the October 25, 2005 meeting the Instructional priority list in order is:

1. Math position       1.5  
2. Soc/AJ              1.0  
3. Human Services      1.0

The Academic Support Services priority is:

1. TLC                 1.0  
2. Media Specialist III 1.0  
3. Library Assistant IV 1.0

The University Center priority is

1. APT for University Center 1.0

The OCET priority is

1. Permanent OCET Director 1.0  
2. MLI Director/Instructor from temporary to tenure track 1.0

Supplies necessary to maintain a high quality of educational experience include:

1. Computer replacement in labs and classrooms
2. Replacement/repair of boards used in the classroom