SECTION SIX
Quality Assurance and Improvement:
Program Review, Assessment, & Use of Data as Evidence

Subsections include:

- Reviving the Program Review Calendar and Meaningful College Statements
- Sociology: Making the Program Review Process Meaningful
- External Accreditation: MA Counseling Psychology
- Use of Evidence in Decision-Making: Continuing Challenges and New Opportunities

> *O Kuaʻana ka nalu; o Paiahaʻa ka ʻāina*
> Kuaʻana is the surf; Paiahaʻa is the land
> > *-- ʻŌlelo noʻeau* that speaks of the pride of the people of Kaʻū in watching their chiefs ride the famous waves of Kuaʻana to the shores of Paiahaʻa.

WSCUC guidelines for program review state: "Successful quality improvement efforts are broadly participatory, iterative, and evidence-based. This component of the institutional report includes a discussion of three basic tools of quality improvement—program review, assessment of student learning, and data collection and analysis—and presents the ways these tools inform the institution's decision making. In addition, institutions are welcome to discuss other quality improvement approaches that have made a difference, if they wish." Unfortunately, like many institutions, UH Hilo has been beset by doubts about the value of assessment, which made undertaking program review difficult.[1] Thus rather than approaching assessment for the sake of drumming up data, we have kept our approach simple and sustainable—meaning we provide support through faculty mentorship to help teachers and their programs make use of existing student work and to provide help in assessing those artifacts.[2] These assessments in turn become the basis for program review, which had to overcome the hurdle of being seen as nothing more than an "official channel to lobby for badly needed resources, such as additional office or research space, as well as the golden ticket, new faculty lines."[3] Thus the focus of this section of the Institutional Report will look at efforts to turn long-standing misconceptions of assessment and program review into a useful conversation for both faculty and administration on a subject both can agree—the love of students and pride in this institution. This essay will proceed to

---

[1] Erik Gilbert, "Assessment Is an Enormous Waste of Time," *The Chronicle of Higher Education*, March 20, 2019.
[2] For more information on sustainable assessment practices, see Linda Suskie, "Making assessment worthwhile," *A Common Sense Approach to Assessment in Higher Education*, March 13, 2018, accessed June 16, 2020.
[3] Jane S, Halonen and Sana S. Dunn, "Avoiding the Potholes of Program Review," *The Chronicle of Higher Education,* February 27, 2017, accessed September 22, 2020.

narrate, through two specific examples, how this institution utilizes program review and external secondary accreditation to ensure the rigor and quality of educational programs at this institution.

Reviving the Program Review Calendar and Meaningful College Statements

Since the revision of our program review guidelines in 2006 and the last WSCUC site visit, UH Hilo had been undertaking a regular schedule of five to seven years per the UH System's Executive Policy 5.202, from 2009 through 2018; however, as the list in Table 6.1 demonstrates, we started falling behind our established schedule. By AY 2017-2018, certain programs chose to delay submission which led others to fall behind as well. Some were never contacted; others received no confirmation that they could proceed with program review. A handful just refused. By the fall of 2019, none of the programs slated for AY 2019-2020 and for AY 2020-2021 were ready or willing to undertake self-studies. And even among those that were turned in, the required assessment element was missing from two programs.

Part of this may be attributed to the reorganization of the College of Arts and Sciences (CAS) and the creation of the College of Natural and Health Sciences (CNHS) in 2018.[4] UH Hilo also experienced a wave of interim leadership, starting in 2017 through 2020; the Chancellor, the Vice-Chancellor of Academic Affairs, the Dean of CAS, the Dean of CHNS, and the Dean of the College of Business were staffed with interim appointments. There were also impasses over MOUs (the end result of the old self-study process) that were signed by both faculty and administration but never materialized in terms of fiscal resourcing (including new hires). Some of these stalemates led to the inability of new MOUs to be signed, meaning the program review process could not be closed out, making the scheduling of the next review impossible.

The opportunity to re-strategize came in Fall of 2019 when we found that no other campus in the UH System required a signed MOU between departments and administration. We were also advised by the University of Hawaiʻi Faculty Assembly, the faculty union, that an "MOU" was a legally binding agreement that could only be negotiated between the union and administration, and that a department or a program chair could not enter into such agreements as it would compromise collective bargaining. To rectify this and to help restart and reinvigorate the process, we undertook another major revision to our old program review website, with the first step being to remove all MOUs.

The next step was to provide more support and centralized data collection. The search for missing self-studies and external reviews that were not posted onto the VCAA website was immediately undertaken—the lack of record-keeping of past reviews and external evaluations in departments left many chairs without a starting point. The third was to devote personnel trained in design and ADA

---

[44] UH Hilo Stories, "Interim chancellor gives updates on reorganization of UH Hilo College of Arts and Sciences," January 19, 2018.

compliance to set up a user-friendly website that linked program review specifically to accreditation to show the relationship between the two. Fourth, the ALO also took a more proactive role in the process by contacting all departments and negotiating a new calendar of reviews. (CFR 4.1)

TABLE 6.1. *Below*, Old Schedule of Program Review with Revised Dates.

Old Schedule	New Schedule
AY 2015-2016	
Administration of Justice (completed)	AY 2021-2022
Art (completed)	AY 2022-2023
English (completed)	AY 2023-2024
History (completed)	AY 2021-2022
Marine Science (completed)	AY 2023-2044
Political Science (completed)	Ay 2021-2022
AY 2016-2017	
Computer Science (completed)	AY 2021-2022 (on time)
Economics (completed)	Stopped out
Sociology	AY 2019-2020
Physics & Astronomy (completed)	AY 2024-2025
Education (MEd Program)	AY 2022-2023
Geology	AY 2020-2021
AY 2017-2018	
Communication	AY 2022-2023
Geography/Env. Science	AY 2020-2021
Languages (formerly Japanese Studies)	AY 2020-2021
Anthropology & MA Heritage Management	AY 2020-2021
Mathematics	AY 2020-2021
Biology (completed—AY 2018-2019)	AY 2026-2027
TCBES, M.S. (completed—AY 2018-2019)	AY 2026-2027
All programs in the College of Agriculture, Forestry and Natural Resource Management (CAFNRM)	AY 2020-2021
AY 2018-2019	
PhD Pharmaceutical Sciences	AY 2020-2021
Performing Arts	AY 2020-2021
Psychology	AY 2021-2022
Philosophy (completed)	AY 2024-2025 (on time)
Linguistics (completed)	AY 2025-2026 (on time)
AY 2019-2020	
Chemistry	AY 2022-2023
Kinesiology	AY 2024-2025
All programs in Ka Haka ʻUla O Keʻelikōlani (KHʻUOK)	AY 2020-2021
AY 2020-2021	
Administration of Justice & Political Science	AY 2021-2022
English	AY 2023-2024
Art	AY 2022-2023
Marine Science	AY 2023-2024
Chemistry	AY 2022-2023

We strategically scheduled most departments which were never reviewed or were more than ten years in arrears to be scheduled within the next two years, with the exception of Liberal Studies and Kinesiology which asked for time to develop assessment:

- Sociology, last reviewed in 2006, underwent review in AY 2019-2020
- The Hawaiian Studies B.A. (reviewed 2009), the Hawaiian Literature M.A. (reviewed 2009), the Indigenous Language and Culture M.A. (reviewed in 2015), and the Hawaiian and Indigenous Language and Culture Ph.D. (reviewed in 2015) were folded into one larger self-study for Ka Haka ʻUla o Keʻelikōlani and is scheduled for AY 2020-2021
- Performing Arts, never reviewed, now AY 2020-2021
- Geology, last reviewed in 2004, now AY 2020-2021
- Anthropology, last reviewed in 2005, now AY 2020-2021
- Languages, last reviewed for Japanese Studies only in 2009, now AY 2020-2021
- Pharmaceutical Science (Ph.D.), never reviewed, AY 2020-2021
- Gender and Women's Studies, never reviewed, now AY 2021-2022
- Psychology, not reviewed since 2010, now AY 2021-2022
- Liberal Studies, not reviewed since 1997, now AY 2024-2025
- Kinesiology, never reviewed, now AY 2024-2025

But rescheduling only fixed the problem of time. What we also had to correct was the belief that program review wasn't connected to the larger workings of the university. To address this we asked the deans in each college to work with faculty to develop statements on the "meaning of the degree" for each college. This was meant to facilitate a common understanding on what a student can expect by coming through a particular college at UH Hilo; it was also intended to help colleges link their degrees (and program reviews) to the larger mission and vision of the university. (CFR 2.2) Our newly revamped Program Review Webpage now holds self-studies and other related documents by college, with each boasting their own degree statements:

- College of Agriculture and Natural Resource Management (CAFNRM)
- College of Natural and Health Sciences (CNHS)
- College of Business and Economics (CoBE)
- Daniel K. Inouye College of Pharmacy (DKICP)
- Ka Haka ʻUla O Keʻelikōlani College of Hawaiian Language (KHʻUOK) (CFR 2.2)

The website also includes a reference to WSCUC Standard 2.7, a link to the University of Hawaiʻi System Board of Regents' policy on program review, and a link to the UH Hilo IRO website devoted to programmatic data. The tables for each college also include a section for the posting of assessment data, making this, as opposed to an MOU, one of the most important aspects for program review. (CFR 2.7)

During this resetting of the schedule, it became clear in multiple interviews that our 2002 revision of program guidelines was not be enough to encourage the process—many (including the deans) didn't see the value of the experience beyond a requirement for WSCUC.

Once a revised schedule of programs was developed, the ALO and the Chair of the Department of Sociology (for whom this represented the first time undertaking a review) worked together to undertake the process together. Their experience led to further revisions of the Program Review Guidelines, including detailed instructions for Deans and the Office of the Vice Chancellor of Academic Affairs. This process of interactive learning and continuing improvement is detailed in the next section.

Sociology: Making the Program Review Process Useful

The first challenge for any chair that was identified is the data collection. While the guidelines make it appear there is just one source for data, the reality is that different units are responsible for different sectors of information:

TABLE 6.2. *Below*, Quantitative Data and Tables from Sociology Program Review, AY 2019-2020.

	FALL 14	FALL 15	FALL 16	FALL 17	FALL 18/19	
1. Course Count Information (per academic year)						
a. Number of Majors	87	77	77	84	73	75
b. Number of Minors	7	16	16	12	11	
2. Annual Course Information						
a. Number of Student Semester Hours (SSH) offered by term	1234	1420	1130	1009	1086	
b. Number of Full Time Equivalents (FTE) Course Enrollment (SSH divided by 15 for undergraduate and by 12 for graduates)	82.3	94.7	75.3	67.3	72.4	
c. % FTE own majors	41.17	40.13	38.76	47.67	42.82	
d. % FTE majors within college	35.09	38.37	47.52	37.26	35.17	
e. % FTE all other students	23.74	21.50	13.72	15.06	22.01	
f. % FTE Writing Intensive courses	3.40	4.01	13.01	9.22	5.25	
g. % FTE GE courses	55.92	50.42	58.58	73.74	54.79	
h. % FTE DL or online	7.29	15.85	19.65	24.68	24.59	
3. Course Delivery						
a. Average class size – Face-to-Face (computed as # registrations / # classes)	23.1	24.1	22.6	19.4	18.9	
b. Average class size – DL/Online	30	25	18	27.7	22.3	
c. Number of FTE Full Time Faculty	2.50	3.42	3.0	2.75	1.75	
d. Number of FTE Adjunct Faculty (lecturers)	.75	.50	.50	.58	1.83	
e. % SSH taught by Full Time Faculty	76.92	87.23	85.71	82.50	48.84	

f. % SSH taught by Adjunct Faculty	23.08	12.77	14.29	17.50	51.16	
g. FTE student-faculty ratio (FTE course enrollment / FTE total faculty)	25.3	24.2	21.5	20.2	20.2	
4. Graduation and Placement					18	19
a. Number of degrees earned	26	31	23	26	28	35
b. % of Majors graduating	29.88	40.25	40.25	30.95	38.3	46.6
c. % of Native Hawai'ian graduates	10.3	22.02	11.00	13.09	13.6	24
d. % of Graduates who were Pell Grant Recipients						
e. Number of Certificates and Minors	1	1	2	0	2	
5. Cost of Delivery						
a. Budgetary allocations	437255	453147	435682	399282	425182	
b. Cost per SSH	354.34	319.12	385.56	395.72	391.51	

While areas one through four are embedded in the eight new tables provided by IRO in its Program Review website, budgetary allocation and cost of SSH require the Budget Office to generate a "KFS Financial Report," which is a report per the UH Systemwide financial management system. Likewise, the data for enrollments vis-à-vis General Education certified courses comes from the Curriculum Coordinator housed in the Office of the Vice Chancellor of Academic Affairs. Once these were identified, the chair only had to rely on the new accreditation webpage—which houses annual collection of Core Competency Data and old program reviews for all units. (CFRs 4.1, 4.2, & 4.3)

Table 6.3. *Below*, Core Competency Assessment Data, AY 2019-2020, for Sociology.

SOC 377 Spring 2020	Learning of course materials (vocabulary)	Prose/Discourse	Analysis/Insight
Paper 1			
Reader 1	3	3	3
Reader 2	3	3	3
Paper 2			
Reader 1	3	2	3
Reader 2	3	2	3
Paper 3			
Reader 1	3	3	3
Reader 2	3	3	3
Paper 4			
Reader 1	3	3	3
Reader 2	3	3	3
Paper 5			
Reader 1	3	2	3
Reader 2	3	2	3
Paper 6			
Reader 1	3	2	2
Reader 2	3	3	2
Paper 7			
Reader 1	3	3	2
Reader 2	3	3	2

Paper 8			
Reader 1	3	3	3
Reader 2	3	3	3
Paper 9			
Reader 1	3	3	3
Reader 2	3	3	2
Paper 10			
Reader 1	3	3	2
Reader 2	3	3	3
Paper 11			
Reader 1	2	2	2
Reader 2	2	2	2
n = 11 73% agreement Correlation = .84, p = .001 k = .56, p = .010	AVERAGES Reader 1: 2.90 Reader 2: 2.90	AVERAGES Reader 1: 2.63 Reader 2: 2.72	AVERAGES Reader 1: 2.63 Reader 2: 2.63

Based on the chair's gathering and analyzing of data, the ALO developed a more straightforward and streamlined, numbered template for the self-study while also making the ties between program review and WSCUC compliance more prominent. Each template level now includes more straightforward writing prompts. These were then submitted to the Faculty Congress in May of 2020 as an update to the established guidelines. Below is a truncated version of the first four pages of the newer guidelines:

Preamble: Why Do Program Review?

The Program Review Process is where accreditation standards meet the day-to-day operations of academic programs. Through this process, units and their faculty collectively examine how they uphold educational quality and rigor while contributing to the larger mission of the University

I.   Meaning of the Degree (a short statement that encapsulates what a degree from the program means in terms of the collective experiences to be undertaken and skills to be attained by the students graduating from this unit)
II.   Mission Statement and Goals of the College, Department, or Program
III.   Executive Summary by Dean, Department Chair, or Program Chair
IV.   Program Organization/Faculty List—include rank, specializations, degrees and dates of conferral
V.   Program Components (including curriculum, student learning outcomes, course sequencing
VI.   Programmatic Data & Quantitative Data Tables
VII.   Evidence of Program Quality (Assessment)
VIII.   Program Resourcing
IX.   Future Program Goals and Resource Requirements
X.   Response to External Reviewer's Report
XI.   Future plans/Academic Action Plan[5]

---

[5] See pages 2-4 of Academic Program Review Guidelines, Ho'okahi Ka 'Ilau Like Ana: Wield the Paddles Together, updated Spring 2021.

These newer categories replaced the more narrative instructions that were found in the previous version and simplified the compilation the self-study. This, along with revised models based on best practices, appeared to be a tremendous help:

> First, reviewing the models of preparing for future reviews (English) was most instructional particularly in developing a curriculum matrix and annual assessment plan. Maintaining a formal approach to assessment will assist in improving the quality and rigor of the degree. Our findings, for example, the cost efficiency of the program and the recognition of interference by the interim Dean in course scheduling were also revealing - in addition grants and funds, although where these monies go has still not been established.

> What worked is the ALO officer's patience and support. By this I mean she did not intrude on the process, but answered questions as they came up immediately, clarified point. In addition, KFS documents, other budget information, and the institutional data, the ALO was able to direct me to these items but also served as a conduit to these offices, which [. . .] expedited responses and accesses to resources.

> I think the [revised] document, [of] April 2020, was extremely useful, it truly set an outline for the self-evaluation. In developing the self-evaluation I cut and pasted each of the questions and answered them, created tables to support or empirically confirm the responses. After I answered each of the questions to my satisfaction, I deleted the questions and the text of the self-evaluation flowed.[6]

Apart from mentoring the chair's work, the ALO also kept track of the process, encouraging conversations between the chair and designees of the administration. The chair also leveraged program review to undertake WI assessment of an upper division course just before submission of the self-study, proving to other faculty members in the department that assessment is not an overwhelming task. (CFR 2.4)

We also solicited input from other chairs who have submitted self-studies within the past five years to further identify areas needing clarification. The responses were surprising:

- In ordinary times, the alumni feedback is helpful for structuring our program and identifying new skills that we can teach as part of our existing curriculum or by expanding our course offerings. The enrollment numbers are frequently helpful for making requests to administration. Earlier documents help to provide a department history.

---

[6] Marina Karides to Seri Luangphinith, Email, June 30, 2020.

No one reads these documents, so the process has very little value. We still don't have MOUs from the last three that we completed. The administration does not read the documents, and they certainly will not agree to adequate staffing levels or replacement of lab equipment, so there is precious little that can be accomplished.

The administration at UH has not commented on a single review since August 13, 2003. Hence, we have no recommendations from this group upon which to act. The recommendations from our external reviewers have been valuable.[7] (Computer Science, reviewed AY 2014-2016)

- [P]rogram review helped sharpen our vision and adapt to changes. We learned that we needed to be more flexible and to align better with changes within the field of English Studies in general. One of the most positive outcomes was the decision to move ahead with the Creative Writing Certificate, which garnered enthusiasm from both faculty and students. Our department already had, and still has, very competent faculty who keep in mind SLOs and deliver quality instruction. Program review did not really lead to an improvement in instruction and SLOs, but rather reinforced that we're doing the right thing.

  In our relationship with Administration, the excitement about program review fizzled quickly. The VCAA was very hesitant about signing the MOU, did not want to guarantee hires, and really just wanted to get enrollment and his budget under control. The Dean did not act on our program review at all. Program review never became a meeting point in decision making between the department and Administration.[8] (English, reviewed AY 2015-2016)

- The actual review process itself I found to be quite valuable. Our department routinely discusses ways we can improve our program and reach out to students who are struggling, but the review forced a more systematic review of everything we do. We thought about our role in relation to the university's mission and the discipline of philosophy as a whole. Our outside reviewer gave us both specific and global suggestions on how to improve the program. The data gathering gave us a bit more perspective on how many students we were serving.

  The biggest failure in the review process is that it's not clear that any administrator at any level even glanced at the program review. There was never even an acknowledgement that it was received.[9] (Philosophy, reviewed AY 2018-2019)

---

[7] H. Keith Edwards to Seri I. Luangphinith, Email, September 2, 2020.
[8] Kirsten Mollegaard to Seri I. Luangphinith, Email, September 3, 2020.
[9] Christopher Lauer to Seri I. Luangphinith, Email, September 2, 2020.

These comments indicate that while the process was valuable in looking at the rigor of the degree and considering changes to the discipline, this work was not necessarily acknowledged beyond the department. This collection of anecdotes led to formalized writing prompts to guide the various levels of review. These writing prompts are also meant to communicate back to faculty on what administration needs to look for; also included are items pertaining to fiscal efficiency as there is a strong desire to move the conversation away from "compliance and reward" (i.e. a new position) to how current resourcing can be better utilized. These are in the process of being finalized as another update to the guidelines which will be discussed at the end of this essay.

Sociology has since received feedback from the ALO regarding the future need to undertake assessment of departmental SLOs specific to the discipline instead of relying solely on annual core competencies. The dean designee recommended looking at national standardized tests as one means to moving towards programmatic assessment. The VCAA designee was able to review the overall program for elements such as faculty productivity (grants and conferences) that in turn enhance the quality of the major; the VCAA designee also looked at course enrollments vis-à-vis course caps as one means of gently prodding fiscal efficacy given the changing economics in higher education. Once it was vetted by the chair of Sociology, the reviews offered by the ALO, the dean designee, and the VCAA designee (see Table 6.3) were publicly posted with those of the external reviewer with the intention of setting an example of how communication between these different levels can lead to productive relationships across the university. (CFR 2.7)

Table 6.4. *Below*, Listing of Sociology's Documents from Program Review.

Program	Last Review	Next Review	Current Self Study	External Review	Assessment
Sociology	2005-2006 2005 – 2006 Self Study 2007 SOC External Review 2009 External Review Response	2025-2026	2020 SOC Self Study	2020 SOC External Review 2020 ALO Review for WASC Compliance 2020 Dean Designee Review 2020 VCAA Designee Review	2014-2020 SOC Assessment

As with these earlier departments, Sociology also found the review process invaluable in confirming that their number of majors were one of the highest in the college; assessments (though infrequent) in Oral Communication and Writing Intensive) showed that students did perform at admirable levels. What may still be missing is the use of assessment data to make improvements; we certainly have a long way to go

in weaning ourselves from additional resource demands as the sole purpose in undertaking program review.

Given these insights, we are attempting to push through for the coming academic year program reviews for departments that have never gone up for review or which are more than ten years late: CAS—Languages, CAS—Performing Arts, CHNS—Geology, and the Ph.D. in Pharmaceutical Science (CoP). As with Sociology, the ALO will be directly overseeing the development of self-studies for all four with the hope of eventually posting these as examples along with that of Sociology. Results from these should be ready for perusal by the beginning of Fall of 2021. (CFRs 2.7 & 4.1)

External Accreditation: MA Counseling Psychology

UH Hilo offers a number of programs that are linked to key professions, which are encouraged to maintain secondary accreditation. One of the programs that has undergone a recent review for accreditation is the MA in Counseling Psychology.

In Spring of 2020, the program submitted a self-study and reapplication for accreditation to the Masters in Psychology and Counseling Accreditation Council (MPCAC). MPCAC maintains stringent standards as exemplified in their Curriculum Standards with Operational Definitions, which are used as guideposts in the evaluation of programs. In addition, the review process requires very explicit demonstrations of curriculum mapping and assessment:

TABLE 6.5. *Below*, Curriculum Map: Course number by MPCAC Standards[10]

Course No.	Course Title	MPCAC Standards
PSY 601	Applied Multivariate Statistics	F
PSY 602	Research Methodology and Program Evaluation	F
PSY 603	Psychological Assessment	D, E
PSY 604	Professional Identity, Ethics, and Legal Issues	A, J
PSY 611	Lifespan Human Development	H, I
PSY 612	Career Development	E, G
PSY 613	Psychopathology over the Lifespan	D, H
PSY 620	Counseling Theories	B
PSY 622	Group Work and Counseling	B, J
PSY 623	Social and Cultural Foundations	C, J
PSY 624	Counseling Skills	B
PSY 640	Practicum Supervision	A, B, C, D, E, G, H, I, J, K
PSY 640F	Practicum Fieldwork	A, B, C, D, E, G, H, I, J, K
PSY 659	Internship Supervision	A, B, C, D, E, G, H, I, J, K
PSY 659F	Internship Fieldwork	A, B, C, D, E, G, H, I, J, K
PSY 656	Child Maltreatment (Elective)	I
PSY 657	Psychopharmacology (Elective)	H
PSY 693	Cognitive Behavior Therapy Adult (Elective)	B

---

[10] Bryan S. Kim, Response to MPCAC, May 12, 2020.

PSY 695	CBT for Children and Families (Elective)	B, I, J

TABLE 6.6. *Below*, Proposed Assessment of MPCAC Standards

MPCAC Standard	Methods of Assessment
A	Written Assignments, Presentations, Exams, Clinical Evaluation
B	Written Assignments, Presentations, Exams, Clinical Evaluation
C	Written Assignments, Presentations, Exams, Experiential Activity, Clinical Evaluation
D	Written Assignments, Presentations, Exams, Clinical Evaluation
E	Written Assignments, Presentations, Exams, Clinical Evaluation
F	Written Assignments, Presentations, Exams
G	Written Assignments, Presentations, Clinical Evaluation
H	Written Assignments, Presentations, Exams, Clinical Evaluation
I	Written Assignments, Presentations, Exams, Clinical Evaluation
J	Written Assignments, Presentations, Exams, Clinical Evaluation
K	Written Assignments, Presentations, Clinical Evaluation

TABLE 6.7. *Below*, Mean Ratings for Practicum (Fall 2019)

Scale
1. Competence considered to be in need of further training and/or to require additional growth, maturation, and change on the part of the trainee in order for him/her to be effective in the various skill areas; trainee should not be allowed to function independently.
2. Competence currently considered to be below average but which, with further supervision and experience, is expected to develop satisfactorily; independent functioning is not recommended and close supervision is required.
3. Competence at least at the minimal level necessary for functioning with moderate supervision required.
4. Competence assessed to be above average; trainee can function independently with periodic need for supervision.
5. Competence very developed and trainee can function independently with little or no supervision required.

Category	Mean $n = 16$
A. Clinical and Relationship Skills	
1. Relationship Skills - established rapport, was aware of own impact on others, and showed respect for clients, colleagues, and staff in professional contexts.	4.50
2. Assessment Skills - demonstrated appropriate knowledge and use of assessment instruments; was able to appropriately interpret and discuss test results with clients and colleagues as well as integrate in intake reports.	3.71
3. Diagnostic Skills - incorporated multiple sources of data; showed sensitivity to client concerns; demonstrated good knowledge of DSM-IV; used diagnosis to establish client goals and make appropriate referrals.	3.89
4. Intervention Skills - showed flexibility in using a variety of appropriate strategies to help clients work toward identified goals.	3.89
5. Crises Management - recognized and handled clinical crises and emergencies in a professional manner.	3.67
6. Consultation Skills - worked effectively with significant others (family members, teachers, relevant professionals) to help meet client needs.	4.00

B. Professional Presentation and Behavior	
7. Professional Behavior - showed readiness and ability to assume and discharge assigned duties; initiated opportunities to gain and share skills.	4.35
8. Self Presentation - presented self in a professional manner through physical appearance/dress, composure, organization, confidence, and desire to help.	4.75
9. Management of Personal Issues in a Professional Manner – Controls personal stress, psychological dysfunction, or emotional reactions so they do not affect case conceptualization, professional interaction with clients and their families, or relationships with colleagues and other professionals.	4.50
10. Ethical Knowledge & Practice – demonstrated understanding of ethical principles; showed awareness of ethical dilemmas as they occurred; conformed to ethical principles in professional work and practice.	4.20
11. Knowledge and Practice of Diversity Issues - demonstrated understanding of diversity issues related to concerns of clients and colleagues; showed awareness of ethnic, cultural, sexual preference, and religious concerns as they arose; sought consultation and additional knowledge from a variety of appropriate non-client sources to enhance relationship and practice.	4.25
12. Intake Report and Progress Notes – completed intake reports and case notes in a timely manner, and included relevant professional information in a manner which could be used and interpreted by other professionals.	4.06
C. Supervision Behavior and Knowledge Demonstration	
13. Knowledge Base - demonstrated good understanding of theories and research in psychology, human development, counseling/psychotherapy, assessment, and psychopathology.	4.10
14. Written Communication Skills - showed ability to write clearly in a professional style that is clear, succinct, and devoid of unnecessary jargon.	4.20
15. Oral Communication Skills - showed ability to use oral language to communicate effectively with clients, supervisors, and colleagues.	4.40
16. Supervisory Involvement - sought supervision when needed, openly shared concerns and ideas with supervisor, demonstrated openness to feedback, used supervisory suggestions to make improvements.	4.40
D. Agency Behavior	
17. Program Development Skills – developed alternative prevention or intervention programs to meet client or community needs.	4.00
18. Agency Involvement - attended and actively participated in staff meetings and conferences; fulfilled administrative responsibilities.	4.56

Per the following comments from the Program Director, secondary accreditation is a successful method for self-reflection and self-inquiry. The process helped faculty review their strengths, their weaknesses, and also their strong commitment to maintaining a program that helps local students pursue professions of incredible importance to this community. Furthermore, the director states:

> From the start, the department's faculty had as its primary goal to offer a high-quality program
> with strong faculty and rigorous training program for its students. The main intent was to have a

program that would enable graduates to provide the highest level of mental health services to the residents of Hawaii and beyond. In this pursuit of excellence, the program applied for and received the "established status" (jargon for permanent status) from the University of Hawaii System in 2009. This program review process within the University of Hawaii System served as an initial indicator that the program is of top quality. This then was followed by the program looking outward for assurance from an external accreditation agency regarding its top quality.[11]

As of AY 2019-2020, the Master of Arts in Teaching (MAT), the Kahuawaiola Indigenous Teacher Education Program, Nursing, the College of Business, the PharmD in the College of Pharmacy, and Ka Haka 'Ula o Ke'elikōlani College of Hawaiian Language—in addition to the MA in Counseling Psychology—are all reviewed by an external, secondary accreditor. Given their specializations, their reviews by specialized agencies offer a more rigorous experience than a generic academic program review that encourages peer review between departments but may not offer enough expertise specific to benefit degree programs that require the rigor of profession-specific input. (CFR 2.7)

Use of Evidence in Decision-Making: Continuing Challenges and New Opportunities

As stated earlier in our profile of the program review process for Sociology, the evaluation was not something given much thought by many levels—it was called "superficial" at best, or at worst, a document that contained "bragging rights" and "demands" for compensation having completed the review. This is not to say that programs should not use the review as an opportunity to highlight what they do well and what their faculty and students are accomplishing; in fact, having all programs posted on a publicly assessable website helps communicate to external audiences the value of degree programs here at UH Hilo. However, once reviews were turned in, faculty and academic affairs administration usually remained locked in bitter debates over faculty hires and resourcing as the only aspect about the overall process that was of vital importance, regardless of the assessment data or the quality of degree programs. What was not a part of our practices was syncing program review to decision-making at any level—from the department through upper level administration. Oftentimes, hiring were decided upon vacancies and enrollments, meaning it was often done completely independent of the overall collection of program review documents; there was no long-term review of programmatic progress or thinking of possible changes to the fiscal or disciplinary landscape of higher education. This lack of usefulness has thus made it difficult to initiate program review in co-curricular programs in student affairs.

Part of the problem may have been the kinds of data we were reviewing. As seen in the multi-colored table labeled Table 6.2 (see previous pages 5 though 6) which was a requirement for an older version of the program review, the collection of numbers didn't prompt much analyses in the Sociology self-study and earlier reviews. The data from that table was recently modified into eight simplified and visually

---

[11] Bryan S. Kim to Seri I. Luangphinith, Email, June 15, 2020.

communicative graphs that are posted on the [IRO website for program review](#): Enrollment; SSH to FTE; FTE breakdown (students within the major, students within the college, and students from other colleges); FTE by Writing Intensive (WI), Distance Learning, and General Education; average class size and faculty-student ratios; instructional FTE by tenure track faculty versus adjunct; total student count for all classes by academic year; and degree/certificate completion. (CFR 4.2) The website allows for cross comparisons between departments and between colleges. The Director of Institutional Research, who came on board in January of 2020, was also instrumental in updating [the UH Hilo Data Dashboards](#), which includes [Department Level Enrollment Data](#) and reports percent changes in majors over time. These improved and diversified tools for data retrieval will be instrumental now that the Long-Range Budgeting and Planning Committee (LRBPC) has been reconvened and developed new metrics; plans are underway to bring program review and fiscal strategizing together in a more meaningful and communicative manner. (CFRs 4.1, 4.2, 4.3, & 4.6)

One of the first steps toward syncing program review and long-term planning and resource allocation is to include that language in guided questions for a range of evaluators within the program review guidelines to ensure that bringing both together remains a key focus for multiple levels. The following were developed in response to chairs' comments:

Purpose of the Evaluations by the ALO, Dean, and VCAA

The evaluations by these three levels are needed to ensure the purposefulness of Program Review in the larger operations of the University. The following are the areas that should be undertaken by each:

Accreditation Liaison Officer: The ALO reviews the self-study for compliance with WSCUC standards of accreditation, namely that programs are undertaking regular (yearly) assessment of both Core Competencies and programmatic learning objectives. The ALO should review past self-studies and compare them against the most recent program review for progress. In particular, attention is needed to ensure SLOs, PLOs, curriculum matrices, and other elements of ideal practice in assessment are acted upon and that the data is used to "close the loop" in terms of improving student learning.

The Dean of the College: The dean (of designee) of the College which houses the program or unit in review looks at the self-study per the mission and the larger operations of the college. The following are questions meant to help deans evaluate self-studies:

- How well does the Program/Department/College support student learning? Do assessment activities support quality learning? If not, what strategies or initiatives can or should be undertaken?
- How good are they at tracking student success, especially in terms of system performance goals?

- Does the data support on-time completion? Does the data exist to show their 4-year course map works?
- How effective is the program's efforts to mentor and usher students through the major?
- Effective scheduling: how well does the unit do in terms of maximizing SSH for the major? For GE? How effective is the scheduling of lower division versus upper division courses?
- Faculty service and productivity—are they doing a good job in maintaining their research and does this research have any impact/bearing on instruction? Are their publications and conferences of sound quality? (This is in light of overall faculty performance in tenure and promotion guidelines, including five-year post-tenure review)
- Cost per SSH, is this realistic? Are there ways to be more fiscally efficient?
- How fiscally efficient are they in terms of the use of full-time hires versus lecturers?

Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs: The VCAA (or designee) reviews the self-study from the larger perspective of the goals and operations of Academic Affairs as a larger unit. The following questions are meant to help the VCAA evaluate the self-study:

- What new initiatives to support learning can be undertaken with the minimal investment? Per the evaluations and recommendations of the ALO and the Dean—how can "closing the loop" be further undertaken by the unit?
- How do their priorities align with serving the maximum number of students possible?
- How well does the program align with the larger goals and mission of the university?
- How well do they compare to other units across the university in setting priorities (course scheduling, course assignments, etc.) as resources become scarcer?
- Cost per SSH, is this realistic? Are there ways to be more fiscally efficient given that they are asking for additional hires? Is the historic cost of SSH sustainable over the long term? Does the program provide pragmatic insight into how it will continue to operate going forward in a climate of declining enrollments and resources.
- Is there truthfulness in the reporting of resource needs? Does the objective data support their priorities?
- Do they position themselves well for a future that will probably include declining state funding and tuition revenue?

These talking points have been officially added to our program review guidelines and are guiding all self-studies as of AY 2019-2020. (CFR 4.5)

These questions will inevitably help guide us towards a new conversation with new opportunities to improve on what we do. Just as our teachers constantly seek ways of refining and enhancing their teaching, so too are we, as an institution, open to regularly assessing our practices and intervening as needed when those practices prove outdated. "Section Seven on Sustainability: Fiscal Viability; Preparing for the Changing Higher Education Environment" will look at the changes that are underway to better integrate enrollment management, academic programming, and long-term strategic planning—this is just one of the ways we are our moving away from program review as simply bragging rights or demands for resources. Only by building upon this solid foundation can program review, as a real review of rigor and quality, become the ideal envisioned by WSCUC and by our own institution.

Author of this report:
Seri I. Luangphinith, Accreditation Liaison Officer and
        Chair of Assessment Support Committee

Text provided by:
Kelli Okamura, Institutional Research Analyst
Bradley A. Thiessen, Director of Institutional Research
Kaleihi'iikapoli P. Rapoza, VC Admin Affairs
Marina Karides, former Chair of Sociology
Kirsten Mollegaard, Chair of English
Christopher Lauer, Chair of Philosophy
Harry Keith Edwards, former Chair of Computer Science
Bryan S. Kim, Division Chair of Social Sciences, former Director of MA Counseling Psychology

Reviewed by:
Jenny Wakida, Office of the Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs
Mary Louise Haraguchi, Hawaiian Collection—Mookini Library
Donnette "Lei" Kapono, Office of the Chancellor

ADA Compliance and Web Design:
Steve O. Young, Student Employee, Office of the Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs

February 2021