College Mission Statement
- Serve the community as an affordable, flexible, learning-centered, open-door comprehensive community college that meets the post-secondary educational needs of individuals, businesses, and the community.
- Serve the Pacific Region as the primary technical training center in areas such as transportation, information technology, education, communications, construction, and public and personal services.

Program Mission Statement
The Administration of Justice program’s mission is to serve the community as a learning-centered, open door program that provides technical training to meet the demands of the justice industry and the needs of the individual. An open-exit option allows the students to identify their career objectives and participate in program exploration.

Part I: Quantitative Indicators for Program Review

External Demand
Labor Market & Student Applications

Available data show that the current annual jobs and projected 2005-2012 job outlook for the general occupational cluster Police and Sheriff’s Patrol Officers are 1424 and 241 respectively in Honolulu County…and 2145 and 423 within the State of Hawai’i.

There were 114 applicants to the Administration of Justice program in Fall 2004, and 51 applicants to the program for the Spring 2005 Semester. Overall, among those Fall and Spring applicants, 137 or 83% appear to have been accepted by the college and admitted to the program, while 28 or 17% appear to have cancelled applications, or been redirected etc. Among those accepted and admitted, available data show that 84 or 61% actually enrolled in the semester initially applied for.

- Overall, our sense of the labor market and its relationship with the number and enrollment yield of applicants to our program is that we appear to be doing well in terms of students being interested. The job outlook data though should be read with caution though since this program not only deals with protective services such as “Police and Sheriff’s Patrol Officers” (as identified above) but also gives many students the opportunity to pursue other career paths such as legal occupations by pursuing a 4-year degree at UH-West Oahu (which is fully articulated with this program). As
predicted, the applicants for the fall term are significantly greater than applicants for the spring term.

**Internal Demand**

Registration headcount of actively enrolled students in Fall 2004 and Spring 2005 show that the Administration of Justice Program Major carried 253 students in the AAS in AJ Degree program.

Available data show that of 141 and 112 students in the major for Fall 2004 and Spring 2005, 86 or 61% were enrolled in Department classes in Fall--and 78 or 70% enrolled in Department classes in Spring.

Program major’s enrollment in department classes generated 516 student semester hours in Fall 2004 for an average of 6.00 semester hours, and 473 student semester hours in Spring 2005 for an average of 6.06. The resulting credit hours generated equate with 34.4 and 31.5 respective Fall 2004 and Spring 2005 Full Time Equivalent (FTE) enrollments.

There were also program non-majors enrolled in Department classes—23 and 27 respectively in Fall 2004 and Spring 2005--generating 5.04 and 6.11 student semester hours overall respectively.

We see from available data that these students are primarily from Liberal Arts Majors or from the KCC, Manoa, or West Oahu home campuses.

Enrollment by program majors and non-majors accounted for the 632 and 638 generated by the department subject code AJ in Fall 2004 and Spring 2005 respectively.

Overall, students under our program major enrolled for totals of 1302 semester hours in Fall 2004, and 1025 in Spring 2005. As mentioned above, they generated 516 and 473 in Fall 2004 and Spring 2005 respectively within the department.

Then, augmenting coursework within the department, 109 Program Majors were enrolled in a total of 786 student semester hours of coursework in other departments in the Fall 2004, while 82 enrolled for 552 student semester hours outside the department in the Spring 2005 semester.

We see from additional data that program major’s coursework outside the department was primarily in the subject areas English and Math with 60 and 60 of our program majors enrolling for 189 and 173 student semester hours respectively in Fall 2004.
In Spring 2005, major’s coursework outside the department was again primarily in the English and Math subject areas, with 28 and 48 students enrolled for 85 and 143 student semester hours respectively.

- Our sense from comparing major's average credit hours within department classes 6.00 and 6.06 and outside the department 7.2 and 6.7 is that for this academic year, it would appear that AJ majors were attempting to complete more of their general education requirements (courses outside the department). However, this is nothing to be alarmed at because the numbers for “average credit hours within department classes” is at the expected rate since the AJ course sequence structure is only 2 AJ courses per semester.

**Internal Efficiencies**

**Scheduling and Instructional Faculty**

With 2.47 Full Time Equivalent (FTE) faculty in Fall 2004, and 2.47 in Spring 2005—the department offered 12 active class sections in Fall and 12 in Spring.

Average Class Size in Fall 2004 was 18.3 and the Class Fill Rate was 60%. For Spring 2005, Average Class Size was 18.3 with a Class Fill Rate of 54.6%.

The department utilized 1.1 and 0.8 Full Time Equivalent (FTE) BOR approved faculty in Fall 2004 and Spring 2005 respectively. There were an additional 1.4 Full Time Equivalent (FTE) Part Time Lecturers teaching in Fall 2004, and 1.7 for Spring 2005.

Overall In Fall 2004, Full Time BOR approved faculty delivered 5 or 41.7% sections, taught 16 or 13.2% course credit hours, and were associated with generating 209 or 33.1% student credit hours within the department. In Fall 2004, Part Time Instructors delivered 7 or 58.3% sections, taught 21 or 56.8% course credit hours, and were responsible for 423 or 66.9% generated student credit hours within the department.

In Spring 2005, Full Time BOR approved faculty delivered 4 or 33.3% sections, taught 12 or 32.4% course credit hours, and were associated with generating 219 or 34.3% student credit hours within the department. Part Time Instructors in Spring 2005 delivered 8 or 66.7% taught 25 or 67.6% course credit hours, and were responsible for 419 or 65.7% generated student credit hours within the department.

Based respectively on student credit hours generated and course credit hours taught, the ratio of full time student equivalents (FTSE) to full time faculty equivalents (FTFE) was 17.08 in Fall 2004, and 17.24 in Spring 2005. The ratio of program majors to FTE faculty was 57.2 and 45.4 respectively in Fall 2004 and Spring 2005.
Our sense of departmental operating efficiencies from considering these data is that with the number of AJ courses offered per semester and the number of AJ majors puts a very heavy load on the lone full time faculty member that coordinates this program. Of note in the data is the ratio of program majors to FTE faculty. Notice that it was 57.2 (majors to FTE faculty) in the Fall 2004 and 45.4 in the Spring.

**Instructional Outcomes**

As reflected in available data for the 04/05 academic year, the department awarded 29 degrees.

Available data on student grade distribution within the department subject code indicate that of all grades awarded in Fall 2004, 40.8% A, 28.0% B, 15.2% C, 2.8% D, and 4.7% F. In Spring 2005, 32.4% A, 30.0% B, 25.4% C, 2.3% D, and 0.9% F.

Student Persistence within the subject code AJ from Fall 2004 to Spring 2005 was 58.7% persistence of majors in the same period (whether enrolled in department courses or not) was 57.3%.

Review of department major’s performance on the Perkins Core Indicators indicates…..

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>1P1</th>
<th>1P2</th>
<th>2P1</th>
<th>3P1</th>
<th>3P2</th>
<th>4P1</th>
<th>4P2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2004-2005 Core Standard</td>
<td>81.81%</td>
<td>90.00%</td>
<td>36.00%</td>
<td>71.00%</td>
<td>90.00%</td>
<td>14.18%</td>
<td>12.86%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AJ Actual Performance 04/05</td>
<td>76.36%</td>
<td>84.21%</td>
<td>31.58%</td>
<td>76.67%</td>
<td>91.30%</td>
<td>43.88%</td>
<td>47.37%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Given consideration of these data, our sense of instructional outcomes is that without any comparison data, it is difficult to determine if our number of degrees awarded or persistence rates are above, at, or below normal trends.

**OVERALL**

Department demand for the 04/05 academic year was calculated at 1.3 which translates to a Unhealthy (below minimum) demand status.

Department efficiency for the 04/05 academic year was calculated at 59.8 which translates to a Cautionary (above minimum) efficiency status.

Department Outcome for the 04/05 academic year was calculated at 20.7 which translates to a Cautionary (above minimum) outcome status.
Given consideration of these demand, efficiency, and outcomes indicator data together, our sense of overall program health is Cautionary.

Part II: Assessment Results for Program SLOs
One of the immediate problems for this program is the sudden retirement of the lone full time faculty member who was coordinating this program. Without the coordinator, the program curriculum is taught entirely by lecturers, many of which are full-time professionals. Being that these lecturers are full-time professionals, it makes it very difficult to coordinate any curriculum assessment. However, the institution understands that assessment is a necessary component of any program review and thus this tentative plan.

Since it is unknown when a full time faculty member can be hired to replace the vacant position, this attempt at assessing one of the stated program outcomes will depend on the support of various institutional committees. One of the stated AJ program outcomes is “Upon successful completion of the AJ program, the student will be able to write clear and accurate reports.” A suggested plan to assess this outcome is to first survey the various lecturers who are assigning writing projects in the courses. We will then collect samples of writing from these identified courses and have them read by an independent committee such as the curriculum or assessment committee or if need be, even a special ad hoc committee. The committee members who will evaluate the quality of the writing samples can use a simple evaluation rubric. This will then provide some measure of how the AJ program is meeting this outcome.

Part III: Curriculum Revision
Curriculum revision will follow depending on the results of the proposed assessment above.

Part IV: Analysis of Data
The AJ mission is aligned with the college mission. The program outcomes were developed to be aligned with the program mission. The data that is strange is that the AJ program’s demand has gone from a “Cautionary” status in 2004-2005 to an “Unhealthy” status in 2005-2006, even though there seems to be student demand for this program. What is good is that the AJ program’s measure of efficiency, which is currently “Cautionary”, has gone up from its previous status of “Unhealthy” back in 2004-2005. Since the program has lost its lone full time faculty member, it is difficult to make any judgments about quality and student learning since we lack the intimate knowledge that this faculty member had about the AJ program. However, with this new assessment process in place, there are plans to have formalized and systematic processes for surveying students and employers (if possible) to help with producing evidence of quality and student learning. Due to lack of budgetary figures, statements of resource sufficiency cannot be made at this time.
Part V: Action Plan
The main concern for this program is to find a full time faculty member who will be able to not only coordinate the program but also be able to begin the implementation of program assessment activities within the program.

Part VI: Budget Implications
Due to lack of budgetary figures, statements of resource sufficiency cannot be made at this time.