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COLLEGE MISSION STATEMENT

Honolulu Community College serves the community, the city, the state of Hawai‘i, and the Pacific region as an affordable, flexible, learning-centered, open-door, comprehensive community college. Honolulu CC meets the evolving post-secondary educational needs of individuals, businesses, and the state by:

- Offering high quality courses and programs in the liberal arts and career and technical fields;
- Maintaining unique educational partnerships with state-registered apprenticeship programs in diverse career fields;
- Supporting the Native Hawaiian community and its language, history, and culture;
- Delivering continuing education and training to meet the demand for a competitive workforce; and,
- Providing diverse educational opportunities for personal enrichment.

As a learning-centered, open-door college, Honolulu CC, is committed to providing the academic and student support to assist students as they progress through their respective courses and programs, and to facilitate the important work of campus faculty and staff. The college will acknowledge, promote, and maintain a multicultural environment where gender diversity and other aspects of personal identity are appreciated and respected.

PROGRAM MISSION STATEMENT

The Communication Arts program’s mission is to serve the community as a learning-centered program that provides hands-on technical training. The two-year career and technical curricula is for entry level employment or skill upgrading in keeping with the demands of the design, publishing, and printing industries as well as the needs of the individual.

Part I: Executive Summary of Program Status

No data provided for this section by anyone for the Communication Arts Program since the last comprehensive program review report submitted in 2007. I believe this summary needs to be available in order to establish the basis by which action or possible action may or should be taken, in order to make effective and beneficial changes in the program.
Part II: Program Overview

PROGRAM DESCRIPTION

Communication Arts is a graphic design program that integrates art and technology to communicate ideas and information for a wide range of visual communication needs such as: marketing collateral, advertising design, packaging design, for print and digital media needs and more. The program provides a curriculum of technical and conceptual problem solving skills to encourage innovation, critical thinking, and the application of formal design.

The Communication Arts program prepares students for entry level employment in graphic design, advertising design, desktop and on-line publishing, and includes all aspects of the publishing, printing, and related services and industries.

PROGRAM HISTORY

The Communication Arts Program has been in existence since 1966 under the name Applied Art as an offshoot of the Fine Arts area, at Honolulu Community College. The name was changed in 1976 to Commercial Art, and in 1999 to Communication Arts which included the integration of the Graphic Arts Program.

Historically, the Commercial Art and Graphic Arts Programs have always been unique to the University of Hawai‘i system. Both programs evolved as a means of meeting the needs of the graphic industry in Hawai‘i. The Graphic Arts Program has its roots at Leeward Community College and was transferred to Honolulu Community College in 1994. Both programs’ emphasis is training students for entry level skill jobs in the respective facets of the same industry. The Commercial Art Program trained students for front-end of production (preparing layouts/mechanicals); the Graphic Arts Program trained for the back-end (offset printing). The transfer from Leeward, as well as the merging of the two programs, had resulted in a full spectrum production in keeping with changes in the industry.

The major course modifications, first in Commercial Art (beginning in 1993), and then in the program and courses modification for Graphic Arts (1994) led eventually to the consolidation proposal of 1996. The new series of courses reflected the introduction of new technologies, as well as the changing nature of the communication environment. The content of the courses reflected the necessary changes in existing curriculum in order to meet new entry level skills requirement for placement within the industry. The number of courses also reflected the complexity of computer technology itself, as well as the competencies established by the Printing Industries of America (PIA), the oldest (1887) and largest graphic arts trade association.

This association (PIA), most visible as a regulatory and legislative representative for the industry on a national level, has been devoted to the advancement of the printing industry, and includes in its membership over 13,000 companies nationally, including those in Hawai‘i. In order to meet the industry’s changing needs, PIA developed the PrintEd Accreditation Program (1990) as a partnership
with education. The PrintEd Accreditation Program established the industry standards in graphic arts education because of the industry’s concern for quality employees. As these have become the standards that give employers a common reference point from which to initiate new (entry level) employees into the workplace, the Communication Arts program has integrated the same standards into its program’s core courses.

In 1996, the new “Communication Arts” Program received the Advisory Board’s approval. By Fall 1998 the new CA alpha courses replaced the Commercial Art Program and the Graphic Arts Program, as well as including multimedia. It was not until 1999 that it was officially approved by the Board of Regents as an AS degree granting program with courses above the 100 level.

The Communication Arts Program has always been a student learning outcome (SLO) based program. The primary objective of the Communication Arts Program has always been to prepare students for entry level employment in: graphic design, advertising design, desktop publishing, electronic imaging and prepress, on-line publishing, digital photography, and all aspects of the publishing and printing industries, including service bureaus and other related industries.

The CA Program’s focus is on meeting business and industries’ ever changing needs. The curriculum is based on a set of foundation courses that enable students to understand the concepts behind the new technology as it applies to production. The focus has been on the digital media of art and copy preparation, composing for print production beginning with electronic imaging, typesetting, typographic imaging to electronic composing and prepress, and culminating in a professional working portfolio.

The latest major curriculum changes were submitted to the curriculum committees in October, 2011 for implementation in Fall 2012 (see pages 6-8). The rationale for the program modification: 1) to collapse two tracks and integrate all areas into one, and 2) add digital and interactive media design skills as part of basic requirement.

The program modification required taking the existing three tracks and integrating the respective areas into one. The program continues to emphasize design as a primary focus, while integrating digital media and print needs at the same time. Although multimedia is a relatively new industry requirement, the Communication Arts program’s multimedia courses have existed since 1996, but as a separate track. Now these skills are an essential requirement of a successful designer, so they have been integrated.

In order to integrate the necessary multimedia skills as a program requirement without adding more course credits to the minimum to graduate, 12 courses contents were modified, 4 courses were deleted, 3 courses were deactivated, and 3 received minor co-requisite changes. In totality, 22 courses were changed in order to streamline the program.
Communication Arts Program Student Learning Outcomes:
Upon successful completion of the CA program, students will be able to:

• Produce compositions utilizing the various steps of the design process: investigate client needs, do marketing research, define the design problem, problem solve, develop an idea/concept, thumbnails, layouts, comps and presentation art, prepare final art and produce mechanicals when necessary.
• Use tools, equipment and services to implement ideas for production. Techniques to include use of computer hardware, software, and service bureaus.
• Select appropriate software tools to achieve or maintain effective design solutions.
• Follow instructions to produce, modify, or output files according to client/project supplied criteria.
• Produce graphic design formats appropriate for delivery output while demonstrating the ability to meet deadlines, organize time and maintain schedules.
• Work independently as well as part of a team.
## COMMUNICATION ARTS' OCT. 2011 MAJOR PROGRAM AND COURSES MODIFICATIONS

General Education Requirements:
- Communications: 3
- Quantitative or Logical Reasoning: 3
- Choose one: Group A or Group B: 3
- CA 101 Power of Advertising (Group C): 3
- CA 100 Survey of Graphic Styles (Group D): 3

| Minimum Credits Required | 15 |

### FIRST SEMESTER

- CA 121 Art and Media Preparation I: 4
- CA 122 Copy Preparation: 4
- CA 123 Color and Comprehensives: 4
- CA 125 Beginning Graphic Design: 4

### SECOND SEMESTER

- CA 131 Art and Media Preparation II: 4
- CA 132 Page Composition: 4
- CA 135 Typographic Design: 4
- General Education: 6

### THIRD SEMESTER

- CA 142 Page and Web Layout: 4
- CA 143 Prepress and Digital Printing: 4
- CA 145 Graphic Design: 4
- General Education: 6

### FOURTH SEMESTER

- CA 152 The Business of Advertising: 4
- CA 155 Portfolio Presentation and Review: 4
- Elective (Choose one of the following):
  - CA 134 Digital Photography: 4
  - CA 146 Advertising Design: 4
  - CA 150 Special Projects: 4
  - CA 193V Cooperative Education: 1 - 4
- General Education: 3

| Total Minimum Credits Required | 64 - 67 |

**PREREQUISITES:**

- CA 121
- CA 121 CA 122
- CA 122 and Pre or Co CA 125
- CA 131 CA 132
- CA 123 CA 132
- CA 123 CA 132 CA 135 CA 100 CA 101
- CA 101 and Pre or Co CA 145 or CA 146
- CA 145
- CA 123 CA 132 CA 135 CA 100 CA 101
- CA 132

Assessment for course SLOs (see page 16) are accomplished at the end of the Fall semesters and mid-Spring semesters before the Portfolio Review and Presentation event. Courses prerequisites and respective course content are continually assessed for SLOs and are corrected by the subsequent semester.
Courses Modified:
CA 121 Art and Media Preparation I
CA 131 Art and Media Preparation II

As a result of the program modification’s intention to integrate multimedia, there has been a redistribution of content between CA 121 and CA 131 as well as inclusion of CA 137 and CA 138 into these two courses.

CA 121 Art and Media Preparation I reflects the integration of motion imaging from CA 138 Motion Imaging II (2D Animation).

CA 131 Art and Media Preparation II reflects the content from CA 137 Motion Imaging I (video), into what has previously been a still imaging course dealing primarily with pixelbased graphics using PhotoShop as a primary software.

CA 122 Copy Preparation
CA 132 Page Composition
CA 142 Page and Web Layout

Because of the program modification, the integration of multimedia and specifically the web, CA 122, CA 132 and CA 142 were modified by having parts of the content of each of these courses move i.e., from CA 142 to CA 132, and CA 132 to CA 122 in order free up time for the web layout portion integrated into CA 142.

CA 125 Beginning Graphic Design
CA 135 Typographic Design
CA 145 Graphic Design
CA 146 Advertising Design

As part of the objective of the program modification, the integration of multimedia, specifically web and social media issues have been added to the following courses content. New course outlines reflect changes in the course description and SLO, therefore please find attached, existing SLO as well.

CA 143 Prepress and Digital Printing

Course modification reflects changes in printing equipment; digital conversions; elimination of darkrooms; as well as changes finishing and bindery equipment.

CA 134 Digital Photography

Course modification reflects changes from traditional equipment and film to digital and the elimination of the darkroom with the use of the computer and PhotoShop.

CA 123 Color Theory and Issues

Course modification reflects changes in additional content in color issues: color proofing; output; offset printing inks and color management; color profiles; as well as web safe and out of gamut colors. Removal of comprehensives from this course has been incorporated into CA 132, CA 142, and CA 145.
Courses Modified Prerequisites only:
CA 150 Special Projects
CA 152 Business of Advertising
CA 155 Portfolio Presentation and Review

Courses deleted:
CA 144 Still Imaging II
Action: delete
CA 148 3-D Animation
Action: delete
CA 141 Beginning Offset Press
Action: delete
CA 151 Advanced Offset Press
Action: delete

Courses deactivated:
CA 137 Motion Imaging I (Video)
Action: Hold
CA 138 Motion Imaging II (2D- animation)
Action: Hold
CA 147 Studio Photography
Action: Hold
ADMISSION REQUIREMENTS
Program Prerequisites:
ENG 22 or 60 OR Placement in ENG 100
MATH 24 or 50 OR Placement in MATH 25

CREDENTIALS / LICENSURES OFFERED
None

FACULTY AND STAFF
Full time faculty: Sandra Sanpei
Lecturers: Lee Schaller, Glenn Matsumoto, Scott Kawamura, Lowell Gillia, Bonnie Chappell, David Ciano, and Tamara Gillia.
Articulation Agreements
None

ADVISORY COMMITTEE:
Jim Meyers, Trade Publishing
Rick Noyle, Rick Noyle Photography
Richard Puetz, Chair, Loomis and Pollock
Lee Schaller, Lee Schaller Marketing
Jason Suapia, 1013

INTERNSHIPS STUDENTS PARTICIPATE WITH:
Pacific Basin Communications
Milici Valenti Ng Pack Advertising Agency
Tori Richards
Core Group One
Stacey Leong Design

DISTANCE DELIVERED / OFF CAMPUS PROGRAM
• Are there any courses in your program that are delivered via distance education (this includes via cable television or the web)? No.
• Are there any courses delivered off campus? No.
### Part III. Quantitative Indicators for Program Review

(See Appendix: Program Data)

#### Demand Indicators

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>2007</th>
<th>08-09</th>
<th>09-10</th>
<th>10-11</th>
<th>11-12</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>New &amp; Replacement Positions (State)</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New &amp; Replacement Positions (County Prorated)</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Majors</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SSH Program Majors in Program Classes</td>
<td>546</td>
<td>1,072</td>
<td>994</td>
<td>1,188</td>
<td>1,108</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SSH Non-Majors in Program Classes</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SSH in All Program Classes</td>
<td>631</td>
<td>1,168</td>
<td>1,076</td>
<td>1,276</td>
<td>1,183</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FTE Enrollment in Program Classes</td>
<td>42.07</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Number of Classes Taught</td>
<td>15</td>
<td></td>
<td>26</td>
<td></td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Efficiency Indicators

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>2007</th>
<th>08-09</th>
<th>09-10</th>
<th>10-11</th>
<th>11-12</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Average Class Size</td>
<td>11.53</td>
<td>12.9</td>
<td>11.0</td>
<td>12.5</td>
<td>12.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FTE BOR Appointed Faculty</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Majors to FTE BOR Appointed Faculty</td>
<td>44.5</td>
<td>45.5</td>
<td>39.3</td>
<td>76.5</td>
<td>75.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Majors to Analytic FTE Faculty</td>
<td>25.21</td>
<td>26.7</td>
<td>21.4</td>
<td>20.3</td>
<td>20.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Analytic FTE Faculty</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall Program Budget Allocation</td>
<td>$358,163</td>
<td>$336,685</td>
<td>$199,816</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Funded Budget Allocation</td>
<td>$272,245</td>
<td>$250,767</td>
<td>$199,816</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special/Federal Budget Allocation</td>
<td>$85,918</td>
<td>$62,031</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost per SSH</td>
<td>$307</td>
<td>$313</td>
<td></td>
<td>$157</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Low-Enrolled (&lt;10) Classes</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Effectiveness Indicators

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Cautionary</th>
<th>Cautionary</th>
<th>Cautionary</th>
<th>Cautionary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Successful Completion (Equivalent C or Higher)</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>89%</td>
<td>91%</td>
<td>89%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Withdrawals (Grade = W)</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Persistence (Fall to Spring)</td>
<td>68%</td>
<td>79%</td>
<td>71%</td>
<td>74%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unduplicated Degrees/Certificates Awarded</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>(9) 16</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Degrees Awarded</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>(9) 16</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Certificates of Achievement Awarded</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic Subject Certificates Awarded</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Certificates Awarded</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transfers to UH 4-yr</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transfers with degree from program</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transfers without degree from program</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Distance Education Completely On-line Classes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Distance Education Classes Taught</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enrollment Distance Education Classes</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fill Rate</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Successful Completion (Equivalent C or Higher)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Withdrawals (Grade = W)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Persistence (Fall to Spring Not Limited to Distance Education)</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Part IV: Analysis of Program

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Overall Program Health</th>
<th>2007</th>
<th>F08-S09</th>
<th>F09-S10</th>
<th>F10-S11</th>
<th>F11-S12</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Indicators:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Demand Indicator</td>
<td>Healthy</td>
<td>Cautionary</td>
<td>Healthy</td>
<td>Cautionary</td>
<td>Healthy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(3.) Number of majors</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012 Comprehensive Review Data</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>difference between annual and comprehensive data</td>
<td>(29)</td>
<td>(25)</td>
<td>(24)</td>
<td>(16)</td>
<td>(23)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(8.) Total number of classes taught</td>
<td>F15</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012 Comprehensive Review Data</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Efficiency Indicator</td>
<td>Healthy</td>
<td>Healthy</td>
<td>Cautionary</td>
<td>Cautionary</td>
<td>Cautionary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(9.) Average class size</td>
<td>11.53</td>
<td>12.9</td>
<td>11.0</td>
<td>12.5</td>
<td>12.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012 Comprehensive Review Data</td>
<td>12.1;14.2</td>
<td>13.5;11.7</td>
<td>10.0;12.3</td>
<td>11.5;13.8</td>
<td>11.5;12.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(10.) Fill rate</td>
<td>55.81%</td>
<td>76%</td>
<td>68%</td>
<td>76%</td>
<td>75%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012 Comprehensive Review Data</td>
<td>72%; 90%</td>
<td>78%; 74%</td>
<td>62%; 77%</td>
<td>70%; 87%</td>
<td>71%; 77%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(16.) Number of low enrolled (&lt;10) classes</td>
<td>(81%)</td>
<td>(76%)</td>
<td>(69.5%)</td>
<td>(78.5%)</td>
<td>(74%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Effectiveness Indicator</td>
<td>Healthy</td>
<td>Cautionary</td>
<td>Healthy</td>
<td>Cautionary</td>
<td>Healthy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(19.) Persistence (Fall to Spring)</td>
<td>69.66</td>
<td>68%</td>
<td>79%</td>
<td>71%</td>
<td>74%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012 Comprehensive Review Data</td>
<td>77%</td>
<td>68%</td>
<td>82%</td>
<td>77%</td>
<td>81%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(20.) Unduplicated degrees/Certificates awarded</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012 Comprehensive Review Data</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The following is the response I received regarding the discrepancy/differences in the above data:

From: Steven Shigemoto <ssshigemo@hawaii.edu>
Subject: Re: 5-year comprehensive program review data elements - Updated
Date: November 13, 2012 11:48:09 AM HST
To: Keala Chock <keala.chock@hawaii.edu>, Sandra Sanpei <ssanpei@hawaii.edu>
Reply-To: Steven Shigemoto <ssshigemo@hawaii.edu>

1) The major definitions between the two reports are completely different and should not match. Because the major definition is different, so is the persistence rate as the Comprehensive review utilizes the revised definition. Generally speaking this should be better in the Comprehensive review because it’s only for majors taking program classes in the fall, not merely those declaring a major.

2) The ARPD includes CA 193V in Fall 2008. The ARPD omits CA 150 from Fall 2008 and CA 152 from Spring 2009 from an input error. These affect total classes taught, average class size, and fill rate.

3) The average class size for 2011-2012 is different for reasons I can’t determine. The system office also computes total SSH that is greater than all CA classes combined, including those courses that should be explicitly excluded (193V and 199V). I ask that you trust me on this one. My computation is consistent with the results from 2009-2010 and 2010-2011.

4) The fill rates you have inferred from the Comprehensive Review are incorrect; you can’t simply average the fall and spring rates unless the denominators (max class size totals) are the same for both semesters. They are not, although they are very close. That said, the combined fall-spring fill rates for the Comprehensive do not match those of the ARPD for the years you cite. I can’t determine how the system office is determining their fill rates for 2009-2010, 2010-2011, and 2011-2012. The exact data they use is unavailable to me and I’m left to surmise what they did. As far as I can tell, they’re including the capacities for CA 199V in their denominator, which causes that small differential between the ARPD fill rates and the ones I’ve calculated. I believe mine are more accurate.

5) The unduplicated degrees/certificates shown in the Comprehensive review are correct. The ARPD numbers in the past were lagged by a year, which makes earlier reports inconsistent with more recent ones.

I can provide my raw data (and also the combined AY results for average class size and fill rate) if you’d like, but that wouldn’t necessarily explain why there are differences between the Comprehensive and the ARPD. As I mentioned, I don’t have the exact data the system office uses to calculate the ARPD numbers, only the results and definitions that you see. I have to guess what they did and they aren’t exactly forthcoming when we ask questions.
STRENGTHS AND WEAKNESSES IN TERMS OF DEMAND, EFFICIENCY, & EFFECTIVENESS BASED ON AN ANALYSIS OF THE QUANTITATIVE INDICATORS IN PART III.

The following selected items from the ARPD and Comprehensive program data (page 11) are being noted since these items are critical in the computation of the overall program health.

**Demand:**
(3.) Number of majors:
The number of majors has declined over the past five years.

Although the demand indicator is healthy, it does affect the class sizes as well as the number of low enrolled classes.

(8.) Total number of classes taught:
The total number of courses offered has been rather consistent through the years in order to exit students in a timely way.

**Efficiency:**
(9.) Average class size:
The average class size ranges from 11.0 to 12.9, with the caps on most courses are at 15.
A course like CA 150 Special Projects should not be factored in the averaging since it is funded separately from the other courses and the enrollment count does not determine whether the course goes or not. This course has had anywhere from 3 students to a high of 8 students. I do not know whether this has had adverse results on data, but it definitely impacts the number of low enrolled courses.

(10.) Fill rate:
The fill rate is one of the factors used to determine the efficiency of a program, (healthy = 75% - 100%), and the program had a healthy fill rate.

(16.) Number of low enrolled (<10) classes:
Low enrolled classes have always been the greatest of concerns because those are the courses that are in jeopardy of being cut. The impact of cancelled classes for the students is traumatic as it postpones graduating by at least a semester; if not a year.

**Effectiveness:**
(19.) Persistence (Fall to Spring):
Persistence in 09-10 was the only time within the five years span that reflects a healthy score (75% - 100% = healthy). Retention is an obvious issue, however; whether it is due to not succeeding in courses or changing majors or just life, I believe it is a combination of all of the above.

(20.) Unduplicated degrees/Certificates awarded:
In 2009 the data for graduates in 2008 reflected 9 students. It has taken 2 years since this discovery for the records to be corrected. Now, the 2007 data is incorrect. It is this type of discovery that questions the validity of the program data - whether it is the mislabeling of information or just plain incorrect numbers, it leaves an erroneous impression.
## ANALYSIS OF THE PERKINS CORE INDICATORS FOR WHICH THE PROGRAM DID NOT MEET THE PERFORMANCE LEVEL.

### Perkins IV Core Indicators

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Goal</th>
<th>Actual</th>
<th>Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2010-2011</td>
<td>1P1 Technical Skills Attainment</td>
<td>90.10</td>
<td>95.65</td>
<td>Met</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2P1 Completion</td>
<td>45.00</td>
<td>65.22</td>
<td>Met</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3P1 Student Retention or Transfer</td>
<td>56.00</td>
<td>82.61</td>
<td>Met</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4P1 Student Placement</td>
<td>51.00</td>
<td>47.06</td>
<td>Not Met</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5P1 Nontraditional Participation</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5P2 Nontraditional Completion</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009-2010</td>
<td>1P1 Technical Skills Attainment</td>
<td>90.05</td>
<td>88.24</td>
<td>Not Met</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2P1 Completion</td>
<td>44.50</td>
<td>29.41</td>
<td>Not Met</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3P1 Student Retention or Transfer</td>
<td>55.50</td>
<td>80.39</td>
<td>Met</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4P1 Student Placement</td>
<td>50.50</td>
<td>71.05</td>
<td>Met</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5P1 Nontraditional Participation</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5P2 Nontraditional Completion</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008-2009</td>
<td>1P1 Technical Skills Attainment</td>
<td>90.00</td>
<td>89.47</td>
<td>Not Met</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2P1 Completion</td>
<td>44.00</td>
<td>42.11</td>
<td>Not Met</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3P1 Student Retention or Transfer</td>
<td>55.00</td>
<td>92.45</td>
<td>Met</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4P1 Student Placement</td>
<td>50.00</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>Met</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5P1 Nontraditional Participation</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5P2 Nontraditional Completion</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007-2008</td>
<td>1P1 Technical Skills Attainment</td>
<td>90.00</td>
<td>94.12</td>
<td>Met</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2P1 Completion</td>
<td>44.00</td>
<td>41.18</td>
<td>Did Not</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3P1 Student Retention or Transfer</td>
<td>55.00</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>Met</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4P1 Student Placement</td>
<td>25.00</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Did Not</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5P1 Nontraditional Participation</td>
<td>25.00</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Did Not</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Review of department major’s performance on the Perkins Core Indicators indicates the following items NOT MET. (see: Part VII: Analysis of Data page 32)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Goal</th>
<th>Actual</th>
<th>Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2010-2011</td>
<td>4P1 Student Placement</td>
<td>51.00</td>
<td>47.06</td>
<td>Not Met</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008-2009</td>
<td>4P1 Student Placement</td>
<td>50.00</td>
<td>42.86</td>
<td>Not Met</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009-2010</td>
<td>1P1 Technical Skills Attainment</td>
<td>90.05</td>
<td>88.24</td>
<td>Not Met</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008-2009</td>
<td>1P1 Technical Skills Attainment</td>
<td>90.00</td>
<td>89.47</td>
<td>Not Met</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009-2010</td>
<td>2P1 Completion</td>
<td>44.50</td>
<td>29.41</td>
<td>Not Met</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008-2009</td>
<td>2P1 Completion</td>
<td>44.00</td>
<td>42.11</td>
<td>Not Met</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007-2008</td>
<td>2P1 Completion</td>
<td>44.00</td>
<td>41.18</td>
<td>Did Not</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**ASSESSMENT RESULTS FOR PROGRAM SLOS**

If possible, state how many or what percentage of students could not perform the SLO. Students who could not or cannot perform the SLOs do not graduate from the program. In order to have an idea of the number or percentage of students that could not perform, one would have to check to see how many students had D’s or F’s in courses such as CA 142, CA 143, CA 145 or CA 146. Since subsequent (fourth semester) courses CA 150, CA 152, and CA 155 demand demonstrated proficiency in all of the program SLOs, those students would not be in the fourth semester courses.

Results of Program Assessment: If you did not assess all of your program SLOs, then state which SLOs were assessed. State what SLOs you are not achieving and why.

All of the Program Student Learning Outcomes that have been assessed in Fall 2011 during program and curriculum modifications.

Even if you are meeting 100% of SLOs, you should state what SLOs you will not meet in the future if some curricular action, instructor hire, or important piece of equipment to purchase is not approved. This is important in order to justify your budget requests.

Five of the six SLOs are affected if budget for sustaining the program's need in terms of replacement of equipment and the updating of software in a timely way are not met. The affected SLOs as follows:

- Produce compositions utilizing the various steps of the design process: investigate client needs, do marketing research, define the design problem, problem solve, develop an idea/concept, thumbnails, layouts, comps and presentation art, prepare final art and produce mechanicals when necessary.
- Use tools, equipment and services to implement ideas for production. Techniques to include use of computer hardware, software, and service bureaus.
- Select appropriate software tools to achieve or maintain effective design solutions.
- Follow instructions to produce, modify, or output files according to client/project supplied criteria.
- Produce graphic design formats appropriate for delivery output while demonstrating the ability to meet deadlines, organize time and maintain schedules.

**EVIDENCE OF STUDENT LEARNING:**

From the very beginning of the program, students and faculty strive toward excellence in the portfolio endeavor because in the field, one's portfolio is the key to getting a job and/or continuing their education at a four-year institution. Exiting requires a professional portfolio that meets industry standards. In order to accomplish this, students are required to accumulate “pieces” (projects) from the various courses beginning with the second semester's CA 132 Page Composition I and CA 135 Typography courses. The bulk of student pieces are collected from their third semester classes (CA 142, CA 143, CA 145, CA 146). The fourth semester is the time for refining, as well as adding pieces from courses such as: CA 152 The Business of Advertising, and CA 150 Special Projects — “live jobs only”.
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• CA 155 PORTFOLIO PRESENTATION AND REVIEW:

The exit course, CA 155 Portfolio Presentation and Review, is the ultimate test of student learning. Students are required to have a minimum of 12 – 15 very strong pieces that meet a level of quality in keeping with CA Advisory Board’s approval. The portfolio course is unusual in that it is not a “traditional” lecture type course. The hours outside of the designated class time in preparation for an event of the magnitude described below, and a separate exhibition of work done at the same time as one is refining an individual portfolio requires an average of 20 hours per week for students and the faculty member in charge.

Since the year 2000, the portfolio course has been a very public event. Students are expected to have their portfolios available for review not only by the Advisory Board, but approximately 200 printing, publishing, and design industry professionals as well. Students in the portfolio class design and produce all the collateral material for the event, as well as put on an exhibition of their work. These industry professionals are invited to what we have named our “portfolio review” event. Based on Advisory Board and industry feedback, the time, energy, and effort of this event is well invested for the students as well as the program. Students get job offers during and because of the event; the program has gained high visibility and strong, increasing community support.

The portfolio review event is the ultimate assessment of all our faculty, the program, and the students. The results of individual student portfolios year after year, as well as the ability of our program to successfully compete with four-year institutions are strong “health indicators” of our program’s excellence, our committed quality faculty, and the effective design and delivery of our program courses.

The portfolio event has been going on now for over 10 years and the results have been: 1) other campuses such as UH Manoa, KCC, and LCC now have annual events that are not only similar, but are coordinated so as not to have a conflict with the dates of our event. 2) The feedback from the industry has been very positive and students often times are offered jobs or interview appointments at the event itself.

• CA 150 SPECIAL PROJECTS

This advanced course deals with live jobs and has the same SLOs for the course that the program uses. The course’s Student Learning Outcomes and the Programs SLOs are the same. CA 150’s course SLOs are as follows:

1. Perform on an advanced level the various steps of the design process; investigate client needs, research, define the design problem, problem solve, develop a concept, do thumbnails, roughs, comps and presentation art, finish production of mechanicals and final art.
2. Select appropriately from various technical alternatives to achieve professional design solutions.
3. Demonstrate skill and experience with tools and equipment and services used in production techniques, including use of computers and design software, pre press production and service bureaus, designate printing and paper specs, oversee printing and production bids, do quality control, and understand billing.
4. Demonstrate skill and experience in writing technical specifications, project objectives and reports, in giving oral presentations, and in listening and development of constructive positive interpersonal
relationships with peers and supervisors.
5. Meet deadlines, and organize time and schedules.
6. Produce layout, measure and rule relevant guidelines (edge of sheet, gripper margins, plate clamp, center marks, etc.)
7. Produce jobs consisting of halftones; special effects; single and multi-color that includes screen tints; line and half tone combination; 4-page signature; 8-page signature; duotone; tritone; full-color.

**ASSESSMENT RESULTS FOR COURSES SLOS**

1. Department Meeting: All scheduled courses are assessed every semester with a department meeting: End of Semester Faculty Review. At this end of the semester meeting, all faculty present student projects that “demonstrated evidence” that learning has been applied and is evident in students projects. These projects address the course and program SLOs. Other issues, such as whether the current course prerequisites adequately meet specific course needs or are if faculty teaching prerequisite courses are covering essential topics in enough depth. (see page 6 for list of courses prerequisites)

2. Annual Program Event: Portfolio Presentation and Review ( A program event with invited advisory board members, industry professionals, family, and friends to review exiting students portfolios.) (see pages 19, 21, and 22)

3. Industry Competition: Hawaii Advertising Federation and American Advertising Federation Student Competition- Awards and Scholarships: American Advertising Federation in which CA students took first place seven years out of ten. (see pages 17 - 25)

4. Constant industry feedback: The fact that the program has been in existence for over 30 years, the “industry” includes former students that come to the portfolio event to recruit for job positions. The following is a list of companies that employ our former students that attended the last portfolio:

   **COMPANY:**
   - Clarence Lee Design
   - Communications Pacific
   - Core Group One
   - Design Asylum
   - Element B
   - Fingerprints
   - Fleet Street Graphics
   - Foodland
   - Hagadone Printing
   - Harris
   - Jean Okazaki Designs
   - Kaars and Pinlac Design
   - Laird Christainson Advertising
   - Obun Hawaii
   - Orangeroc
   - Orasi Design
   - Pacific Basin Communications
   - Pacific Basin Communications
   - Tori Richards
   - 1013

   **FORMER STUDENTS:**
   - Glenn Coloma
   - Ryan Ragus
   - Kevin Ulep
   - Merniam Fontanilla
   - Elene Nakama
   - Eric Matsumoto
   - Jeff Patingan
   - Leslie Tamonte
   - Jeff Nakama, Creative Services*
   - Daniel Alvarez
   - Aida Kama Smith
   - Ryan Yanagawa
   - Haphael Ballesteros
   - Christine Higa, Creative Services Director*
   - Blaine Mateo, Graphic Designer*
   - Jean Okazaki
   - Michael Sunouchi
   - Todd Saiki, Art Director@LC*
   - Paul Segawa, Senior Art Director @LC*
   - Phillip Wee, Senior Production Artist @LC*
   - Yuki Kokubo, Hyong Kim
   - Andy Jackson
   - Chanelle Young
   - Stacey Koike
   - Amber Holton
   - Flemar Yadao
   - Janelle Kalawe
   - Traci Yamada
   - Kelly Griffin
   - Jason Suapaia, President*
**EVIDENCE OF QUALITY:**

Awards and Scholarships: The program students have entered the American Advertising Federation’s annual competition in the student division for the past ten years. Until this past year, the Communication Arts program had been the only two-year program competing with four-year institutions, UH Manoa being the main competition. Within the past ten years, the CA program has taken seven first place Pele awards. In 2009, the project entered was deemed “Best of Show” by the national judges, however, could not be awarded the prestigious place of honor because of the “student” category. The judges however, feeling so strongly about the publication created by a team of four students, created a special award and recognition for them at the awards ceremony. In the 2012 competition, not only did we get first place, we also had an entry that went into the finals at the nationals that received an Addy award. I believe that the quality of the program has been clearly demonstrated both on the local level as well as nationally. The following are the years the Communication Arts’ students have won the Pele:

2012
- 2012 Zachary Lagrimas - 1st Place
- 2012 Jillian Roque Award of Excellence; Nationals: Addy
- 2012 Dwayne Pesquira - Merit Award
- 2012 Armel Dela Cruz - Merit Award

2010
- 2010 Quintin Campbell won the 2010 Pele Award as well as an Award of Excellence.
- 2010 Award of Excellence Kalena Leong was the recipient of 2 and 1 award of Merit for the 2010 competition.

2009
- 2009 Chanelle M. Young, Janel J. Natividad, Kenneth L. Amor, and Jeffrey T. Soriano received the Pele. These four students were formally recognized by the national judges as the “Best in Show”. Since the student division is not eligible for this award, the judges took it upon themselves to publicly recognize and honor them at the event with their own award since they believed it to be truly the best in show.
- 2009 Award of Excellence:
  - Felmar Yadao, Cynthia Cruz, Kari Nakayama, Melissa Nixon, Dustin Chang, Jeffrey Bonsato, Kalena Leong, Quintin Campbell, Zachary Waterfall

2006
- 2006 Olga Schevenko - 1st Place
- 2006 Ad2 Scholarship $500 Olga Schevenko

2005
- 2005 Todd Saiki - 1st Place

2004
- 2004 Susanne Rehnmark - 1st Place
- 2004 Ad2 Scholarship $500 Susanne Rehnmark; Camilla Skold
- 2004 George Pellegrin Scholarship $1000 Brenda Soria; Lacy Solis; Elene Nakama

2003
- 2003 Stacie Taira - 1st Place
- 2003 Aida Smith Excellence Award
- 2003 Aida Smith Merit Award
- 2003 Susanne Rehnmark Excellence Award
- 2003 Ad2 Scholarship $500 Kelly Griffin
- 2003 George Pellegrin Scholarship $1000 Brenda Soria; Lacy Solis
2012 PELE Award recepient: Zachary Lagrimas

2010 PELE Award of Excellence recepient: Jillian Roque

CA students bring home the coveted Pels Award, presented by the local chapter of the American Advertising Federation (AAF).

CA student represents Hawai‘i at a national competition sponsored by the AAF, and receives a prestigious ADDY Award.

Dwayne Pesquira (left) and Arnel Dela Cruz (right) recepients of 2012 Awards of Merit
Zachary Lagrimas (left) presenting his portfolio at the 2012 Communication Arts Portfolio Presentation and Review event.
(Right) Communication Arts advisory board member Jim Meyers reviewing student Kea Peter’s portfolio.

(Left) Invited guests include HCC’s Tech II Dean Russell Uyeno and (right) Chris Magpoc, Clifford Cheng, Michael Horton, and CA faculty Lowell Gillia - professional graphic designers and executive board members of AIGA (American Institute of Graphic Arts).

(Left) Noah Tom of Harris Agency, an advertising, marketing and public relations firm checks out Chris Viernes’s portfolio while (right) Bernard Uy of Wall to Wall Designs checks out Davis Silva’s portfolio.
Quintin Campbell won the 2010 Pele Award as well as an Award of Excellence.

2010 Pele Award for the Bob Marley CD packaging piece in the above photo.
Kalena Leong was the recipient of 2 Award of Excellence and 1 award of Merit for the 2010 competition.

Kalena Leong’s PCATT (Pacific Center for Advanced Technologies Training) cover design series was part of the Special Projects course (CA 150) that cater to “live” jobs rather than course projects. This quarterly series ran during 2010. The red circle on the cover design is the same person in the photo indicated with the other red circle. Students sometimes use friends and family as models in their design work.
The portfolio review event is the ultimate assessment of our faculty, the program, and the students. The results of individual student portfolios year after year, as well as the ability of our program to successfully compete with four-year institutions are strong “health indicators” of our program’s excellence, our committed quality faculty, and the effective design and delivery of our program courses. From the very beginning of the program, students and faculty strive toward excellence in the portfolio endeavor because in the field, one’s portfolio is the key to getting a job and/or continuing their education at a four-year institution. Exiting requires a professional portfolio that meets industry standards. In order to accomplish this, students are required to accumulate “pieces” (projects) from the various courses beginning with the second semester’s CA 132 Page Composition I and CA 135 Typography courses. The bulk of student pieces are collected from their third semester classes (CA 142, CA 143, CA 145, CA 146). The fourth semester is the time for refining, as well as adding pieces from courses such as CA 152 The Business of Advertising, and CA 150 Special Projects – “live jobs only”.

The Communication Arts program has taken seven Peles over the past ten years. Until this year (2012), we were the only 2-year program competing in this event. As much as we left a major impression on the judges in 2009, 2010 proved to be as outstanding as well.
The Pele is the highest award and of course the most coveted. As much as we have taken the Pele seven times out of nine, this year was very special. In addition to receiving the Pele, these four students were formally recognized by the national judges as the ‘Best in Show’. Since the student division is not eligible for this award, the judges took it upon themselves to publicly recognize and honor them at the event with their own award since they believed it to be truly the best in show. They also received cash reimbursement of the entry fee.

Kenneth Amor, in addition to the Pele, received an Award of Excellence for another project, which he did as an individual.
Judged “best in show” as well as awarded the Pele for 2009 Student Division, this book “Alone, Judged & Unheard” was written, photographed, and designed by the above four students in the special projects course. This book has since gone on to compete in the nationals.

Chanelle M. Young, Janel J. Natividad, Kenneth L. Amor, and Jeffrey T. Soriano at the Hilton Hawaiian Village’s Tapa Ballroom after receiving the Pele Award from the Hawaii Advertising Federation which is the local chapter of the American Advertising Federation.
2009 Award of Excellence
for a new ID system and marketing campaign for the Pacific Center for Advanced Technology Training.

Yadao, Felmar B. (left)
Cruz, Cynthia M. (right)

Nakayama, Kari K. (left)
Nixon, Melissa L. (right)

2009 Award of Excellence
for a page composition project brochure.

Chang, Dustin K. (left)
Bonsato, Jeffrey S. (right)

below:
Leong, Kalena M. (left)
Campbell, Quintin H. (center)
Waterfall, Zachary M. (right)