Executive Summary
Honolulu Community College Program Review 2007

Honolulu Community College has a total of 28 programs of which 24 are instructional and 4 are non-instructional. The 24 instructional programs are AJ, AERO, APTR, AEC, ABRP, AMT, CARP, AVIT, CA, CENT, COSM, DISL, ECE, EIMT, FT, FIRE, HSER, IED, OESM, RAC, SMP, MARR, WELD, and LIBERAL ARTS. The 4 non-instructional programs are Student Services, Academic Support, Administrative Services, and the Pacific Center for Advanced Technical Training (PCATT).

Of the 28 programs, 9 programs were determined as having “healthy” overall program health, 13 programs had a “cautionary” overall health, and 6 programs had an “unhealthy” overall health. The 9 programs considered “healthy” are AEC, AMT, CARP, CENT, COSM, EIMT, FIRE, RAC, and WELD. The 13 programs considered “cautionary” are APTR, ABRP, CA, DISL, ECE, FT, HSER, SMP, LIBERAL ARTS, Student Services, Academic Support, Administrative Services, and PCATT. The 6 programs considered “unhealthy” are AJ, AERO, AVIT, IED, OESM, and MARR.

The determination of a program’s health for the instructional programs was made strictly using the three units of program measure. The three units of program measures are, “measure of demand”, “measure of efficiency”, and “measure of outcome”. For each measure, a standard, system-wide calculation is used based on data from various system-wide databases. This calculation produces a number for each program measure. That number is then compared against a pre-determined level to determine if that particular measure is “below minimum”, “above minimum”, or “above satisfactory”. The stated overall program’s health in this report was made based solely on these three units of measurement (demand, efficiency, and outcome). For example, if a program’s measure of demand and efficiency are “above satisfactory” but the measure of outcome is “below minimum”, this was still deemed to be a “healthy program” since at least two of the measurements were above satisfactory levels. However, these generalized determinations of program health based solely on numerical data sometimes masks strengths and weaknesses of different areas of each program.

The determination of a program’s health for the non-instructional programs was left to the individual programs to determine for themselves. This is because none of the non-instructional programs have come up with a system-wide definition of what makes a program “healthy”, “cautionary” or “unhealthy”. Because all non-instructional programs across all seven campuses are using individualized definitions of what constitutes a program’s health, the 4 non-instructional programs decided to submit a “cautionary” health status since they all had areas performing very well but with areas that could be improved. While Student Services has come up with an agreed upon system-wide template for program review, the Administrative Support group is still in discussions on what to include in their program review report. Academic Support has yet to establish an agreed upon template with quantitative indicators.