



2020

ANNUAL REVIEW OF PROGRAM DATA

Professional Development



UNIVERSITY of HAWAI'I®
KAUA'I
COMMUNITY COLLEGE

1. Program or Unit Description

Enrich the professional and personal lives of faculty and staff at Kaua'i Community College and provide instructional technology and individualized support. Align professional development with the vision and philosophy of staff development as stated in [CCCM 2080](#) and Kaua'i CC's vision, mission, goals, and learning outcomes.

Note: Each of the sections below has two parts to better reflect the two main areas of the Professional Development (PD) program: professional development and instructional technology & individualized support.

2. Analysis of the Program/Unit

Demand Indicators

Professional Development Demand Indicators

Indicator	Academic Year	Number
Number of Professional Development Training/Sessions Conducted	AY 13-14:	35
1. Lailima Overview		
2. Classroom Equipment	AY 14-15:	25
3. Google Suite		
4. Embedded Tutor Training		
5. Lailima	AY 15-16:	20
6. WI: Marking Papers		
7. DE/DL Brown Bag	AY 16-17:	57
8. CES Information Session		
9. Ulu Three Ways		
10. Making Accessible Documents I	AY 17-18:	30*
11. Making Accessible Document II		
12. Closed Captioning Videos	AY 18-19:	30
13. OTOC Sanitation Workshop		
14. Lailima Crash Course	AY 19-20:	45
15. Google: The Basics		
16. Lailima: Gradebook		
17. Lailima: Resources	Total:	245
18. Using Google Draw and Pixabay		
19. Lailima: Assignments		
20. Lailima: Test and Quizzes		
21. Learning Pathways I		
22. Learning Pathways II		
23. Lailima: Lessons Tool		

2020 Kaua‘i Community College ARPD
 Program: Professional Development

24. Screen Capture Tools 25. DE/DL Brown Bag 26. Using Adobe DC 27. Laulima and Zoom I 28. Laulima and Zoom II 29. Laulima and Zoom III 30. Using Zoom to Proctor Tests I 31. Using Zoom to Proctor Tests II 32. 10 Principles of Effective Online Teaching I 33. 10 Principles of Effective Online Teaching II 34. DETERMINED I 35. Planning to Teach Online 36. DETERMINED II 37. Remote Teaching Training I 38. Basic Steps Towards ADA Compliance 39. 10 Principles of Effective Online Teaching III 40. Remote Teaching Training II 41. Google Forms 42. DETERMINED III 43. Enabling YouTube and Auto Closed Captioning 44. Student Engagement Training 45. Google Draw and Pixabay		
Number of Professional Development Training/Session Attendees	AY 13-14:	664
	AY 14-15:	431
	AY 15-16:	308
	AY 16-17:	350
	AY 17-18:	182*
	AY 18-19:	120**
	AY 19-20:	342
	Total:	2,367
* Incomplete record, missing SP ‘18 sign-in sheets and logs ** Not including College Conversations, E Kūkākūkā Kākou, etc.		

Instructional Technology and Individualized Support Demand Indicators

Indicator	Academic Year	Number
Support Requests <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Classroom Equipment (e.g., using Classroom equipment, LED monitors, projectors, etc.) • Cloud and Computer Software/Application (e.g., Lulima, LiveText, CES, MS Office, Google Suite, etc.) • Computer Hardware (i.e., basic use of office and/or classroom computers) • Mobile Devices/Computing (e.g., connecting to UH Passthrough, establishing UH account on mobile devices, etc.) 	AY 13-14:	0*
	AY 14-15:	0*
	AY 15-16:	0*
	AY 16-17:	286
	AY 17-18:	226
	AY 18-19:	271
	AY 19-20:	299**
	Total:	1,082
* Was not being logged or tracked ** Actual number is higher. Unfortunately, some support calls were not logged due to shift in working conditions. New tracking system was implemented for AY '20-'21		

Efficiency Indicators

Professional Development Efficiency Indicators

The program implemented a new indicator in the Spring 2019 to measure efficiency regarding its professional development duties. This indicator looks at how well the program responds to the needs and wants of the campus. A prioritized list of these needs and wants was compiled using survey results.

The following priority areas were identified:

- Technology Tools, specifically
 - Video tools (e.g., YouTube, Zoom, Loom, etc.),
 - Lulima (and other LMS tools), and
 - Google Suite and its various tools.

- Pedagogy and Curriculum, particularly for distance education.

Instructional Technology and Individualized Support Efficiency Indicators

Indicator Type	# of Days	(%)
Response time to resolution for support request	Same Day:	87%
	1 Day:	5%
	2 Days:	3%
	3 Days:	2%
	4 Days:	2%
	5+ Days:	1%

Effectiveness Indicators

Professional Development Effectiveness Indicators

Indicator	Responses	(%)
The likelihood attendees will use information and/or lessons learned from PD events attended in their PROFESSIONAL lives. (Based on survey results.) Scale: 5-1, where 5 is “Very Likely” and 1 is “Will not be”	5:	34%
	4:	45%
	3:	15%
	2:	5%
	1:	1%
	5:	15%

The likelihood attendees will use information and/or lessons learned from PD events attended in their PERSONAL lives. (Based on survey results.) Scale: 5-1, where 5 is “Very Likely” and 1 is “Will not be”	4:	26%
	3:	27%
	2:	17%
	1:	15%

Instructional Technology and Individualized Support Effectiveness Indicators

The program implemented a new indicator in the Spring 2019 to measure its effectiveness regarding its instructional technology support duties. This indicator looked at how well the program addressed support requests.

Unfortunately, the data collected were too *complex* to analyze, and the PDC is concerned that the data do not necessarily measure the effectiveness of the program. The PDC will seek assistance from the campus institutional researcher to come up with a better plan and data collection tool.

Demand Analysis

Professional Development

Using the historical data over the last 7 years and the trends over the last 3, the following benchmarks were established:

- Host and/or conduct 35 events per academic year and
- Have at least 175 participants (35 events with at least 5 participants) attend the various events.

In AY 19-20, the program met its demand benchmarks.

There were 45 events with 342 attending. The overall number of attendees shows a marked increase from the last academic year (342 vs. 120 or a 185% increase). This uptick in attendees can be attributed to three factors:

- These data include the attendance records of a large event;
- Unlike AY 18-19, the data include attendance for events conducted or hosted by other KCC faculty and staff; and finally,
- With Spring ‘19 and Fall ‘20 courses being moved to remote and online instruction due to the COVID-19 pandemic, more DE/DL-related professional development was offered over the summer of 2020 to better support faculty for AY 20-21.

Instructional Technology and Individualized Support

Using the historical data over the last 4 years (since tech support logs were kept) and the trends over the last 3 years, a benchmark of 270 technology support requests per academic year was established.

In AY 19-20, the program met its demand benchmark.

From AYs 16-17 (when support requests began being tracked) through AY 18-19 the program has supported a little over a thousand requests (likely more as not all requests were logged for a variety of reasons). In AY 19-20, there was a 10.3% uptick in support requests (i.e., from 271 in AY 18-19 to 299 in AY 19-20).

Efficiency Analysis

Professional Development

In SP ‘19, the program determined that at least 70% of the PD events conducted should address priority areas identified via campus survey.

In SP ‘19, these priorities were identified as:

- Technology Tools, specifically for
 - Video tools (e.g., YouTube, Zoom, Loom, etc.),
 - Lulima (and other LMS tools), and
 - Google Suite and its various tools.
- Pedagogy and Curriculum, particularly for distance education.

In AY 19-20, the program met its efficiency benchmark.

Of the 45 events conducted in AY 19-20, about 93% were in the priority areas identified above.

Instructional Technology and Individualized Support

In SP ‘19, the following benchmarks were established:

- 80% of support requests be addressed and resolved in a day or less with no more than
- 5% taking 5 or more days.

In AY 19-20, the program met its efficiency benchmarks with 92% of support requests being addressed and resolved in 1 day or less and only about 1% taking 5 or more days.

Effectiveness Analysis

Professional Development

The benchmarks for this measure were adjusted to reflect issues with data collection. As was mentioned in PD’s AY 18-19 APRU:

The data are likely flawed because of a new survey implemented. It used a 5-point Likert scale that only identified the extreme ends of the spectrum--i.e., a 5 being a “very likely” to

use (and/or incorporate) information and/or lessons learned from a PD event and a 1 being a “will not be” using (and/or incorporating) information and/or lessons learned from a PD event. In earlier surveys, each number had a corresponding text description (i.e., 5: Very Likely, 4: Somewhat Likely, 3: Unlikely, 2: Highly Unlikely, 1: Will not be). Without these descriptions, respondents had to use their own judgement when interpreting what the scale meant. It is very likely some interpreted 3 as a “neutral,” where in the old survey it was clearly a negative response.

Because of this, the benchmarks were adjusted to the following:

- 85% of respondents selecting a 3 or better on the PD satisfaction survey when asked how likely they were to use or incorporate the information learned from PD events in their PROFESSIONAL lives and
- 50% of respondents selecting a 3 or better on the PD satisfaction survey when asked how likely they were to use or incorporate the information learned from PD events in their PERSONAL lives.

In AY 19-20, the program met its effectiveness benchmarks.

94% of respondents selected a 3 or better on the PD satisfaction survey when asked how likely they were to use or incorporate the information learned from PD events in their PROFESSIONAL lives, and 68% of respondents selecting a 3 or better on the PD satisfaction survey when asked how likely they were to use or incorporate the information learned from PD events in their PERSONAL lives.

Overall Program Analysis

Strengths of the Program

The program has strong demand. For the most part, it is efficient and effective in carrying out its duties. It provides a wide variety of PD opportunities and provides quick and responsive instructional technology and individualized support. Because the PDC position requires a somewhat unique skill set, the college needs to ensure that current and future PDCs can manage its expansive and disparate duties.

Weaknesses of the Program

Although the program has many strengths, it does need to improve in some key areas.

1. Because PD is a program of one, it is difficult for the PDC to manage all aspects of the position, namely the clerical ones. The program does evaluate trainings; however, there is plenty of room for improvement in this area. A clerical support person (or student worker) would go a long way in ensuring attendees of events are properly logged and events properly surveyed.
2. The program could do a better job making the PD training room a vibrant and better utilized space. Unfortunately, because the PDC has other duties that require him to be away from the

training room, the room cannot always be open at opportune and convenient times. A student worker with basic tech skills could assist in keeping the training space open and available more often, which make it much more convenient to seek assistance.

3. The PDC has historically been a quite fluid position, which means its duties have been quite broad and disparate. For example, in its last CPR cycle, aside from the obvious PD duties, the PDC has been responsible for...
 - Administering and maintaining LiveText and LiveText Via,
 - Assisting the campus with its shifting assessment plans and goals,
 - Functioning as the campus’ sole representative on a UHCC ad-hoc instructional designer committee, which was tasked with working on UHCC’s 5-Week AA program,
 - Training and assessing instructors and courses chosen to participate in the UHCC 5-Week AA program,
 - Functioning as the Early College Coordinator,
 - Assisting with the drafting and implementation of the campus’ new DL policies and handbook, and
 - Teaching courses.

Although some of the aforementioned duties seem best suited for the PDC, the program needs to ensure that its coordinator can focus on his or her primary duties, which is to coordinate and provide PD opportunities and to support faculty and staff with issues related to instructional technology. This would go a long way in ensuring compliance with its own policies for logging, surveying, and assessing PD on campus.

3. Program Student Learning Outcomes or Unit/Service Outcomes

- a) The program does not have formal unit outcomes at this time.

4. Action Plan

Action Plan

The program’s next Comprehensive Program Review is due in AY 22-23 or in three years. During the remainder of this review cycle, the program would like to...

- Establish unit outcomes.
- Establish a better plan to measure the efficiency of its technology and individualized support duties;
- Establish a method for determining the effectiveness of initiatives like Tuesday Tech Tips and Aloha Friday Finds;
- Improve its survey frequency to ensure all (or nearly all) PD events are being surveyed;
- Continue offering PD events in the identified priority areas;
- Update its long-term PD plan;
- Resurvey the campus to determine any new needs;
- Unify all survey tools;

- Dedicate more time on cultural initiatives (e.g., One Theme One Community) to address campus initiatives; and
- Rebuild its web resources (i.e., Faculty and Staff Guidebook and New Faculty and Staff Handbook)

5. Resource Implications

No additional resources are being requested at this time.

- ✓ **I am NOT requesting additional resources for my program/unit.**