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SUMMARY OF THE EVALUATION REPORT

Institution: UHCC System Office

Date of Visit: October 14-18, 2012

Team Chair: Dr. Helen Benjamin
Chancellor, Contra Costa Community College

Accreditation teams visited the six community colleges and the System Office of the community colleges that comprise the University of Hawai‘i Community College System (UHCC) during the week of October 14-18 for the purposes of determining whether and how well each institution continues to meet Accreditation Standards, evaluating how well the college is achieving its stated purposes, and providing recommendations for quality assurance and institutional improvement.

A different approach was taken in evaluating the UHCC. The 2006 visiting team recommended to the Accrediting Commission for Community and Junior Colleges (ACCJC, Commission) that a separate team be formed to conduct the UHCC visit rather than have one of the college team chairs serve in that capacity while simultaneously coordinating a college visit. As a result, the Commission appointed two additional persons to lead a UHCC evaluation. This team was augmented by one member from each of the college teams, forming the nine-member System Evaluation Team (SET) with the responsibility to coordinate all aspects of the UHCC evaluation, work closely with the college evaluation team chairs on system issues and write the SET report.

A few changes occurred in the University of Hawai‘i (UH) since the 2006 comprehensive visit. Maui Community College (MCC) was included in the 2006 comprehensive visit. However, effective August 2009, the accreditation of MCC was transferred from ACCJC, Western Association of Schools and Colleges (WASC) to the WASC Accrediting Commission for Senior Colleges and Universities and renamed University of Hawai‘i Maui College. Despite the change in accrediting bodies for MCC, the college remains part of UHCC for administration, organizational reporting and funding. The number of members of the Board of Regents (BOR) increased from 11 to 15. The BOR Committee on Community Colleges was re-established in 2005 as part of the reorganization that recreated the community college system. The BOR policy related to the Committee on Community Colleges was modified in 2011 as part of a comprehensive review of BOR policies.

In preparation for the visit, the chair of the SET conducted a telephonic pre-visit with the vice president for community colleges (VPCC) to arrange the details of the visit. SET members reviewed the college evaluation reports and information contained on the college and UHCC websites. The team was well prepared for the visit.

Three activities, coordinated by the SET, were held at Kapi‘olani Community College on the afternoon of Sunday, October 14. The first activity was a meeting led by the VPCC, who provided team members with a verbal update on the progress made on previous recommendations from 2006. The second and third meetings provided an orientation and
reception, respectively, for the SET, college team chairs, their assistants and one additional member from each college team. The orientation, provided by Dr. Morton, gave an insightful and thorough presentation on how UHCC functions, the challenges and opportunities facing UHCC, its major accomplishments, and how it differs from the California community colleges. In attendance at the orientation and reception were four members of the BOR, the UH president, the six community college chancellors, the UH executive vice president for academic affairs/provost, the UHCC associate vice president for administrative affairs (AVPCC), and other UH, UHCC, and college employees.

On Monday, October 15, selected team members met with staff members from the UH and the Office of the VPCC to ask questions and have discussions on UHCC matters related to the Accreditation Standards. Each session was scheduled for 30 minutes in length. Meetings were held with four members of the BOR; the system president; the VPCC; representatives from academic affairs, information technology, budget and finance, research, and facilities; and members of the Council of Faculty Senate Chairs. Following the final session, the VPCC conducted another meeting to share progress made on the 2006 recommendations. After the sessions, all of the college team members departed for their assigned colleges to begin their visits. The SET began their work at the UHCC offices.

SET members had several opportunities to observe the UHCC in action through one-on-one and group interviews; attendance at a portion of the October 18 BOR meeting; and interactions with the regents, the UH president and other administrators. The three members of the SET made visits to each of the colleges located on O'ahu and planned and implemented both audio and video conversations among the team chairs, UHCC administrators and members of the SET. On Wednesday, October 17, three such meetings were conducted: one with all team chairs and the SET; another with UHCC staff and team members at any college location, providing the opportunity for teams to get additional information; and another with the entire SET. On Thursday, October 18, the SET members attended one hour of the BOR meeting, and, at the end of the day, gave the UHCC exit interview.

The UHCC Office cooperated with the team in the completion of its work prior to and during the visit. UHCC personnel were extremely professional, courteous and helpful in meeting the variety of requests and needs of the team. The SET found UHCC to be seriously committed to the success of students in word and deed. It is against this backdrop that the following commendations and recommendations are made.
Commendations

UHCC employees are engaged in a variety of activities that distinguish UHCC and contribute to student success. The following listing represents only a few of those activities for which UHCC is commended:

- dedicating efforts to support the success and achievement of Native Hawaiian students and the preservation and study of Native Hawaiian culture;
- establishing a fund to support innovation in support of student success and for preserving this fund in the face of serious fiscal challenges;
- encouraging and supporting a spirit of “ohana” throughout UHCC;
- adopting a tuition increase schedule for 2012-17 in order to provide stability and predictability; and
- using a common student database to transition students to four-year institutions, improving articulation, and awarding Associate of Arts (AA) degrees back to students based on their coursework at four-year colleges.

Recommendations

**UHCC Recommendation 1: Institutional Mission and Effectiveness**

In order to meet the Standards for institutional effectiveness and integration of planning and resource allocation processes, including program review, it is recommended that:

- The VPCC and the Chancellors develop broad-based, ongoing, collegial dialogue between and among the UHCC and the colleges to better assess the breadth, quality, and usefulness of UHCC analytical tools (e.g., UHCC Annual Report of Program Data (ARPD)) and planning processes through feedback from college stakeholders. In addition, the UHCC and Chancellors should provide training for the appropriate use of the tools to support on-going improvement and effectiveness.
- The Chancellors provide clear descriptions and training regarding the planning timeline and budgeting process. The information and training should be available to all college constituencies and reviewed regularly to ensure accuracy for resource allocation that leads to program and institutional improvement (Standards I.B.3, I.B.1, II.A.1.c, II.A.2.a, e, f, II.B.1, II.B.3.a, and II.b.4, I.B.1, I.B.4, I.B.6).

**UHCC Recommendation 2: Student Learning Programs and Services**

In order to meet the Standards, degrees offered by the colleges must be consistent with the general education philosophy as outlined in the college catalog and the rigor of the English and math courses needed to fulfill the degree requirements must be appropriate to higher education (ER 11, Standards II.A.3, II.A.3.b).

**UHCC Recommendation 3: Student Learning Programs and Services and Resources**

In order to meet the Standard, the UHCC and the colleges shall take appropriate actions to ensure that regular evaluations of all faculty members and others directly responsible for student progress toward achieving stated student learning outcomes include, as a component of the evaluation, effectiveness in producing student learning outcomes (Standard III.A.1.c).
**UH Recommendation 4: Resources**

In order to meet the Standards, it is recommended that a comprehensive UH system wide technology plan that includes and supports distance education be developed and implemented and is integrated with institutional planning (Standards II.A.1.b, II.A.1.c, II.A.2.c, III.C.2, III.C.1, III.C.1.c, III.C.2).

**UH Recommendation 5: Board and Administrative Organization**

In order to meet the Standards, it is recommended that the UH BOR adopt a regular evaluation schedule of its policies and practices and revise them as necessary. In addition, the UH BOR must conduct its self evaluation as defined in its policy and as required by ACCJC Standards (Standards IV.B.1.e, IV.B.1.g).
The ACCJC evaluates multi-college systems as part of the comprehensive evaluation of accredited colleges. The UHCC is a multi-college system providing services and functions that enable the seven University of Hawai‘i Community Colleges to operate and meet Accreditation Standards. The Commission recognizes the important role a system plays in the ability of colleges to meet the Accreditation Standards and has established guidelines for visits to districts/systems. UHCC is not only a multi-college system, but a system embedded in the larger UH. In meeting the requirements set forth in the Commission Policy and Procedures for the Evaluation of Institutions in Multi-College/Multi-Unit Districts or Systems, the Commission appointed a separate team for the sole purpose of determining the extent to which the UHCC meets the Accreditation Standards established by the Commission for multi-college systems.

The UH was established in 1907 and developed into a system in the 1960s and 1970s, with the first community college becoming part of the system in 1964. The UH currently includes six community colleges accredited by ACCJC and one accredited by WASC and three four-year universities, one each at Manoa, Hilo, and West O‘ahu. The UHCC Office, led by the VPCC, is located at the UH Mānoa campus on O‘ahu.

In 2005, a major change occurred in the organizational structure of the UHCC. The BOR approved reorganization of the community colleges to include a vice president who reported to the president of the UH and provided leadership for all the community colleges in the UHCC. Responsibilities of the position include executive leadership, policy decision-making, resource allocation, development of appropriate support services for the seven community colleges, and the re-consolidation of the academic and administrative support units for the community colleges. The position and responsibilities are codified in the University of Hawai‘i Board of Regents Reference Guide. The community college chancellors serve in a dual reporting role to the VPCC for leadership and coordination of community college matters and to the UH president for system wide policymaking and decisions related to the individual colleges. The community college chancellors maintain responsibility for the daily operations of the colleges. The community college chancellors, as well as the chancellors for the UH campuses, serve on the Council of Chancellors to advise the president on strategic planning, program development and other areas. The community college chancellors meet as the Council of Community College Chancellors to provide advice to the president and VPCC on community college policy issues and other matters of community college interest.

Since the last comprehensive visit in 2006, the UHCC has made considerable progress by: dramatically increasing enrollment; moving to outcomes-based funding; enhancing its mission with a focus on student support leading to increased success for Native Hawaiian people and an emphasis on the preservation of Hawaiian language, history and culture; and becoming involved with two national programs for increasing student success, Achieving the Dream and Complete College America.
Recent Accreditation History

The last comprehensive visit to the UHCC was conducted from October 22-28, 2006, as part of the comprehensive evaluation of the seven community colleges then comprising UHCC. A Special Report focusing on one of the three recommendations given to the UHCC was to be submitted by October 15, 2007, followed by a visit. A two-person team representing the Commission made a visit to the UHCC on November 14, 2007, for the purpose of validating the Special Report on the progress of the UHCC in addressing the details required in Recommendation 1 of the 2006 report and visit. At its meeting in January 2008, the Commission took action to accept the report and commended UHCC for its work. The letter also reminded UHCC that each college was to submit its Midterm Report by October 15, 2009, requiring resolution of any team recommendations and other information. In 2009, UHCC submitted a separate Special Midterm Report responding again to Recommendation 1. The Commission accepted the report in its January 2010 meeting.

2012 Self Evaluation Document

As it had in 2006, the UHCC established a committee representing all six colleges for the purpose of responding to Standard IV.B., Board and Administrative Organization, Nos.1 and 3. The UHCC provided coordination of the effort and established the project as having two stages: the first, for the committee to write the descriptive summaries for each query; the second, for each college to complete the Self Evaluation and Actionable Improvement Plans sections. Honolulu Community College provided a brief self evaluation for most of the IV.B.1 and IV.B.3 components, but none of the other five colleges provided any self evaluation with the exception of a Standard sentence for IV.B.3.g. The Windward Community College report did not include descriptive summaries for all of the Standards.

The effort resulted in a common response that did not provide any self evaluation comments, other than a simple declaration of “meeting the Standard.” The descriptive summary, self evaluation and actionable improvement plans should have been more focused and precisely supported with appropriate evidence and documentation. More analysis would have improved the overall quality of the responses. In addition, some of the descriptive summaries provided a statement with a link to a board policy or some other reference without any description or explanatory response to the query. As a result, it was difficult to evaluate the appropriateness of the evidence referenced when reading. The document appeared to have been developed without the opportunity for dialogue that would have allowed for self reflection with an understanding of the UHCC, thereby yielding more cohesive and thoughtful responses. The development of thoughtful self evaluation responses might have resulted in actionable improvement plans where needed. The collaborative work on the report does appear to have been somewhat effective in providing college staff an opportunity to more fully understand the board and administrative structures that affect the UHCC.

Despite the weaknesses in the report and the accompanying evidence, the team was able to verify the degree to which the colleges and the UHCC meet the requirements for accreditation by the Commission. In addition, the SET was able to validate progress since the 2009 Midterm Report.
on the three previous recommendations based on a verbal report given on the first day of the visit.
RESPONSE TO RECOMMENDATIONS OF THE PREVIOUS VISITING TEAM  
OCTOBER 22-28, 2006

The previous visit to UHCC occurred October 22-28, 2006. That visiting team made three recommendations to which the UHCC needed to respond in the intervening six years.

2006 Recommendation 1

It is recommended that the Office of the President and the Vice President of the UH for Community Colleges conduct a systematic evaluation process to determine the effectiveness of the new community college organization and governance structure between—and among—the UHCC and its community colleges in the areas concerning:

a. Strategic Planning processes (Standard I.B.3)
b. Program review and assessment practices (Standards I.B.1, II.A.1.c, II.A.2.a,e,f, II.B.1, II.B.3.a, and II.b.4)
c. The allocation of resources (Standards I.B.6, III.D.1.a,d, IV.B.3.c)
d. Facilities management, including deferred maintenance (Standards III.B.1.a,b, III.B.2.b)
e. Board and administrative leadership (Standard IV.B.3.a)

The UHCC should implement the improvements/changes that result from the review and widely communicate those outcomes (Standards I.B.3.g, IV.B.3.b, and f).

2012 Visiting Team Response

As written, Recommendation 1 was satisfied in 2008 with the completion of a systematic evaluation that included all the referenced elements, and the results of that evaluation were disseminated widely. The 2009 Midterm Report also brought current the UHCC activities regarding Recommendation 1. Since that time, however, the organizational and governance structures of the UHCC have continued to evolve. The descriptions below capture the current situation at the UHCC level and provide an updated opinion on the status of the recommendation in terms of it meeting the Standards.

a. Strategic Planning processes

The Strategic Planning Council (SPC) oversees strategic planning for the UHCC. Members of the SPC include the college chancellors, faculty senate chairs, student body president and the VPCC and AVPCC. The VPCC convened the SPC in spring 2007 to update the UHCC Strategic Plan. The goal of this effort was to align the plans of UH, UHCC, and the individual community colleges. The outcome of the review was to establish clear and measurable outcomes to assess performance and progress. The UH administration developed, and the BOR approved, the University of Hawai‘i System Strategic Outcomes and Performance Measures, 2008-2015. The UH established ten measurable outcomes from which the UHCC adopted five
measurable goals with targets for 2008 through 2015. The five outcome-based funding goals are number of graduates, Native Hawaiian graduates, Science, Technology, Engineering, and Mathematics (STEM) graduates, Pell grant recipients and transfers to UH baccalaureate programs. Each goal was weighted according to the UHCC priority. Since 2008, the colleges have met or, in most cases, exceeded the targets for their goals. The STEM goal, while marginally met, is beginning to show greater progress.

The 2009 Special Midterm Report indicates that the VPCC held meetings at all the community colleges to help establish college-specific goals and to explain the planning process. The report also states, “This process will be repeated annually.” While difficult to find on the UH website, there is evidence of biannual meetings of the SPC where the VPCC can provide an overview of the UHCC planning process and progress. Evaluation of the planning process includes distribution of the community college inventory to SPC members and other college leaders.

Elements of the strategic planning system require further attention with: stronger integration of strategic planning and resource allocations; aligning program review data with strategic planning; and using data collected in the annual evaluation of the process for improvement. In essence, a more formalized evaluation process is now required for the planning process to take full advantage of evaluation data to improve the UHCC and its colleges.

This portion of the recommendation is partially satisfied.

b. Program review and assessment practices

The templates used for program review were developed by the UHCC, with input from the colleges, and are common across the colleges. The templates continue to be refined with additional benchmarks and further aligned with budget requests in the colleges. The most developed area of program review is instruction, which is overseen by the Instructional Program Review Council (IPRC). The council has developed Standard data, benchmarks and scoring rubrics to assess the health of instructional programs. The UHCC requires annual program reviews every year along with comprehensive reviews at least every five years. As of the Midterm Report, there was evidence of evaluation of the program review process. Evidence gained through interviews and review of minutes suggests that within and across colleges there is not a universal understanding of how to use the data or how results of the data are to be integrated into planning and resource allocation.

The assessment aspect within the program review process has lagged in development. The colleges have not uniformly assessed student learning and used the data on learning to make improvements at the appropriate level to meet Accreditation Standards. In addition, the results of Student Learning Outcomes (SLOs) assessment have not been integrated into the program review process on a systematic basis. The
UHCC role in providing assessment templates is noted, but the UHCC should explore other means by which the colleges can be supported in meeting Accreditation Standards in assessment.

Because of the current level of assessment practices and the use of that data in improvement of the program review process, this recommendation is partially satisfied.

c. Allocation of Resources

The UH Strategic Plan establishes the framework for the UHCC. The UH Strategic Plan, adopted by the Board of Regents in 2002, was updated by the UH community and the public in the 2007-08 academic year, and those participating in the review broadly affirmed the strategic goals and values underlying the goals.

The UHCC SPC coordinates with the colleges in developing their strategic plans to align with the UH plan and outcomes. The strategic plan provides direction for budget development. Strategic planning and budget development are closely linked processes. The colleges, through their annual program review process, evaluate assessment results and prepare prioritized lists of resources and budget requests for the improvement of college services and programs.

The president sets the budget directions for the UHCC, and the colleges develop their budget requests based on this direction. Resource allocations are based on the strategic planning goals, attainment of strategic planning outcomes, and the results of the annual program review process. The SPC works with the colleges throughout the budget process and is responsible to submit the budget document to the VPCC for inclusion in the UH budget for discussions and decisionmaking.

By basing the allocation of resources on strategic goals and on measurable outcomes established and understood system wide, the allocation is equitable and fair and based on measurable, assessed data. Competing needs of the UHCC and the three universities are discussed and prioritized through meetings with the UH vice president, the UHCC president, and the Council of Community College Chancellors. Priorities campus wide are vetted and the group agrees to what will be funded based on the resources available.

The UH-level reorganization of the community colleges in 2005 accomplishes the need to retain the integrity of the individually accredited colleges with a VPCC to coordinate the community colleges. In addition, the Council of Community College Chancellors has a direct reporting line to the UH president for system wide policymaking and decisions impacting their colleges. The reorganization has provided the colleges a structure to collaborate and communicate in a transparent manner with each other and with the president and administrative staff at the UH level. In the reorganization, the SPC serves as the mechanism for setting benchmarks.
and goals for the colleges, and then the individual colleges establish individual goals and budgets to meet the overall goals set by the SPC.

Implementation of the 2005 reorganization, along with creation of the SPC, has allowed the institution to make progress in strategic planning and to drive budget development with transparent goals and measurable data. Communication and collaboration between the UH president, the VPCC, and the Council of Chancellors is positive, strong, and effective.

This portion of the recommendation continues to be satisfied.

d. Facilities management (including deferred maintenance)

UHCC has responded decisively to this element of Recommendation 1 since 2006. In 2010-11, the UHCC instituted and institutionalized facilities master planning through the Long Range Development Plan (LRDP). The UHCC developed a comprehensive maintenance and operations program under the leadership of the Facilities Planning and Services Division. Priority was placed on repair, renewal and replacement of facilities and equipment beginning in 2009. The UHCC introduced a new component in the planning process based upon "Resource and Stewardship" aimed to reduce deferred maintenance costs in the future. This addition resulted in significant resource allocation in capital improvement budgets from 2009-11. The colleges have implemented program review to assess the adequacy of facilities for education programs, and these are integrated into the budget and in the LRDP. The colleges demonstrate adequate and appropriate linkage of facilities with institutional goals. The LRDP clearly links educational programs and facility needs.

This portion of the recommendation continues to be satisfied.

e. Board and Administrative Leadership

The 2005 reorganization reestablished the UHCC within the UH under a new position of VPCC. The new organizational structure retained the dual reporting structure of the chancellors to both the UH president and the VPCC. In addition, to provide clear direction and communication, the BOR established its Committee on Community Colleges. All evidence has shown that these board and administrative structures continue to provide the appropriate level of focused attention to community college issues and serve to further the goals of the community colleges.

This recommendation required that the delineation of functions of the new organization should be described and communicated. Such a chart has been posted on the website and widely distributed. In addition, the University of Hawai‘i Board of Regents Reference Guide describes the administrative structure in detail and is posted on the website as well.
This recommendation continues to be satisfied.

2006 Recommendation 2

It is recommended that the University of Hawai‘i Community College System ensure that the financial reporting system is integrated and transparent throughout the System. (Standards III.D.2.a.b.g, III.D.3)

2012 Visiting Team Response

The UH and its community colleges are working toward common goals that are supported by transparent guidelines and financial infrastructure. The UHCC implements financial and budget directives from the UH through its strategic planning and budget development procedures. By visiting the UHCC Budget Planning and Finance website, it is possible to review budget development resources, consolidated audited financial statements, enrollment growth reports, repair and maintenance plans, state apportionments to the UHCC, tuition and fee history, annual program reviews, college inventory comparisons, and numerous other budget and financial reports.

In addition to the financial and budget reports, the website contains administrative policies and procedures covering procurement, contract management, risk management, debt service plans, general fund reserve policies, and delegation of authority policies. The fiscal biennium budgets are also available on the UH website.

The 2006 recommendation was focused on the development and utilization of the new integrated financial reporting system just begun the year before the 2006 visit. UHCC became a member of the Kauli financial management project in 2005 to design an integrated financial reporting system. In the 2006 report to the Commission, the UHCC reported that the development of the project had been slow and uneven. During the following five years, the project languished due to changes in personnel and varying commitments to making the implementation a priority. In 2011, the project was once again made a high priority.

A priority was placed on meeting the internal implementation deadline of July 1, 2012, for the Kauli financial management system; that deadline was met. The implementation is significant to the business operations and financial management and reporting systems of the UH. Basic software was implemented, which means the software will be modified to meet institutional needs. The process will be on-going to adjust the software to the specific needs of the UHCC. While still a work-in-progress, the UH vice president for administrative services reported that the financial management system is operating to effectively support the financial management and reporting requirements of the community colleges. Staff training continues to be a need and is also ongoing.

The recommendation has been met.
2006 Recommendation 3

It is recommended that the Board of Regents adopt a regular evaluation schedule of its policies and practices and revise them as necessary. (Standard IV.B.1.g)

2012 Visiting Team Response

In the college self evaluations, it is consistently reported that the BOR initiated and completed a review and revision of its policies in 2010-11. The SET team verified that this occurred. There was a review and revision of all BOR policies which included UHCC input. UHCC reports that the evaluation and revision of policies has continued routinely to the present time. In addition, the former Community College Memoranda that guided UHCC prior to the 2002 reorganization are being converted into UH Community College Policies (UHCCP). The 2006 Recommendation 3 also required a regular evaluation schedule; this element does not currently exist. Adoption of a regular evaluation schedule will assure a timely and thorough review of all BOR policies and assure appropriate development and placement of new policies. In addition, the conversion of Community College Memoranda into BOR policies must be completed.

Based on the evidence, this recommendation has been partially met.
STANDARD I
Institutional Mission and Effectiveness

A. Mission

General Observations

Colleges within the UHCC have mission statements that are tied to the UH mission and strategic plan. Each college uniquely defines its purpose and intended student population, though there is a UHCC emphasis on supporting the educational attainment of Native Hawaiian peoples. There is evidence in the college self evaluations that college missions are tied to institutional planning and priorities.

Findings and Evidence

The UHCC has developed and published a mission statement for the UHCC that identifies the broad educational purpose of the UHCC’s collective six community colleges, identifies various student populations the UHCC is intending to serve, and conveys a commitment to achieving high levels of student learning. The programs offered by the colleges support the varied populations and geographic areas defined in the mission statement. The UHCC has expanded its distance education offerings in an effort to reach geographically remote populations and to expand offerings of high demand courses that are constrained by space during certain times of the day. These strategies align with the intent of the UHCC to provide open-access education to the people of Hawai‘i. Individual college mission statements place a particular emphasis on promoting the educational attainment of the native people of Hawai‘i (I.A.1).

The UHCC has established a routine of assessment and review of its mission that occurs every seven to eight years. The most recent revision occurred in 2010 and was orchestrated and managed by the SPC which includes as members administrative, faculty and student representation from each community college in the UHCC. The SPC was the primary venue for receiving feedback from each of the colleges, through their committee representatives, regarding the effectiveness, accuracy and quality of the mission statement. Feedback on the UHCC mission statement was captured from the individual colleges and minor changes were worked into multiple revisions of the draft until a final version was agreed upon and approved by the SPC. The colleges in the UHCC recently reviewed and revised their mission statements. In some instances, this update was prompted by the effort of the UH to update the UHCC strategic plan (I.A.2, I.A.3).

Concurrent to the development of the UHCC mission statement was the creation of an updated version of the UHCC strategic plan titled The UHCC Strategic Outcomes and Performance Measures, 2008-2015. The measures embedded within the UHCC strategic plan align rather closely with the UHCC mission and play a key role in establishing a foundation for institutional planning at the UHCC and at each of the individual colleges (I.A.4).
The Office of the VPCC has conducted assessments of the strategic planning process to achieve the strategic planning goal of “developing and sustaining an institutional environment that promotes transparency and a culture of evidence that links institutional assessment, planning, resource acquisition and resource allocation.” The 2009 survey was adapted from the one conducted two years prior to capture the level of satisfaction faculty and staff at the colleges have regarding the UHCC strategic planning processes. Findings from the community college inventory survey were made available on the UHCC web page and were reviewed by the SPC (1.A).

Conclusion

While the evaluation team finds the UHCC to be in compliance with Standard 1.A, there are opportunities for the UHCC to improve upon the process of review and assessment of the UHCC mission and strategic planning processes. The UHCC conducts a community college inventory survey that examines, in part, satisfaction with the UHCC mission and strategic planning process. However, there is no evidence that the UHCC collects feedback or engages in dialogue with the colleges to identify strategies for improving the processes that underlie the review the UHCC mission and UHCC strategic planning. Some of the satisfaction scores from the 2009 community college inventory survey indicate a need to broaden the engagement that the UHCC has with the colleges regarding planning and priority-setting and further indicate some concern that the UHCC continues to engage in practices that are off-mission. The VPCC has acknowledged that these concerns need to be addressed and is intent on making changes to improve transparency.

The UHCC meets Standard 1.A.

Recommendation

None
B. Improving Institutional Effectiveness

General Observations

The UHCC provides evidence that planning is data driven with specific benchmarks tied to college allocations. UHCC and college goals consistent with the mission and purpose of the UHCC have been established in key areas. Goals are defined in measurable terms, and college chancellors understand the goals and fiscal impact to their college. Colleges are expected to respond to the UHCC goals and develop local processes for systematic evaluation and resource allocation to support the UHCC goals. The system-developed program review data and processes have provided a direction and focus for colleges to use program data and evaluation for improvement. To date, program review processes have not included student learning outcomes data. Thus, at the UHCC level, there has not been an emphasis on evidence of achievement of student learning, though at each college, SLOs assessment is at various stages of development. There is no indication that assessment of student learning is systematically tied to resource allocation across the UHCC.

Findings and Evidence

Within the last five years, the UHCC has made substantive changes to its strategic planning processes. In 2007, the UHCC embarked on a strategy to improve the institutional effectiveness of the community college system by providing greater strategic direction to each of the colleges. Under the leadership of the Office of the VPCC, the UHCC implemented a strategic planning process that includes an identification of specific goals related to student achievement outcomes and institutional performance that aligned with the UHCC stated mission. A review of actual performance against these goals is conducted annually by both the UHCC and at the individual colleges. Funding allocations from the UHCC to the college are determined, in part, by the degree to which each individual college meets or surpasses the stated goals in the strategic plan (1.B).

With the creation of the UHCC Strategic Outcomes and Performance Measures, 2008-15 report, the Office of the VPCC established a set of outcome goals for the UHCC and each of the individual colleges. Assessment of progress against the goals is conducted every year, both at the UHCC and the college levels. Each college is asked to demonstrate that it has met all five of the overarching goals highlighted in the report to be eligible to capture performance funding dollars, which, at its full value, comprises roughly 3 percent of the UHCC budget. These planning goals are broadly disseminated and largely quantitative, allowing for systematic tracking of performance and assessment of the degree to which the UHCC and each of the colleges have achieved the strategic planning goals. The Office of the VPCC also provides program review templates that include data on department demand, efficiency and effectiveness to each of the instructional departments at the colleges. The templates also provide an analytically driven assessment of the health of the department in each of the three domains, using one of the following designations: Healthy, Cautionary or Unhealthy (1.B.2, 1.B.3).
The UHCC Office evaluates the strategic planning process using a survey instrument administered to the SPC, a group that provides oversight to the UHCC planning process. Formally established in policy, the SPC is the primary body for assuring system-wide participation in the UHCC strategic planning process. Responses to the community college inventory indicate varying levels of satisfaction with the process and some concern whether “resources are consistently allocated to address the priorities identified throughout the planning process.” Survey participants also indicate that there exist opportunities to broaden the depth of awareness and understanding of these department-level goals, how they were determined, how they are used to inform decision-making and how faculty, staff and administrators at the colleges can provide feedback that leads to improvements in both the template and the process. The Office of the VPCC has acknowledged that there are opportunities to improve transparency and make resource allocation processes more visibly linked to planning processes and is undertaking efforts to make improvements in these areas. Dialogue about processes at the UHCC level appears to be primarily around UHCC and college performance goals and the concomitant resources attached to the recently developed performance-based funding allocations available to the colleges. UHCC and college goals reflect the direction and purpose of the UH. These actions should be of high priority, along with efforts to sustain and expand upon current evaluation processes intended to provide reflective feedback on how to make improvements to planning processes. There is no formal process for capturing input from faculty and staff at each of the colleges at the UHCC level into the evaluation and assessment of student learning. Reflection on institutional processes is essentially conducted at the institution/college level (1.B.1, 1.B.3-4).

As noted in the general observations covering Standard 1.A, there are some important limitations to the information captured by UHCC Office from the colleges in areas related to planning. First, the inventory is primarily a satisfaction and perception survey of a small group of UHCC-level planners and college administrators. While feedback from this group is important and should be collected, it captures the perspective of one very small and biased group that has particularly close proximity to UHCC planning decisions and conversations. Second, there doesn’t appear to be a system-wide evaluation tool or survey that provides faculty and staff and other end-users of the UHCC planning products at the colleges opportunities to provide feedback on how to make improvements to either the content of the information provided or the processes that determine how they are used and distributed. Absent this feedback loop, it will be difficult for the UHCC Office to capture the information needed to assure they are providing real value to the colleges and that each college is being given the information it needs and requires to achieve sustainable, continuous quality improvement with regard to institutional effectiveness (1.B.1, 1.B.2).

There is dialogue at the UHCC level, including a rich array of data, regarding progress toward achieving goals. Colleges not attaining predetermined benchmarks have the performance funding incentive to make relevant improvements; however, improvements are made absent a formal feedback loop whereby the colleges can coordinate with UHCC to develop approaches that speak to challenges specific to individual colleges.
Integration of planning is not apparent as the discussion of college-level performance measures and resource needs pertaining to physical and human resources are not connected. Evaluation of outcomes uses both qualitative data (college inventory) and quantitative data (performance outcomes) (I.B.3).

Input into the UHCC planning and resource allocation process, including program review, is limited. Qualitative input is limited to a few representatives from each institution. The planning cycle is modified at times, yet it is not apparent such moves are driven from analysis of the planning and resource allocation process. The UHCC does report out on major college initiatives. While the Office of the VPCC does capture feedback to support a limited evaluation of the SPC, an expansion of the evaluation mechanisms to include broader coverage of the SPC and to possibly expand it to include the Institutional Research Cadre, would provide a more complete picture of the breadth and quality of the engagement with the colleges regarding planning and resource allocation processes and decisions (I.B.4, I.B.5, I.B.6).

Given the number of planning processes that connect the UHCC with the individual colleges and the many planning processes and structures requiring routine evaluation, the UHCC may be relying too heavily on a single survey to capture feedback intended to be helpful in guiding improvements across so many domains. The UHCC would benefit from a systematic and thoughtful expansion of existing evaluation mechanisms that includes a more in-depth assessment of process that better captures feedback beyond simple satisfaction and that includes a more comprehensive evaluation of processes and procedures in place at various planning bodies, including, but not limited to, the UHCC SPC.

Conclusion

There appears to be an unclear link between resource allocation and planning. Assessment of student learning outcomes has started, but is not fully implemented across all programs. To a large extent, the planning process is a work-in-progress, and the impact and effectiveness are not fully determined.

The UHCC does not fully meet Standard I.B.

Recommendation

**UHCC Recommendation 1: Institutional Mission and Effectiveness**

In order to meet the Standards for institutional effectiveness and integration of planning and resource allocation processes, including program review, it is recommended that:
• The VPCC and the Chancellors develop broad-based, ongoing, collegial dialogue between and among the UHCC and the colleges to better assess the breadth, quality, and usefulness of UHCC analytical tools (e.g., UHCC Annual Report of Program Data (ARPD)) and planning processes through feedback from college stakeholders. In addition, the UHCC and Chancellors should provide training for the appropriate use of the tools to support on-going improvement and effectiveness.

• The Chancellors provide clear descriptions and training regarding the planning timeline and budgeting process. The information and training should be available to all college constituencies and reviewed regularly to ensure accuracy for resource allocation that leads to program and institutional improvement (Standards I.B.3, I.B.1, II.A.1.c, II.A.2.a, e, f, II.B.1, II.B.3.a, and II.b.4, I.B.1, I.B.4, I.B.6).
STANDARD II
Student Learning Programs and Services

General Observations

Colleges within the UHCC maintain strong and transparent communication regarding instructional and services goals and efforts. The individual colleges maintain critical independence in the development of course offerings and a schedule of services unique to the needs of community members. Nevertheless, the UHCC Office provides the colleges a breath of organizational and infrastructure support meant to simplify and ease transfer within the UHCC, coordinates program outcomes, and ensures a measure of uniformity of skills developed in career and technical education programs.

A. Instructional Programs

Findings and Evidence

The UHCC coordinates efforts that allow the colleges to meet student goals in their various academic programs in a manner consistent with that necessary to address the preparatory needs of a diverse and vibrant community. The UHCC has coordinated a variety of essential support efforts meant to provide for the improvement and uniformity of programs, including: the Placement Advisory Work Group designed to improve student assessment outcomes; the Math Summit Groups designed to improve both remedial and transfer-level course outcomes; the Writing Intensive Course Committee designed to coordinate a university and community college wide initiative meant to improve writing skills and competencies; and the Developmental Education Committee designed to align expectations and outcomes to ensure that courses continue to be of high quality and are in sync across the UHCC (II.A.1, II.A.1.a-c).

The UHCC has promoted, through its strategic plan: the inclusion of the goals and outcomes of the Achieving the Dream Initiative, including a turn to data-driven, outcome-based decision-making; a focus on enhanced recruitment, retention and success of Native Hawaiian students; improved remedial and developmental course outcomes; and increased transfer success. Measurement of the colleges’ participation and success in meeting these objectives has been codified in an annual program review process. The colleges are using student achievement data/outcomes but are not using learning outcomes data in program reviews. Within this process, the UHCC Office provides the colleges with data about student achievement outcomes which fuels campus planning and is the foundation of an outcomes-based funding initiative. This funding, along with that available through support of innovative projects, is tied to meeting benchmarks established by the UHCC in five primary categories: number of graduates, number of Native Hawaiian graduates, STEM-related field graduates, Pell grant recipients, and baccalaureate transfers to UH campuses (II.A.2, II.A.2.a, II.A.2.b).
In an effort to ensure uniformity, the UHCC Office has established processes and guidance for proper implementation and assessment of SLOs for all colleges based on a standard meant to promote continuous quality improvement in the area of SLOs development and assessment. In addition, the UHCC has promoted the development of a process in which campus annual program reviews are analyzed and scored. The UHCC has also established general education requirements that serve to define program requirements for the Associate of Arts, the Associate of Science, the Associate of Applied Science (AAS), and the General Education degrees. The colleges have all effectively aligned their curriculum and degrees with these criteria in an effort to provide students with a uniformly accessible academic experience. In an effort to promote direct and relevant career training, the UHCC has aided four of the colleges in developing the Associate of Applied Science degrees. The desire to offer students more narrowly targeted career training through this degree is a creative alternative that is clearly both appealing and relevant to students. However, the visiting team is concerned that the rigor of this curriculum may be undermined by the fact that the math and English degree requirements are below college level and not consistent with the general education requirements as outlined by the UHCC itself (ER11, II.A.1, II.A.2.c, II.A.2.f-h, II.A.2.1, II.A.3, II.A.3.a-c, II.A.4).

The UHCC has also established policies that address key Accreditation Standard issues such as academic honesty, an interdisciplinary core, career technical education program and course alignment and directives on instructional objectivity.

Conclusion

The UHCC partially meets Standard II.A.

Recommendation

**UHCC Recommendation 2: Student Learning Programs and Services**

In order to meet the Standards, degrees offered by the colleges must be consistent with the general education philosophy as outlined in the college catalog and the rigor of the English and math courses needed to fulfill the degree requirements must be appropriate to higher education (ER 11, Standards II.A.3, II.A.3.b).
B. Student Support Services

Findings and Evidence

The UHCC priorities include the recruitment of students from diverse backgrounds, ranging from high school students, home schooled students, Native Hawaiian students and from the general service area community. The UHCC promotes accessible services for all, regardless of location, and recruits and admits students with diverse backgrounds who can benefit from the courses and programs offered by its colleges. Students are guaranteed opportunities for enrollment and access to college programs without deference. The UHCC assures that colleges have the resources to assess math and English placement using COMPASS. Testing, admissions, counseling and financial assistance services are available across every UHCC campus (II.B.1, II.B.3.e).

The UHCC provides guidance for colleges to address the needs of high risk students and ensures specialized support services and accommodations for students with disabilities through targeted and accessible programs. The UHCC and its institutions have a clear commitment to improve learning support for instructional programs linked to state wide initiatives meant to improve student performance and retention (II.B.3, II.B.3.a, II.B.3.d, II.B.4).

The UHCC supports an environment which encourages uniformity and accessibility for students regardless of which institution they attend. Efforts to develop a common UHCC application and financial aid process have positively reduced confusion and duplication. Additionally, UHCC-inspired recruitment, retention, and success goals to expand Native Hawaiian participation in higher education have been well coordinated and widely disseminated (II.B.3, II.B.3.d).

The UHCC has provided direction and assistance in training faculty in assessment techniques for student support services student learning outcomes. There have been UHCC-sponsored trainings and workshops. The UHCC Office has disseminated information regarding ACCJC expectations of institutions being at the level of continuous quality improvement for SLOs production and assessment (II.B.4).

Conclusion

The UHCC meets Standard II.B.

Recommendation

None
C. Library and Learning Support Services

Findings and Evidence

The college libraries support the information needs of students throughout the UHCC. UHCC libraries provide print, on-line, and data-base resources for students throughout the state through interlibrary loan or through computer access. Unique collections are housed on individual campuses and are made available to both the college community and the public at large (II.C.1, II.C.1.a).

College libraries all provide resources and meet the goal of the UHCC information literacy competency standard for higher education and a common library student learning outcome which requires that individual students must learn to “evaluate information and its sources critically.” In addition, the community college libraries participate in a UHCC-led agreement with University of Hawai‘i, Manoa’s Hamilton Library for Voyager program access and an integrated management system that provides students with system wide library resource access (II.C.1.b, c.1.e, II.C.2).

Conclusion

The UHCC meets Standard II.C.

Recommendations

None
STANDARD III
Resources

A. Human Resources

General Observations

The Board of Regents of the UH is the governing authority that establishes policy pertaining to all faculty and staff. Policies can be found on the university website. The UHCC is embedded in the UH. The chancellors of the community colleges have a dual reporting relationship to the president of the UH and the VPCC. Hiring authority for campus personnel lies with the chancellor of each campus with the exception of the chancellor and those who report directly to the chancellor. The VPCC has hiring authority for those who report to the chancellor as well as for direct reports with the Office of the Vice President for Community Colleges. The VPCC and the UH president recommend the appointment of the chancellors to the Board of Regents who has final hiring authority for the chancellors. The responsibility of evaluation for the college chancellors is also two-fold. Both the VPCC and the president of the UH participate in the evaluation of the college chancellors. The evaluations are based in part on the performance measures of the college as set forth in the strategic plan and the performance funding measures. The five measures that drive the performance funding outcomes are the number of graduates, Native Hawaiian graduates, STEM graduates, Pell grant recipients, and transfers to UH baccalaureate program.

The UH president evaluates the VPCC. There are three components to the evaluation of the VPCC: comprehensive evaluation, a self evaluation, and a meeting with the president to discuss both of the above and to set goals and budget strategy. The relationship between the president and the VPCC is positive and strong as evidenced by discussions with administrators and staff.

Qualification requirements and compensation for academic positions serving in the executive and managerial classifications are established in UH Executive Policies. System wide administrative procedures for classified and administrative, professional, and technical (APT) personnel, and for civil service personnel are codified as well. There are UH wide administrative procedures for recruitment and selection of faculty, APT, and executive personnel. The UHCC is responsible to set the guidelines for contract renewal, tenure and promotion, and evaluation of faculty and staff. The BOR evaluates the UH president.

The UH is responsible to establish the statements on nondiscrimination and affirmative action as well as the statement of professional ethics. The colleges of the UHCC are obliged to operate under the policies established by the UH. The colleges have the authority to create the procedures to implement the UH policies.
Findings and Evidence

The policies and practices in place throughout the UHCC for recruitment, employment, and evaluation are numerous. Staff development opportunities with accompanying funding are embraced and encouraged starting at the UH level and passed on throughout the UHCC. The UH supports programs and activities for its diverse population of both students and staff through various policies and, in some cases, funding.

Separate evaluation processes are in place for the evaluation of faculty, APT, Civil Service and executive personnel. The current faculty evaluation process does not include the evaluation of student learning outcomes but relies on faculty assessment results and institutional performance measures. The UH BOR sets policy and procedures for the UHCC Faculty Classification Plan which sets forth the principles and goals of the UHCC assessment and evaluation of student learning. The UHCC administration and faculty adhere to the evaluation process by assessing and evaluating student learning as defined in the Faculty Classification Plan for tenure track and nontenure track faculty as authorized by the UH BOR. Once tenured, faculty members have no continuing requirement to assess student learning as part of their evaluation.

Through the strategic planning and budget development processes, along with the annual program review process, staffing needs in all areas are addressed and prioritized. Through the SPC and the Council of Chancellors, the staffing needs and prioritization are presented to the UH president. Full-time employees are approved through these processes. Some positions are funded; others rely on reallocation of existing funds depending on the situation (III.A.1-6).

Conclusion

The UHCC is strong in the area of human resources and in using its employees to meet its broad educational program. In the case of the faculty evaluation procedure serving to improve effectiveness, the UHCC utilizes a process which contains two different evaluation methods. The process of faculty tenure and promotion includes analysis of SLOs as part of the evaluation which can occur up to three times during a faculty member's career. Evaluations for promotion occur post-tenure and include student learning outcome analysis. Once the faculty member has completed the promotion activities or elects not to submit a promotion application, that faculty member is then subject to a different evaluation procedure not requiring a detailed analysis of student learning outcomes and occurring every five years. Thus, a tenured faculty member who does not request promotion, or a faculty member who has completed all requirements of tenure and promotion, does not have the same requirement to analyze student learning outcomes for improvement of effectiveness.

While UHCC meets Standard III.A.C.1 for some faculty, it does not hold the same standard for all faculty members to analyze SLOs for effectiveness and improvement.
While the UHCC meets other portions of Standard III.A, it does not meet Standard III.A.C.1. For that reason, the UHCC partially meets Standard III.A.

Recommendation

**UHCC Recommendation 3: Student Learning Programs and Services and Resources**

In order to meet the Standard, the UHCC and the colleges shall take appropriate actions to ensure that regular evaluations of all faculty members and others directly responsible for student progress toward achieving stated student learning outcomes include, as a component of the evaluation, effectiveness in producing student learning outcomes (Standard III.A.1.c).
B. Physical Resources

General Observations

The UHCC and the colleges have placed a high priority on facilities management since the 2006 comprehensive visit. The Evaluation Report of the University of Hawai‘i Community College System (2006) noted several issues with the lack of a “well-crafted facilities plan” and that the amount of money awarded to the UHCC is in the control of the government. The planning processes now include a component based on resource and stewardship which resulted in significant resource allocation in capital improvement budgets from 2009-11. Legislative funding was provided and campus master plans were released in fall of 2009 and have been widely reviewed as part of the Long Range Development Plan (LRDP).

Findings and Evidence

The UHCC has institutionalized facilities master planning through the LRDP. It provides a roadmap for UHCC requests to the State Legislature to ensure alignment of funding with the campus master plans. The UHCC plans, builds, maintains, and updates its physical resources to effectively utilize its resources as well as provide support to academic programs and services (III.B.1.a). The LRDP includes the unique student learning programs and services for each college and is integrated into institutional planning (III.B).

The UHCC has developed a comprehensive maintenance and operations program under the leadership of the Facilities Planning and Services Division (III.B.1.a). Priority was placed on the repair, renewal and replacement of facilities and equipment beginning in fiscal year 2009. The UHCC Office emphasized resource and stewardship in order to reduce deferred maintenance costs in the future. The UH allocated $107 million for capital renewal and deferred maintenance in fiscal year 2010 and $62 million in fiscal year 2011. The State Legislature has provided support to the UHCC by allocating significant funding for repairs and maintenance, although not enough to address the $65 million identified, deferred repairs and maintenance as well as $68 million for modernization and renovation for UHCC.

Through programs that deal with the Americans with Disabilities Act, the UHCC emergency evacuation procedures, and the Police Services, units of the colleges have developed appropriate risk management and safety measures for providing a safe learning and working environment (III.B.1.b.). Overall, the UHCC is meeting Standard III. B through consistent facilities planning and implementation through the LRDP and continued evaluation of its facility needs as it relates to the educational master plans of the colleges.

Conclusion

The UHCC meets Standard III.B.
Recommendations

None
C. Technology Resources

General Observations

The UHCC places a strong emphasis on the effective use of technology in the support of instruction and student and administrative services, evidenced by the investment made in those areas. The UH Information Technology Services (ITS) works in conjunction with the UHCC Office and the colleges in making technology decisions. Overall, the technology for both the UHCC and the colleges operates at high capacity with a ten gigabit-per-second network to the colleges.

Findings and Evidence

Technology resources are used to support student learning programs and services and to improve institutional effectiveness. Each college provides its own local area network support and computing services. At the system wide level, UH ITS provides services for all colleges in wide-area networking, videoconferencing, help desk, site licensing, and enterprise administrative, academic, and infrastructure IT services.

The UH is part of the Kuali Foundation Project (Foundation), which pools resources to develop and sustain many of the software systems needed for higher education. The Foundation was established to "reduce costs and get systems that better fit college needs." Licenses are procured through the UH Office along with the system help desk to provide employee and student support. Ground has been broken for construction of a new Information Technology Center, which will house enterprise information and communications technology systems and services that support modern teaching, administration and research for all ten UH campuses (III.C.1.c-d).

The Sakai open-source, course management system supports online learning for campus-based and distance learning for all ten campuses and is fully integrated into the Banner student information and the UHCC portal. ITS also operates a system wide IT Help Desk and supports a ten gigabit-per-second connection to all ten college sites, as well as a Voice Over Internet Protocol telephone system (III.C.1.a). The system-level focus on the wide-area network (WAN), enterprise resources systems, and video network operates at an effective and efficient level as evidenced in minor issues and general satisfaction at the community colleges. The colleges focus on the more localized services which appear to work well for both the UHCC and the colleges.

The college provides technology training for its faculty, staff, and students. ITS provides for the operation of a system wide-area network and Help Desk functions for all the colleges (III.C.1.b). The UH has not developed an overall plan to address UH responsibilities as delineated in the Functions Map (III.C.1). The colleges systematically plan, acquire, maintain, and upgrade the local technology infrastructure and equipment and integrate technology planning into the college planning.

Although the UH is providing excellent technology services for the colleges, the UH has not updated its technology master plan since 2000. Therefore, technology planning is not current, documented, nor integrated with overall institutional planning (III.C). While the
UH has done an outstanding job of upgrading the network to ten gigabytes, how planning occurs between the colleges and the UH is not clearly evident. The vice president for information technology/information technology officer meets with the chancellors in the UH Council and discusses systems priorities. This appears to be the only linkage between the colleges and the UH Office for technology planning purposes (III.C.2).

Conclusion

Considerable progress has been made at the system wide level in technology services to support student learning and institutional effectiveness. While forward-thinking decisions are made in technology, it is done without formal planning structures in this area. The colleges are dependent on major technology services provided by the UH; therefore, these services need to be integrated into overall institutional planning.

The UHCC partially meets Standard III.C.

Recommendation

**UH Recommendation 4: Resources**

In order to meet the Standards, it is recommended that a comprehensive UH system wide technology plan that includes and supports distance education be developed and implemented and is integrated with institutional planning (Standards II.A.1.b, II.A.1.c, II.A.2.c, III.C.2, III.C.1, III.C.1.c, III.C.2).
D. Financial Resources

General Observations

The UHCC is responsible for the fiscal biennium budget preparation process. The fiscal biennium budget compiles all components of the UH. The BOR sets the policy guidance for the preparation of the fiscal, biennial budget policy paper and budget which is submitted to the Governor and the State Legislature by the UH president. The SPC, made up of the chancellors, faculty senate chairs, student body presidents from each college, and the VPCC and AVPCC for the UHCC, oversees the UHCC budget process. SPC members set goals and benchmarks and review prioritized staffing and other funding requests. The UHCC budget development process is transparent and inclusive. Once the budget requests are reviewed and prioritized, the proposed budgets are forwarded to the UH president for final review and decision making and then forwarded simultaneously to the Governor and the State Legislature. Once appropriations are made to the UH and the UHCC, the president and VPCC make the allocations to the colleges. The annual program review process and data drive much of the prioritization for the colleges.

The UH BOR adopted a six-year tuition increase plan for the UH which includes the UHCC, expiring spring of 2012. On October 26, 2011, the BOR approved another six-year UH and UHCC tuition increase schedule to commence fall of 2012 and end spring 2017. These schedules provide stability and predictability for the students of the UH and the UHCC. The increased tuition, along with a surge in enrollment growth, has provided the UHCC some relief from the State of Hawaii’s budget cuts. The UHCC enrollments grew 30.22 percent over a five-year period while the UH enrollment grew 19.50 percent overall. UHCC enrollment growth has continued through the sluggish economy.

The UH appropriation was reduced by $205 million or 23 percent over two years, 2009-10 and 2010-11. The $57.8 million in revenue from the increase in tuition and fees during that same period has somewhat sheltered the UH from the large state revenue reductions. The fiscal biennium 2011-13 UHCC operating budget restores $12,256,561 to fiscal year 2012-13 from prior-year, legislative cuts.

Through the strategic planning processes, annual program review, college inventory comparisons, and college efficiency reports, the UHCC is provided data and assessment information to establish funding priorities. General fund allocations, including requests for new funds from the State Legislature, are reviewed at multiple levels within the UH system. The Office of the VPCC also works with the Community College Council of Chancellors to review the allocations and make adjustments as appropriate, particularly during times of budget reductions. Budget decisions are carried out by the Board of Regents Finance Committee and the Board of Regents as a whole.
Findings and Evidence

Evidence exists to validate that the financial resources of the UHCC are sufficient to support student learning programs and services and to improve institutional effectiveness. The UH and the UHCC have made much progress in this area since the 2006 accreditation visit. The UH final reorganization approved by the BOR in 2005 provides a clear line of authority within the UH and between the UH and the UHCC. The Council of Chancellors provides continuous opportunities for discussion, program prioritization and funding prioritization. The UHCC Strategic Plan and the UH strategic outcomes and performance measures outlined with each fiscal biennium budget, provide clear direction to the UHCC to follow as they create their college budgets and program and staffing priorities.

Measurable student achievement outcomes and comparison data from the college inventories support and validate the prioritization of needs. Collaboration through the work of the SPC provides the UHCC with reliable and defendable data. Improvement in many areas is evidenced by the results of the comparative college inventories over time (III.D.1.a-d).

The external audit reports are positive and without material findings. The Management Discussion and Analysis (MDA) section of the audit is detailed and communicates clearly the financial position of the UH. The UH positive working capital of $287.6 million is a good measure of both the UH efficiency and financial health. The UH endowment and other investments have increased substantially over the last two years with a balance of $719.6 million at June 30, 2011. The repayment of debt is clearly outlined with a debt-service, line-item budget in place. Long-term liabilities have been addressed and other post-employee benefits (OPEB) are being funded based on actuarial studies made at the State of Hawai‘i level. The audit also validates the strong financial position of the UH in the current fiscally challenging economic environment at the state level (III.D.2.a-e). The external audit report addresses UHCC capital projects and debt if it is specific to a particular college within the UHCC. The financial statements do not separate the transactions for the UHCC from the UH. The MDA and narrative also aggregate the data and corresponding narrative for the UH, including the UHCC. There are no comments which focus directly on the operations of the UHCC separately.

Discussion of OPEB and other long-term debt, salary settlements, benefit costs and cash reserves are addressed in aggregate at the UH level. Cash reserves are strong and available should unanticipated revenue shortfalls occur or unanticipated expenditures arise. The state continues to uphold a strong commitment to maintain and upgrade the UH core facilities. Fiscal policies and procedures are in place for the UH which establish sound financial practices and infrastructure. General obligation, bond-funded, capital improvement program appropriations for the fiscal biennium 2009-11 were approximately $350 million as compared to $308 million for the fiscal biennium 2007-09. The UH issued over $292 million in revenue bonds for the purpose of funding the costs of university projects.
Conclusion
The UHCC meets Standard III.D.

Recommendation
None
STANDARD IV
Leadership and Governance

C. Board and Administration Organization

General Observations

The UH is an integrated higher education system consisting of a research university at Manoa, two baccalaureate-granting institutions at Hilo and West O’ahu and seven community colleges (including Maui). The community colleges are embedded in the UH and are led by a VPCC and referred to as the UHCC. The UHCC Office is located at the UH Manoa campus on O’ahu. Community college chancellors have a dual reporting relationship to both the VPCC and the UH president. The UHCC is governed by the fifteen-member UH BOR appointed by the Governor and confirmed by the State Senate.

The BOR for the UH sets policy; the UH president is responsible for the execution of policies and procedures. Roles and responsibilities of the BOR, the UH president, VPCC, and the college chancellors are clearly defined in the University of Hawai’i Board of Regents Reference Guide, job descriptions, and BOR policies and procedures. These delineations provide for the smooth operation of the UHCC.

The UHCC is a multi-college system integrated with a university system. The UH/UHCC was restructured in 2005 with the UH president providing educational leadership and administration for the ten campuses in the entire system and a VPCC, reporting directly to the president. Under the structure, the community college chancellors report to both the VPCC and the president. In practice, the VPCC works most closely with the UHCC chancellors and serves as an appropriate liaison to the president and the BOR. The president meets monthly with the Council of Chancellors for the purpose of providing an exchange of views and information among all chief executive officers of the UH and the UHCC.

B. 1: Governing Boards

Findings and Evidence

Two sets of documents codify the roles and responsibilities of the BOR and the UH administrative leadership: The University of Hawai’i Board of Regents Reference Guide and the BOR bylaws, policies and procedures. All are easily accessible on the UH website.

The college self evaluation reports did not address the independence of the BOR as required by the Standard, that is, whether the BOR acts as a whole once a decision is reached or the manner in which the BOR advocates and defends the system as a whole. The expectation that the BOR is to act as a whole is clearly stated in Section II.A.7 of the University of Hawai’i Board of Regents Reference Guide. The team found evidence through interviews and minutes that the board
does, in fact, meet this requirement. The BOR is protective of the UHCC as demonstrated in the formation of the BOR Committee on Community Colleges and its focus on the success of the UHCC. As stated in the BOR bylaws, the functions of the Committee on Community Colleges are the following:

- review proposals relative to policies pertaining to community colleges and make recommendations to the full board;
- review and evaluate the academic and vocational aims, objectives and activities of the community colleges;
- review, study and make recommendations to the board relative to the State Plan for Vocational Education; and
- review, study and make recommendations to the board relative to the evaluation report of the State Advisory Council on Vocational Education.

Further, the commitment of the BOR to the success of all students, especially those of Hawaiian descent, is seen as well in its advocacy and support of the Innovation Fund and the addition of the emphasis on incorporating student achievement metrics.

The BOR is responsible for establishing policies that assure the quality and effectiveness of student learning and services as provided by state law. The BOR establishes policies consistent with the mission of the UHCC as evidenced by the adoption of the UHCC System Strategic Plan (2002) and the updated Appendices A and B (2008). Agendas and minutes of BOR meetings clearly indicate that the regents have ultimate responsibility for education, legal, and financial matters for the UH and the UHCC. The BOR works directly with the State Legislature; the latter determines the appropriation to the UH once the BOR submits its budget. Community college allocations are determined in a process that is overseen by the VPCC. Meeting minutes documenting the fulfillment of these roles and responsibilities are available online. The BOR bylaws and policies clearly delineate membership and organization and BOR operating procedures. The size, duties, and responsibilities of the BOR are contained in the University of Hawai'i Board of Regents Reference Guide. With 15 members, the current BOR reflects the membership, organization and structure as detailed in its policy (IV.B.1.a-d).

There is evidence that the UHCC acts in a manner consistent with its policies and bylaws for the most part and that there is a process for updating policies. Part of this process is "policy conversion" which is detailed in the UHCC Policy Conversion Analysis chart, dated October 15, 2008. No update to this chart was provided, although interviews indicated that general policy review and revision are under way. However, there is no evidence of a regular manner in which this evaluation takes place. There are annual workshops, since 2010, in which "best practices" in general have been reviewed; however, during interviews with the VPCC and staff, there was no articulation of a mechanism to provide for and
assure a regular, consistent means of reviewing and revising as appropriate BOR policies. For example, the SET discovered that the UHCC does not have a policy addressing the Commission’s requirement in its Policy on Institutional Integrity and Ethics (June 2011), Section 7, for a complaint policy “regarding questionable accounting practices, operational activity which is a violation of applicable law, rules and regulations, or questionable activities which may indicate potential fraud, waste and/or abuse.” Conducting a regular review of policies would serve to prevent such oversights (IV.B.1.e).

The BOR has a board development program, as witnessed by the SET in attendance at the October 18, 2012, board meeting. Staggered terms of office are codified and followed. The BOR Policy Sections 2-4 detail the BOR self evaluation process. However, the team found in meeting with BOR members that not all members were aware of the self evaluation process. Policy Sections 2-4 dictate a self evaluation workshop every two years which must be announced at least three months in advance and must be dedicated solely to reviewing the work of the BOR. BOR agendas and minutes indicate a self evaluation workshop was held July 2008, but not in 2010. Additionally, explicit actions as an outcome of the workshop must be provided to all BOR members in writing within a reasonable time following the workshop (IV.B.1.f-g).

Regarding the Commission’s requirement that the governing board have and adhere to a code of ethics, the BOR is bound by Chapter 84-31 of the Hawai‘i Revised Statutes: Ethics Guide for Elected Officials, Employees, Members of Boards and Commissions. The statute contains a provision for dealing with violations of the code. The BOR participates in accreditation training and is well informed about UHCC issues involving same. The BOR participated in an accreditation training session facilitated by the ACCJC President on April 1, 2010. The BOR Committee on Community Colleges reviewed the 2012 self evaluation reports for each of the six community colleges, and the full board approved the reports on July 19, 2012, according to the minutes from that meeting (IV.B.1.h-i).

The BOR Policy Chapter 2, Section 2, provides a detailed description of the duties of the president as well as the method of evaluation which is conducted annually. BOR agendas indicate that the president’s annual goal review takes place each January. BOR Policy, Sections 9-12, delineates the process for the evaluation of managers at the executive or managerial level which includes the VPCC and the community college chancellors. Interviews indicated that these administrators are evaluated annually. The BOR participates in the hiring and evaluation of the UH president and delegates operational authority to the system president for the hiring and evaluation of the VPCC. The system president and the VPCC hire and evaluate the six community college chancellors (IV.B.1.j).
B.3: Multi-college Systems

Findings and Evidence

The UHCC Campus-System Function Map was developed in 2006 and most recently revised in January of 2012. The map distinguishes the locus of responsibility of functions between each UHCC campus, the UHCC, the UH, the BOR, and the state. The UHCC Office is working to update and revise policies. This is an ongoing process with no specifically defined cycle. The last “conversion” table is dated 2008. There is no document that gives an update on the status of revised, new, or converted policies. It is reported that a significant revision process began in 2011 which, in part, resulted in an update in January 2012 of the functional map (IV.B.3.a.g).

The UHCC provides services, fair distribution of resources, and effectively controls its own expenditures. The VPCC ensures implementation and administration of BOR policies by the community college chancellors at their respective colleges and serves as a liaison to and among the colleges. The VPCC has been particularly effective in making the reorganization of 2005 work for the UHCC, in particular, and the UH in general. Colleges report that they are represented, and evidence from meeting agendas and minutes of the BOR corroborates this (IV.B.3.b-c).

The budget is developed for the UHCC as a whole following state statute and is then coordinated by the UHCC Office. The VPCC, in consultation with the Council of Community College Chancellors, differentially allocates funds among the six community colleges in accordance with strategic goals of each college (IV.B.3.d).

An action taken by the BOR on June 21, 2005, established the classification of the VPCC in which the position was described as providing “executive leadership work in directing the overall community college system and its affairs.” The document delegates supervisorial responsibility of the chancellors of the community colleges to the position as well. The University of Hawai‘i Board of Regents Reference Guide states that coordination of the community colleges is managed by designated associate vice chancellors under the direction of the VPCC. Stated further is that the chancellor at each campus serves as the CEO and vice chancellors and other administrators have the responsibility of administering various programs and services at each college. The VPCC assures that the UHCC chancellors have full authority and responsibility to implement and administer BOR policies at their colleges, with the chancellors reporting that this delegation is, in fact, working in practice. Additionally, the VPCC visits each college twice per year to discuss UHCC goals, individual college performance and to provide a comparison of the six colleges. Faculty and staff are invited to engage in dialogue with the VPCC. These visits are well received at the colleges, with faculty and staff reporting that they feel they are receiving necessary information from a system level as well as being heard by the VPCC (IV.B.3.e).
The UHCC has begun to regularly conduct a survey of leadership (chancellors, vice chancellors, faculty senate chairs, and student leaders— the members of the SPC). This survey was conducted in 2009 and in 2011 with plans to continue to administer it every other year. Titled the “Community College Inventory Survey,” the results of the survey have been made public and are used by the SPC to evaluate strategic planning. This process is not codified in a formal manner but seems to be proceeding as described. This survey is the primary means by which the UHCC seeks to meet the regular evaluation and communication of evaluation results of role delineation and governance (IV.B.3.f).

Conclusion

The evidence indicates that the UHCC largely meets the Standard and functions effectively and appropriately, particularly given the fact that this is not just a multi-college system, but rather an integrated system of higher education. However, two areas require improvement if UHCC is to meet the Standard.

The UHCC partially meets Standard IV.B.

Recommendation

**UH Recommendation 5: Board and Administrative Organization**

In order to meet the Standards, it is recommended that the UH BOR adopt a regular evaluation schedule of its policies and practices and revise them as necessary. In addition, the UH BOR must conduct its self evaluation as defined in its policy and as required by ACCJC Standards (Standards IV.B.1.e, IV.B.1.g).