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SUMMARY OF THE REPORT

Institution: Leeward Community College

Dates of Visit: October 15-18, 2012

Team Chair: Erlinda J. Martinez, Ed.D., President, Santa Ana College

An eleven-member accreditation team visited Leeward Community College (Leeward CC) from October 15-18, 2012, for the purposes of evaluating how well the institution is achieving its stated purposes, analyzing how well the college is meeting the Commission standards, providing recommendations for quality assurance and institutional improvement, and submitting recommendations to the Accrediting Commission for Community and Junior Colleges (ACCJC) regarding the status of the college.

In preparation of the visit, team members attended an all-day training session on September 21, 2012, conducted by the ACCJC and studied Commission materials prepared for visiting teams. Team members read the college's self-evaluation report, including the recommendations from the 2006 visiting team, and assessed the various forms of evidence provided by the institution.

Prior to the visit team members completed written evaluations of the institution’s self evaluation report and began identifying areas for further investigation. On the day before the formal visit, team members spent the afternoon discussing their views of the written materials and evidence provided by the institution as well as the Midterm Report completed by the institution in 2009 and other materials submitted to the Commission since its last comprehensive visit.

Upon arrival the team found an engaged campus on all levels. The Hawaiian culture of warmth and hospitality was evident from the beginning with the gift of leis and a Hawaiian chant presented to the team. During the visit, the team met with approximately 75 institution faculty, staff, administrators, and students. Team members also met with the University President and Vice President for Community Colleges and others from the University of Hawai‘i System Office and members of the Board of Regents. The team also attended two open meetings to allow for confidential comments from faculty and staff and provided opportunity to hear from members of the college community. In addition team members attended a student forum, the Student Government, the Faculty Senate and one member met with the UH Professional Assembly President. Team members also attended a Campus Council meeting. The institution provided outstanding support to the team prior to and during the site visit. All members of the Leeward CC community were welcoming, hospitable and quite gracious.

The team found that the institution’s self evaluation report was complete and included narrative responses on all ACCJC standards. The team found that there was broad communication, participation and dialog regarding the self evaluation report. The report was well written and
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thorough. The team appreciated the imbedded links; however, some team members reported that some links were broken.

During the site visit, the team found ample supporting documentation and evidence to support its findings. The team determined that the institution is at a high level of proficiency with respect to program review and planning and achieving proficiency in the assessment of student learning outcomes. The College is performing at the “Sustainable, Continuous Quality Improvement” level of the ACCJC’s Rubric for Evaluating Institutional Effectiveness.

The team wishes to express its deep appreciation to Leeward CC. Team members have developed an affection for the institution, its faculty and staff, its mission, its abiding commitment to success and the critical role that it plays in West Oahu and the State. This team hopes that its efforts will in some way contribute to the continued success of this outstanding academic institution.
Commendations and Recommendations of the 2012 Visiting Team

Team Commendations

Commendation #1
The team commends the College on the process and development of the mission statement; the extensive dialog among all constituencies; and an on-going commitment and dedication to the linkage of their mission, strategic plan, annual program review, assessment and resource prioritization. (I.B, III.D)

Commendation #2
The team commends the College for the successful focused efforts to increase the number of graduates and transfers in all programs by 25%. This is a remarkable achievement (II.A.12).

Commendation #3
The team commends the College for extensive dialog and exploration of alternative models for student success in basic skills by implementing a variety of curriculum and support changes such as improved developmental education counseling and tutoring, and accelerated courses in English reading and writing, and the Emporium model in math, both of which shorten and focus the previous sequences. (II.A)

Commendation #4
The team commends the College for its commitment to its Native Hawaiian students and their culture and the college’s successful efforts to increase native Hawaiian participation at Leeward CC. The visible outreach and support provided by faculty and staff at the Wai’anae site and the significant institutional support of the Halau ‘Ike O Pu’uloa Native Hawaiian Student Support Program are exemplary. (II.A, II.B)

Commendation #5
The team commends the College for the implementation of student support services such as New Student Orientation (NSO), initial counseling and the Maka’ala Program, and for the increased institutional focus on student success. (II.B)

Commendation #6
The team commends the College for the dramatic change in student government and campus life since the 2006 recommendation. Not only has the College implemented a program to develop student leadership, it has embraced students’ involvement as an integral part of the campus decision making process. Additionally, in the past three years the Student Life Office has been entrepreneurial in the development of student publications and creative marketing materials inviting student participation to campus clubs and activities, thus cultivating a robust co-curricular experience. (II.B)

Commendation #7
The team commends the College for the strides it has made in shared governance since the last visit that now includes robust engagement by students, employee groups and faculty by
providing a voice to these groups in college and system wide dialogue about institutional effectiveness. (IV.A, III.D)

**College Recommendations**

*Recommendation #1*

The College needs to ensure that the course requirements for any AAS degrees are consistent with the general education philosophy as outlined in the college catalog, and in so doing, carefully consider the rigor of the courses needed to fulfill the degree requirements (ER 11, II.A.3, II.A.3.b.)

*Recommendation #2*

In order to continue to improve educational access for students at Wai‘anae, the team recommends the college move forward expeditiously to develop and execute plans for an expanded facility that will adequately serve the community. (III.B.2.)

**UHCC System 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).
ACCREDITATION EVALUATION REPORT
FOR
LEEWARD COMMUNITY COLLEGE

Introduction

Leeward Community College (Leeward CC) is one of seven public, two-year community colleges in the University of Hawai‘i (UH) System. The UH System consists of three baccalaureate institutions and seven community colleges, including UH-Maui College, which offers two baccalaureate degrees. The college offers a variety of educational programs and services on its main campus in Pearl City, at its satellite campus in Wai’anae, and through its distance education (DE) courses. While the Leeward coast and Central O‘ahu are the primary areas served by the college – a region containing approximately a third of the state’s population – students attend Leeward CC from all parts of the island of O‘ahu.

Leeward CC opened its doors in 1968 as the first community college in the state without a connection to a pre-existing technical school. The college welcomed over 1,640 students into modest buildings that once housed Pearl City Kai Elementary School. In spring of 1969, the college moved to its current location situated on approximately 49 acres overlooking Pearl Harbor.

Since those beginnings in 1968, enrollment has grown to place Leeward CC among the largest community colleges in the state of Hawai‘i with approximately 8,000 students regularly enrolled each semester in liberal arts, career and technical education, and non-credit programs.
Eligibility Requirements

1. **Authority:** The evaluation team confirmed that Leeward CC is authorized to operate as an educational institution and to award certificates and degrees. The institution is accredited by the Accrediting Commission for Community and Junior Colleges (ACCJC).

2. **Mission:** The evaluation team confirmed that Leeward CC’s mission is clearly defined, adopted and published consistent with its legal authorization, and is appropriate to a degree-granting institution of higher education and the constituency it seeks to serve. The mission statement defines institutional commitment to achieving student learning.

3. **Governing Board:** The evaluation team confirmed that Leeward CC has a functioning Board of Regents responsible for the quality, integrity, and financial stability of the institution and for ensuring that the institution’s mission is being carried out. This board is ultimately responsible for ensuring that the financial resources of the institution are used to provide a sound educational program. Its membership is sufficient in size and composition to fulfill all board responsibilities.

4. **Chief Executive Officer:** The evaluation team confirmed that the institution has a chief executive officer appointed by the Board of Regents, whose full-time responsibility is to the institution, and who possesses the requisite authority to administer board policies. Neither the district/system chief executive officer nor the institutional chief executive officer is chair of the governing board. The institution informs the Commission immediately when there is a change in the institutional chief executive officer.

5. **Administrative Capacity:** The evaluation team confirmed that the institution has sufficient administrators and staff, who have the experience and qualifications to provide appropriate oversight to manage the institution’s programs and services to implement its mission.

6. **Operating Status:** The evaluation team confirmed that the institution is operational with students actively pursuing its degree programs.

7. **Degrees:** The evaluation team confirmed that a substantial portion of the institution’s educational offerings are programs that lead to degrees, and a significant proportion of its students are enrolled in them. The institution awarded 697 AA degrees in Fiscal Year 2012.

8. **Educational Programs:** The evaluation team confirmed that the institution’s principal degree programs are congruent with its mission, are based on recognized higher education field(s) of study, are of sufficient content and length, are conducted at levels of quality and rigor appropriate to the degrees offered, and culminate in identified student outcomes. The degree requirements are listed in the general catalog as well as the website and outline 60 unit (two-year) degree programs.
9. Academic Credit: The evaluation team confirmed that the institution awards credit for all coursework based on the Carnegie unit, the standard generally accepted in degree granting institutions of higher education.

10. Student Learning Achievement: The evaluation team confirmed that the institution developed Student Learning Outcomes for programs and services. The institution’s programs are outcome based and undergo rigorous assessments.

11. General Education: The evaluation team confirmed that the institution defines and incorporates into all of its degree programs a substantial component of general education designed to ensure breadth of knowledge and promote intellectual inquiry. The general education component includes demonstrated competence in writing and computational skills and an introduction to some of the major areas of knowledge. General education has comprehensive learning outcomes for the students who complete it.

12. Academic Freedom: The evaluation team confirmed that the institution expresses its commitment to academic freedom. The institution maintains an atmosphere in which intellectual freedom and independence exist.

13. Faculty: The institution has a substantial core of qualified faculty with full-time responsibility to the institution. The core is sufficient in size and experience to support all of the institution’s educational programs. There is a clear statement of faculty responsibilities that includes development and review of curriculum as well as assessment of learning.

14. Student Services: The evaluation team confirmed that the institution provides for all of its students appropriate student services that support student learning and development within the context of the institutional mission.

15. Admissions: The evaluation team confirmed that the institution has adopted and adheres to admission policies consistent with its mission that specify the qualifications of students appropriate for its programs. These are published in the class schedule, college catalog, and on the web.

16. Information and Learning Resources: The evaluation team confirmed that the institution provides information and learning resources services to support its mission and instructional programs. The LRC is well-equipped and designed to support student learning.

17. Financial Resources: The evaluation team confirmed that the institution documents a funding base, financial resources, and plans for financial development adequate to support student learning programs and services, to improve institutional effectiveness, and to assure financial stability.
18. **Financial Accountability:** The evaluation team confirmed that the institution annually undergoes and makes available an external financial audit by a certified public accountant or an audit by an appropriate public agency.

19. **Institutional Planning and Evaluation:** The evaluation team confirms that the institution has taken an operational planning and evaluation process and a strategic/future planning and evaluation process.

20. **Public Information:** The evaluation team confirms that the institution provides a print or electronic catalog for its constituencies with precise, accurate, and current information. The mission statement is clearly articulated in the General Catalog, annual program review, and web site. The general Catalog and website also provide the public with current information on: course offerings, degrees offered and degree requirements, program length, available student services and contact information, to include email and phone numbers.

21. **Integrity in Relations with the Accrediting Commission:** The evaluation team confirms that the institution adheres to the ACCJC Eligibility Requirements and Accreditation Standards and Policies. The institution communicates any changes in its accredited status, and has agreed to disclose information required by the Commission in fulfilling its accrediting responsibilities.
Evaluation of Institutional Responses to Previous Recommendations

Recommendation #1: Improving Institutional Effectiveness

The team recommends that the college maintain the newly approved Leeward Community College Assessment, Program Review and Planning Process, standardize the terminology used in the process, and evaluate the effectiveness of the process after several cycles of full implementation. The evaluation should also include an assessment of the effectiveness of resource allocations in achieving their desired outcome. (Standards I.B.2., I.B.6., III.D.1.c., III.D.2.g., III.D.3., IV.A.2., IV.A.2.a., IV.A.3.)

The College has met the recommendations regarding institutional effectiveness. The College presents ample evidence in the form of Annual Program Review (APR) documentation and completed APRs. The assessment of Student Learning Outcomes is well-integrated into the APR for instructional and student services units. The APR process integrates planning and budgeting both in terms of the documentation generated by the process and in the committee structure that deals with the APRs.

Evidence in the form of Assessment Meeting Minutes and Convocation feedback indicates that there is considerable dialogue among faculty and staff concerning the APR process, the APR template and assessment. The College has conducted informal discussions of the APR Process, conducted a formal assessment (survey) and codified the APR process and documentation in campus policy.

Following the recommendation, the College has established a policy for APR Policy L5.202, with a glossary of terms. APR Policy L5.202 is a replacement of one previous policy. The 2005 policy replaced the 2003 policy.

The documents developed in the APR process are vetted through division chairs and administrators. Requests then go forward to Campus Council which meets three times per semester. Approved items are put into the College’s biennial budget request or fulfilled if funds are available in the current budget. Minutes of the April 18, 2011 meeting indicates that the process is followed and that staffing requests (at least) that make it through the APR are presented to the Campus Council.

An internal survey on the effectiveness of the APR process was conducted in August 2011. Results of the survey were presented to the Campus Council at the November 7, 2011 meeting and were discussed and assessed within small group discussions. No record of these discussions was included in the meeting minutes and a next evaluation was scheduled for Spring 2013. The December 5, 2011 meeting minutes indicate that there was further discussion taking place within the college community.

Conclusion: The College has met this recommendation.

Recommendation #2: Improving Institutional Programs
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The team recommends that the college, having completed student learning outcomes for all its courses and for most of the programs offered by the college, complete student learning outcomes for the remaining programs (some certificate programs and the academic support programs), and initiate or continue the process of assessing the outcomes and applying the results of that assessment to the continuous improvement of the instruction and services provided to its students. (Standard II.A.1.a., II.A.1.c., II.A.2.a., II.B.1.b., and II.C.2.)

The college reports in its self-evaluation that SLOs for 25 of the 29 student learning and support activities identified for SLO implementation, or 86%, have defined and assessed SLOs. Evidence presented in the 2011-2012 Academic Services Support Area Annual Program Review (IIC-33) support this assertion. Multiple SLOs for each of the library and learning support service units within Academic Services are presented in the self-evaluation report, and the results of the assessment of the SLOs are presented in the area APR. The APR also provides evidence that assessment of SLOs is ongoing and systematic, and that results of the assessment are being discussed and used continuously to improve instruction and services provided to students. It appears that deficiencies in the implementation of SLOs related to this standard have been substantially resolved.

Conclusion: The College has met this recommendation.

Recommendation #3: Student Leadership
The team recommends that the college implement a program for developing student leadership participation in the campus decision-making processes. (II.B.3.b., III.C.1.c., IV.A.2., IV.A.2.a., IV.A.3.)

The 2006 evaluation team recommended that the college implement a program for developing student leadership participation in decision making processes. In developing a student leadership program, the college went through a comprehensive review and set an agenda that was thorough and thoughtful in finding the right combination of resources both fiscal and human for the sustained success of student leadership. It appears that Leeward CC has met this recommendation through its allocation of personnel, a successful campaign to raise student awareness of opportunities for leadership, student engagement, and a successful training in leadership. (page 79-81) It appears that deficiencies have been resolved and that students are more engaged and involved in committees, shared governance and civic opportunities.

Conclusion: The College has met this recommendation.

Recommendation #4: Accessibility
The team recommends that the college develop and implement a plan for ensuring that campus facilities are accessible to students, staff, and community members with disabilities. (Standard III.B.1.b.)

The 2006 evaluation team recommended that the college address accessibility and implement a plan. The college has done a fine job in developing a comprehensive plan for disability access and meets this standard. It has in place a Leeward CC disabilities access plan and currently has an ongoing review with updates when appropriate. The college follows the plan through a
framework of repairs, maintenance, renovation and projects. The college consults with ADA representatives and completes the required work regarding access and also provides opportunities for individuals to inform college administration through its ADA 540 coordinator and through the Kako‘o ‘Ike (KI) program about problems or potential problems and have them resolved.

Conclusion: The College has met this recommendation.

**Recommendation #5: Administrative Reorganization**

The team recommends that the college fully implement the Leeward Administrative Reorganization which was approved by the Board of Regents in October of 2006 and, after several years of full operation, evaluate its effectiveness in addressing the college’s problems with administrative instability. (Standard IV.B.2.)

The System implemented the “new” reorganization at Leeward CC approved by the BOR in 2006. It took a while to accomplish this but currently the college is enjoying a stable administrative team. The permanent Chancellor is a Native Hawaiian who was educated locally and on the mainland. The vice chancellors were appointed also in 2008. One administrative position, a director, is not permanent at this time.

Conclusion: The College has met this recommendation.
Standard I – Institutional Mission and Effectiveness
Standard IA – Mission

General Observations
The Institutional Self Evaluation Report is of high quality and addresses Standard I clearly and thoroughly. The evidence presented in support of the evaluation is generally strong and documents the conclusions of the Self Evaluation. All of the evidence was provided electronically and was readily available. After review of available evidence, including the Self-Evaluation report, documentation regarding the creation of the current Mission Statement, examination of other College documents and extensive discussion with multiple members of the College community, the Visiting Team concludes that College is meeting the Standard.

Standard IA defines the College’s mission in terms of the students it serves, and while the mission statement mentions “all students” twice, the College is keenly aware that it serves more native Hawaiians than any of its sister colleges. The College clearly feels not only an obligation to reach out to and serve this population but to assist in the preservation and enrichment of native Hawaiian culture. This particular sense of mission gives Leeward CC an identity distinct from other community colleges in the Hawai‘i system.

Findings and Evidence
The mission statement was revised in 2012—shortened and simplified but also supplemented by a vision statement and four identified “core values.” The four-sentence statement is broad enough to encompass all the College’s educational activities, and the core values—community, diversity and respect, integrity, and open access—speak to principles underlying the mission. In the revised Mission Statement, explicit reference to basic skills instruction has been removed. However, this is not because basic skills is less central to the College; rather, it has been subsumed in the overall mission: basic skills is no longer seen as separate from what the rest of the College does.

The College has established a policy (L4.100) which codifies the purpose of the Mission Statement, required components, the process of review and revision and an approval process, which encompasses all campus constituencies. This process was initiated in 2011 for the latest revision of the Mission Statement. Documentation provided by the college in the form of meeting minutes and draft versions reflect the considerable review and attention given to this process. In regards to I-A, there is considerable evidence presented that the Mission Statement is the subject of considerable input and review involving multiple groups on campus. Policy L-4.100 (2010) establishes a process by which the Mission Statement is periodically reviewed and revised to fit changing situations. In the recent review, the College presents evidence of inclusive, college-wide dialogue regarding the Mission Statement both within the Mission Review Committee (as well as Drafts) and within numerous Campus-wide forums which gleaned input from all constituencies. Participants in the process described it as lengthy, detailed, and negotiated among many college constituencies that cared about the outcome.

As the Committee reached consensus on a near-final document, drafts were presented to four governing groups: Campus Council, Faculty Senate, Na‘Ewa Council, and Student Government.
and was shared in one open forum with faculty, staff and students seeking feedback. Suggestions for revisions were discussed and noted and the Committee incorporated these thoughts into the final draft approved by the Chancellor. (I.A.1, I.A.3)

At Leeward CC, it is evident that faculty, staff and students view the Mission Statement as more than a slogan. Besides publication of the Mission Statement on both the College catalog and the College website, framed copies of the Mission Statement are displayed in offices, meeting rooms and various other points across campus, making it something that is part of the everyday life of the campus. Discussions with academic leaders regarding planning and budgeting indicated that the College mission was one of the foremost considerations in the prioritization of requests at all levels.

The main components of the Mission Statement carry through into the current Strategic Plan of the College quite clearly. Finally, the development and implementation of the AA in Hawaiian Studies, the development of the Wai'anae Center and student life programs focused upon the needs and culture of Native Hawaiians are tangible proof of the Mission Statement as the guiding principle in College governance. Institutional Learning Outcomes (ILOs) are clearly linked to student learning and furtherance of the College mission. (I.A.3, I.A.4)

While the mandate to more effectively serve Native Hawaiian students came from the UHCC, Leeward CC faculty and staff clearly had a pre-existing commitment to these students. Many staff that work with Native Hawaiian students are themselves Native Hawaiian, recognizing the importance of role models and having the institution understand and relate to this population's unique concerns. As the counselor for the Hawaiian Studies program said, "We are dedicated to the indigenous people of these islands." A CTE instructor called the learning environment and relationships between staff and students "truly Hawaiian."

The Mission Statement reflects a strong sense of institutional identity on multiple levels: more than once, people at Leeward CC mentioned that the College began as the first dedicated two-year liberal arts college—as opposed to a trade school. Implied in this is a pride in the college's commitment to breadth and intellectual rigor.

The Self Evaluation shows the linkages between the Mission Statement (revised regularly with considerable dialogue and broad-based participation), the College's "Mission Principles" and the College's Strategic Plan. There is ample evidence provided which documents the level of dialogue and assessment which went into the creation of the latest version of the Mission Statement. The Mission Statement, the Vision and Core Values that grow out of it and the underlying Philosophy are readily accessible on the College Website.

The mission appears to be central to planning and decision-making, both in plan and in practice. The Leeward CC Strategic Plan 2008-2015 connects the College's planning to the mission statement, albeit the pre-2012 statement. The Annual Program Review process includes acknowledgment of the mission statement and is aligned with its central principles.

Learning programs and services appear to be consistent with the College's stated mission and student population. DE offerings have expanded in response to growth in student enrollment.
Existing programs show breadth, with associate degrees in arts, sciences, natural science, applied science, and teaching. The newest degree programs are in Hawaiian Studies and Health Information Technology. New development at the Wai'anae campus reflects the College's commitment to both that region of the district and to its native Hawaiian population.

Conclusion
The College has met this Standard.

College Recommendations
None.

UHCC System 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).
Standard I – Institutional Mission and Effectiveness
Standard IB – Institutional Effectiveness

General Observations
Based on examination of evidence, discussions with members of the College community and a review of the Self Evaluation report, the College meets this standard. The College engages in broad dialogue on its activities, sets goals connected to its mission, and assesses progress toward those goals. These assessments result in improvements to plans and procedures.

Since the last accreditation, Leeward CC appears to have taken steps to institutionalize both dialogue about improvement and measurement of improvement. The 2006 administrative reorganization included establishment of the Office of Planning, Policy and Assessment (OPPA), which gives the College a home for data and a center for evaluative and planning processes. The Annual Program Review (APR) process creates dialogue over assessment and planning at the program level, as each division or area engages in yearly review—including tracking levels of participation. The 2010 creation of the Student Success Committee promotes college-wide dialogue about student success. The 45-member group, comprising faculty, students, administrators and support staff, is charged with creating “a comprehensive strategy for student success.” Dialog also occurs through biannual convocation exercises and periodic open forums on college issues. In one such event, the College created a forum with roundtable discussions on how the College measures up to the ACCJC Rubric for Institutional Effectiveness.

Findings and Evidence
Dialog at Leeward CC is both structured—through offices, committees and processes—and unstructured, occurring in informal ways made possible by the College’s friendly, collegial atmosphere. (I.B.1) Many innovations occur because ideas are shared. Evidence of dialog is widespread. In interviews and forums, faculty and staff said they felt empowered to make changes and voice concerns. The Student Success Committee (SSC) began as an idea among faculty—and one administrator—returning from a conference. At an open forum, faculty and staff offered unsolicited support for the idea that the Mission Statement was conceived collaboratively, with opportunities for input from various constituencies in multiple venues over time, including forums, the Faculty Senate, the Campus Council, and so on. (I.A) One International Studies program—in Korean—arose from a student query but was developed by staff and faculty working together to create curriculum. Different college groups and programs share their ideas with each other, and often with the public—as in the Financial Fitness Fair put on by the Financial Aid Office, or the yearly Discovery Fair (which invites families on campus for “hands-on activities”). These events contribute to an open, inclusive, welcoming atmosphere. Even Leeward CC’s lecturers (part-time faculty), a constituency often disenfranchised on many college campuses, has a strong organization providing their own collegial forum.

The College sets goals for improvement, visible in its Strategic Plan 2008-2015 and in its Strategic Plan Update, July 2011. The SSC has developed goals which “directly align with the Leeward CC and UHCC system strategic plans and outcomes.” Those four goals all focus on student success: increasing graduation and transfer, eliminate “gatekeeper” courses, improving student success rates in courses, and decreasing time spent in “remedial/developmental” courses.
The SSC has a target date of 2015 for achieving these goals, and is collecting data on progress so far. (I.B.3)

Currently, the College is in the middle of a multi-year (2008 – 2015) Strategic Plan. The plan reflects extensive environmental scanning of both regional and global factors which impact the community. The current Strategic Plan represents the work of a system-wide committee as well as internal College processes. At the system level, a broad-based committee with faculty, student and administrative representatives from each campus developed the overarching goals of the program. After each meeting, the dialogue shifted to the campuses and resulting comments and suggestions filtering back to the system-wide committee. After the goals were completed, they were discussed at the College in several forums. The result was the local creation of the activities and desired outcomes as indicators of goal achievement. The resulting Strategic Plan thus encompasses system-wide goals and locally planned outcomes and activities. (I.B.2, 3)

The “ongoing and systematic cycle” of assessment, planning, and implementation demanded by ACCJC has been designed and implemented at Leeward CC in the form of their Planning Cycle. The planning cycle begins and ends with the Mission and Strategic Plan. The components of assessment, revision, resource allocation and implementation are included for both courses and programs. Data comes from multiple sources—SLO assessments, student achievement data, and demographic information. The Self Evaluation Report lists multiple program-level linkages between planning and assessment data, including resource allocation. (I.B.4, 5)

Assessment results are assembled by the OPPA on the college’s intranet and are available internally and to the University of Hawai’i Board of Regents as required by the UHCC system. In the Self Evaluation, the College feels it “can more effectively communicate assessment to external constituencies,” and plans to implement the “Tk20” system to make reporting of data easier and more effective.

Institutional processes are themselves reviewed periodically, but not to the College’s satisfaction. The College Mission is on a six-year review cycle by policy. There is significant evidence that the College has reviewed its planning process and program review processes. There is less evidence that these reviews occur on a systematic schedule. Still, both have been revised recently and those revisions have been based on assessment data. Since the last accreditation visit, the College has brought in consultants to help with internal assessment processes and the assessment of those processes. Its concern is evident in the two Actionable Improvement Plans for Standard 1.8.6 and 1.8.7. They call for the OPPA to coordinate training “to further develop practices and the use of results to improve student learning” and “review models for institutional effectiveness” to help redesign the College’s comprehensive planning process. (I.B.6, 7)

The College claims to be at the “Proficiency” level of progress with Student Learning Outcomes. The evidence provided supports this: courses, programs, and other services have identified learning outcomes and these outcomes appear to have been assessed. The assessments are quite recent in most cases. Procedures and timelines have been developed for this assessment, and the College has for some years provided extensive support for the creation and assessment of learning outcomes. The APR documents for assessed programs show that programs have not only assessed outcomes but planned changes based on those assessments. (I.B)
The evidence suggests an institutional culture that has, in a short time, created extensive dialog about learning outcomes across the College. Through open forums as well as structured processes like the APR process, learning outcomes have been explained and discussed.

The College Annual Program Review (APR) is very thorough. It effectively integrates planning and budgeting as well as providing a venue for the reporting and discussion of Course SLOs. The APRs indicate that planning and budgeting requests originate at low levels in response to student learning needs and are data driven in nature. APR information percolates up through Division Chairs, Deans and ultimately to a broad-based Campus Council with attendant sub-committees. Ultimately planning and budgeting goes onto the University system office.

Not all aspects of APR are completely clear, however, including how and when decisions are transmitted back down the chain to originators. This may be the root cause of the "communication" issues which arose in the Employee Satisfaction Survey and in Spring 2012 Convocation summaries.

The College has developed and implemented a comprehensive Annual Program Review (APR) process for both academic and non-academic units. The APR is established by College policy (L5.202). This policy clearly states five objectives for the APR, all of which are clearly designed to assess institutional effectiveness. In specific, the objectives of the policy link APR to achievement of the college mission, advancement of strategic goals and assessment of student learning outcomes.

The APR is a broad-based process, beginning with the lowest levels (academic disciplines and programs, administrative and student support units) and represents response to student learning needs and resources needed to meet the college mission. The APR process begins with the "template" (an MS Word document) which all programs use for completion of their report. This is developed by the Office of Planning, Policy and Assessment (OPPA). APRs are aggregated at the Divisional level and proceed through the College governance structure. At each level, requests are prioritized. Ultimately, the Campus Council makes final recommendations to the Chancellor for inclusion in the College budget requests and planning. The APR is very thorough. It effectively integrates planning and budgeting as well as providing a venue for the reporting and discussion of SLOs.

What the structure fails to display and what was made clear in discussing APR with Division Chairs and Deans is the significant amount of dialogue and consensus building which takes place as APRs move through the levels of College governance. Thus dialog and consensus-building makes the APR process highly inclusive and transparent. At each level, discussions are holistic in nature and reflect a sense of the College's needs in terms of advancing the Mission and meeting strategic goals. The dialog reinforces a culture of cooperation among programs and divisions and sharing of resources in advancement of the mission rather than a culture of competition for resources. One example cited in discussions with the Division Chairs was History voluntarily giving up an instructional FTE in order to add full-time faculty to the Native Hawaiian Studies program.
At the very beginning of the process, OPPA staff members meet with program report initiators and provide relevant data for the program to assist with assessment; explain the template (a 30 page document) and answer questions and provide advice.

Division Chairs regularly meet with discipline and program coordinators to discuss requests and establish priorities for budgetary requests within the Division. This dialog builds consensus at the lowest level and provides immediate feedback on prioritization of resources.

At the Divisional level, there is a strong collegial attitude among the Division Chairs. The Division Chairs meet weekly (at least) and monthly for wine and cheese. The end result is a broad shared knowledge of programs and disciplines and their relationship to the mission. The Division Chairs meet and discuss the priorities of each division and reach a consensus regarding the requests they put forward. Conversely, they are able to give a very immediate level of feedback to disciplines and programs regarding the status of their requests and the thinking behind the priority established. Ultimately, as the requests channel through Deans to the Campus Council, there is already a strong consensus regarding which requests are most critical to meeting the mission and the goals of the strategic plan.

**Conclusion**
The College meets the Standard. The APR is sound and reflects assessment and revision as a result of that assessment. It integrates planning, budgeting and SLO assessment to address student needs. There is a known and followed process by which requests for resources move forward. APR is also integrated with the Campus Council and its subcommittees further integrating planning and budgeting. Major areas of concern include planning analysis and research. (I.B.1, 4)

The College is committed to improvement and has structures and procedures in place to make those improvements. Standards I.B.1 to I.B.5 are fully met. On Standards I.B.6 and I.B.7, the college concedes that it needs to improve. It remains to be confirmed that there is a systematic way the College reviews their effectiveness in improving programs and support services. The College does, however, review their effectiveness.

Since the last accreditation cycle, the College has established the OPPA, which serves multiple functions. Individuals in the OPPA described their roles as involving communication across the campus as much as research. Within that office, the Institutional Effectiveness Officer (IEO) serves as both an institutional researcher and, increasingly (since the hiring of a dedicated institutional researcher), as an advocate for the achievement of institutional goals defined in the Strategic Plan and a facilitator for the use of data by faculty and staff. The IEO assists in the APR process. While the APR reports are long and sometimes varied in form, the IEO explains that a simplified template has been considered and—for the time being—rejected. He feels that some of the free-form nature of parts of some APR reports, including multiple perspectives, reflects the college culture: “broad-based participation is a value.”

In November, consultants will come to the college to help train “data teams” which will in turn work with faculty and staff to increase the use of data. This should help increase the college’s interpretation and analysis of data.
The OPPA points to examples where data have already driven changes. For instance, results of surveys have led to changes in criteria for meeting goals in the Institutional Plan. They acknowledge flaws in the surveys—for instance, disproportionate responses from faculty more than staff—but cite samples large enough to draw reasonable conclusions.

Some measures of institutional effectiveness are hard to analyze precisely in terms of causation. For instance, recent enrollment increases coincide with marketing efforts by the college, but also coincide with an economic downturn that may have sent students back to college for retraining or additional education. Surveys of departing graduates do not generate a large sample. The OPPA does not survey students in other ways.

In terms of Institutional Mission and Institutional Effectiveness, Leeward CC meets the Accreditation Standards. The Self Evaluation is thorough and forthcoming about the College’s efforts, and the only areas of question are Standards 1.B.6 and 1.B.7—areas where the College is not satisfied with the development of two internal processes. The College is clear and specific on its mission, and is committed to institutional improvement.

**College Recommendations**
None.
Standard II – Student Learning Programs and Services
Standard IIA – Instructional Programs

General Observations
In general, the Self Evaluation Report for Standard II.A is extremely well-written. Evidence is of sufficient quantity and quality to ensure that responses are accurate and demonstrable. The college honestly and openly documents not only their achievements but their struggles. Each section includes direct responses to the Standard and/or sub-Standard requirement. Evidence is both embedded in the text and listed at the conclusion for ease of review. Tables are accurate, well-designed and concise. Survey results are synopsized in the text and available as complete documents in the evidentiary sections.

Most recently, the institution has experienced significant enrollment growth, particularly in the Native Hawaiian student population. Concurrent with the growth, the institution has committed significant resources to improve the technology used to enhance teaching and learning, to improve instructional and computer laboratories, and to develop the Wa'anae Center which is scheduled to move to a new facility.

In the area of Distance Education, the college submitted a Substantive Change as required by ACCJC and clearly documented their rationale for the requested change and the benefit to the students. This is explicitly tied to their Mission and evidence of community need.

The college should be commended for developing new and/or innovative educational programs to better serve their students, including an Associate in Arts in Hawaiian Studies, short-term certificates specifically geared to their student populations, and the new course sequences in math and English that reduce the sequence length and increase success for basic skills students. These have been developed with encouragement and participation from the thoughtful dialog of the respective academic departments, the Student Success Committee and its Developmental Education subcommittee, and the Faculty Senate's curriculum process (onsite interviews).

The Self Evaluation Report indicates that the College is meeting or exceeding the standards in II A. Evidence provided indicates there is a thorough, regular Curriculum Review process for new and existing courses to insure that the College is meeting student learning needs. Institutional, Program and Course SLOs are regularly assessed and dialogue is conducted regarding these assessments. A review of the SLO Assessment Status Report indicates that Math and Science is dilatory in conducting course SLO

A particularly important piece of evidence in regard to dialogue, assessment and SLOs, is the report of the Assessment of the AA Degree dated December, 2011. The assessment was conducted by a broad based committee representing numerous campus constituencies. The report clearly discusses the SLOs for this degree which were assessed, how they were assessed and what the evaluation of the assessment was. Most importantly, the report is very candid about the failure of the assessment process and the need to develop a new process.
Findings and Evidence
The College presents copious evidence, in an electronic format, to substantiate the conclusions of the Self Evaluation report.

Leeward CC has taken the recommendations from the 2006 Visiting Team seriously in regards to identifying student learning outcomes for all academic courses, degrees and programs (1-38). There is ample evidence of a continuous cycle of assessment and authentic dialogue occurring both in face-to-face settings and via surveys. The programs are of high quality and aligned with the mission of the college. As the college transitions to the TK20 system they should ensure that the few remaining SLOs in Academic and Administrative Services and in Office of Continuing Education and Workforce Development (OCEWD) are completed and included in a regular cycle of assessment. (II.A.1)

A comprehensive program review process is in place and has been assessed and improved annually. Since 2007, widespread utilization of the program review (APR) has included requirements to reflect upon student learning outcomes, analyze data and link planning and budgeting to the attainment of student learning outcome goals.

Leeward CC faculty and staff routinely receive and review extensive disaggregated demographic data and use this to improve student outcomes. One-on-one tutoring, directed counseling and new computer labs offer just-in-time assistance to students requiring additional help. Distance education students are frequently surveyed to ensure that their specific learning styles and needs are met.

Opportunities for faculty professional development, particularly for those teaching distance education courses, are readily available and participation is encouraged. The Educational Media Center (EMC) along with the Distance Education Committee provides guidance, oversight and recommendations to ensure the quality and integrity of all DE offerings.

Appropriate oversight is provided for all study abroad and International student program offerings, including establishment of curricula and student learning outcomes by Leeward CC faculty using the existing college requirements, processes and parameters. All curricular processes recognize the expertise of faculty and respect for academic integrity.

The college represents itself honestly and provides clearly stated policies regarding transfer, certificate attainment, academic integrity and course and program descriptions. Student learning outcomes for the institution and all programs are readily available in the college catalog and on course syllabi Pathway requirements are clearly stated.
The UH System has 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 Liberal Arts degree. The team found some English and math degree requirements at Leeward CC are below college level and not consistent with the general education requirements as outlined by UHCC. (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 college's response to Standard II.A.7 seems surprisingly weak for an institution that is part of a system containing major research campuses. The college has adopted the AAUP Statement on Professional Ethics to satisfy subsection II.A.7.a and has a Student Conduct Code to satisfy subsection II.A.7.b, but it has not adopted more general language guaranteeing the academic integrity of the teaching learning process to satisfy the parent standard II.A.7 (such as the classic AAUP Statement of Principles on Academic Freedom). The Self-Evaluation Report response to Standard II.A.7 is a minimal reference to the faculty collective bargaining agreement.

Conclusion
Leeward CC has established clear and consistent policies and procedures and a dynamic annual program review process that requires dialog and reflection on assessments measuring student attainment.

The college meets requirements for Standard IIA and Distance Education.

College and UHCC System Recommendations

College Recommendation

Recommendation #1
The College needs to ensure that the course requirements for any AAS degrees are consistent with the general education philosophy as outlined in the college catalog, and in so doing, carefully consider the rigor of the courses needed to fulfill the degree requirements (ER 11, II.A.3, II.A.3.b.)

UHCC System 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).
General Observations
Leeward CC has done a great deal of work since its last visit in 2006, and since the subsequent midterm report. The college provides comprehensive services to its students at Pearl City and Wai‘anae.

With the mission emphasis to increase the Native Hawaiian population, one of the college’s primary principles in the revised mission statement is Access. The college provides a broad range of services to ensure students can meet their educational goals. As the college serves the largest Native Hawaiian population on the island, Leeward has created a variety of programs, courses, and support services to meet those needs. The college instituted mandatory COMPASS testing for new student placement which revealed great percentages of underprepared students. The college, recognizing this need, employed mandatory NSO and mandatory initial advising, use of STAR, and the Maka‘ala program for all students. The students at Wai‘anae have access to the Learning Resource Center, peer tutoring and to COMPASS placement testing. Further, New Student Orientation (NSO) online, Smarthinking, and counseling via Skype are examples of offering equivalent support services to students regardless of location or mode of delivery to ensure student success and access. The college demonstrates that it meets the expectation for Standard II.B.3a through its work with institutional research to determine the learning support needs of its students and to identify services to address those needs.

Evidence provided in the Annual Program Reviews demonstrates that Student Services units are using multiple means of assessment regarding the effectiveness of each unit in meeting students’ needs. It also appears that the college community has been active and taking a keen interest in developing student support services and programs and assessing them for continuous quality improvement.

Findings and Evidence
Student Services engages in assessment and program evaluation with the campus through the APR process. As part of this process, each instructional division provides feedback regarding improvements needed for students in support of their learning. Student Services uses this feedback as part of their unit analysis to guide discussions on priorities for the unit.

Given the increase in DE students, alternative modes of delivery for counseling such as Skype and additional hours were provided to increase access to email advising. To meet the needs of students at Wai‘anae, there are now two on-site counselors who assist students with registration, applications, financial aid and academic counseling. However, large increases in Native Hawaiian and Distance Education students necessitate commensurate growth in other Student Services staff as well - admissions and records, financial aid, and mental health. The College will need to reassess whether the staffing needs are remedied in a timely manner commensurate with increases in student enrollment.

(II.B.1)
The college publishes a catalog annually that includes current, accurate information on admission requirements, degree requirements, student fees, learning outcomes and policies. (II.B.2a, II.B.2b, II.B.2c, II.B.2d) In 2011, OPPA took over the catalog revision process and, with Creative Services and the Faculty Senate’s Curriculum Committee instituted a new timeline for catalog preparation to better meet students’ registration needs. The catalog is available online on the college website. Additionally, there is a mobile version that can be viewed on portable devices such as smartphones and tablets.

The previous team recommended that the college implement a program for developing student leadership participation in decision making processes. The College’s mission addresses personal development and community development, and it appears that the college has made great strides in developing mechanisms for students to find their voice in leadership as evidenced through student government, which includes a representative from Wai’anae, and student representation with voting rights on college committees.

Student life includes twenty-three clubs and organizations; the reinstatement of Ka ‘ Mana’o, a student-led regularly published journal containing student poetry, art, creative stories and essays; co-curricular activities including educational events; community building events and entertainment are just examples of robust student life that now exists at the college. (II.B.3b)

In 2009, a full-time faculty person was hired at the Wai’anae campus to increase student engagement through the development of student activities and leadership initiatives. Since then, several student-led clubs have been established that have student as well as faculty participation. In addition, one of the counselors has been instrumental in bringing student activities and events to the Wai’anae campus revolving around domestic violence issues. While student engagement at Wai’anae may be somewhat limited due to its separation from the main Leeward campus, opportunities are being enhanced with the inclusion of targeted programming and student involvement in college leadership and student government.

Further, the College has an active social media presence: iLearn@Leeward, Facebook, Flickr, YouTube, Tumblr, Google+ and Twitter. Student organizations post minutes, important college news, and social events on these sites. Additionally, student representatives on college committees use sites to disseminate surveys about issues affecting student life so they can more fully represent the student body when voting at college committees. Some survey examples are: feedback about Math Emporium, smoking in designated areas, domestic violence or veterans issues. Clearly, these various forms expand Leeward CC’s community to connect all students, especially DE and Leeward CC Wai’anae students who are not on the Pearl City campus. The college has substantially met Standard II.B.3.b.

The college has worked on assessing and evaluating student support programs and services in order to develop new services to meet students’ needs. “Initial data suggest that students who attend NSO have slightly higher success rates at the conclusion of their first semester and significantly improved persistence rates compared to historical averages.” The intrusive counseling model of the Maka’ala Program offers early-alert counseling through a structured process. The college developed this model after data collection that provided information on placement and student success in classes. Counseling unit engages in assessment and program
evaluation with the campus through annual APRs. Data gathered through SLO assessment initiated intrusive support services such as the Maka’ala program for all students, mandatory new student orientations and initial counseling sessions. (II.B.3.c.)

The SSC is critical to the institutional dialogue and partnership that occurs between support staff and instructional faculty to support student development and success. The committee represents instructional and non-instructional faculty, student and academic support services, and administration and emerged from the idea that discussion was the idea that all instructional and support programs would be more effective if they were better coordinated as a comprehensive strategy for student success. (II.B.3c)

The expansion of the Maka’ala program to all students, rather than just a small segment, was a deliberate decision in response to an increased urgency to promote student success under the umbrella of both the SSC and the self-generated intrusive counseling emphasis for improvement among the Counseling unit itself.

The mandatory NSO is conducted in collaboration with Student Life, Academic Services, and instructional faculty. In 2010, counselors were assigned to specific programs so that the students of that discipline met with the same counselor(s). Conversations with counselors indicate that having program-specific counselors increased the partnership potential with faculty while also being more effective counseling experience for students. (II.B.3c)

Enhancing and supporting students’ understanding and appreciation for diversity is reflected in the college’s mission statement. Students are introduced to the richness of the campus at the NSO session. As such, Leeward’s commitment to a culturally, religiously, and economically diverse community is made clear early in a student’s academic experience. Students also have the opportunity to participate in a wide-range of student clubs that include the Gay Straight Alliance, the Bahai Interfaith Club, the Catholic Club Campus Ministry, the Every Nation Campus Ministries, the Japan Circle, the Kahiau Hawaiian Club, and the Pacific Division Club

The Halau ‘Ike O Pu’uloa Native Hawaiian Student Support Program fosters and cultivates native Hawaiian culture through courses, speaker series, and events that benefits Native Hawaiians but also enhances other students’ understanding and appreciation of the culture. Students are able to travel abroad through the international initiatives program. Further, the English Learning Institute (ELI) attracts students from 26 countries around the world creating a rich campus community which encourages students to interact with many different types of people and worldviews. The college meets Standard II.B.3.d.

The college utilizes the COMPASS ACT product for skills assessment and course placement. Faculty have been actively involved in review of cut scores and placement procedures to ensure appropriate impact on student completions and the curriculum. In 2006, COMPASS was reviewed system-wide and new testing procedures were instituted. The office of the VP of Community Colleges is considering if a new validation of COMPASS is necessary to make sure the placement tool is still effective. (II.B.3.e)
The records are retained according to the guidelines of the American Association of Collegiate Registrars and Admissions Officers (AACRAO). Access to the Admissions and Records offices is limited to authorized personnel only. Policies and procedures regarding the release of student information is stated clearly in the college catalog and on the website. (II.B.3.f)

The Student Services area has made progress in the implementation and assessment of SLOs. Program Reviews are submitted annually by each Student Service unit. Each Program review is based on six considerations: SWOT Analysis, Last Year’s plans, SLO and Outcomes Measures, Strategic Plan Tactic, Intra-Campus Communication, and UHCC Annual Data. All Student Services units have developed and implemented SLOs and are assessing them regularly. Student satisfaction surveys are used regularly to evaluate student support services. Leeward CC has created many venues for discussion, dialog, and input from faculty, staff, and students regarding student learning outcomes and assessment. Data gathered from the SLO Assessments, student surveys, APRs, and cross-campus dialogue is critical to making improvements to Student Services units. Though this collaborative dialog was not present before, today it is palpable within the culture of the institution. The college has engaged in healthy dialog about assessment and evaluation of student support services and has allocated resources to institutionalize processes that lead to student learning outcome improvements.

The revised mission statement, convocations, surveys, and roundtables evidence a pervasive and robust dialog about student learning and student achievement. The mandatory COMPASS placement, mandatory NSO, early advising, STAR, Halau, and Maka’ala early alert program are implemented practices that support Leeward CC’s continual focus on improvement of educational quality, and student outcomes. The college meets expectations for Standard II.B.4.

Conclusion
The college has done a great deal of work since the 2006 accreditation visit.

Each Student Services unit engages in assessment and program evaluation with the campus through annual Program Reviews. As part of this process, each instructional division provides feedback regarding improvements needed for students in support of their learning. Student Services uses this feedback as part of their unit analysis to guide discussions on priorities for the unit. It is clear that the APR process has instituted a formal assessment and evaluation process that is collaborative and comprehensive in nature.

The college allocates resources, implements structural processes, and makes changes according to data gathered from formal assessment processes such as APR. while also instilling a culture of collaboration and dialogue focused on student success and access. This is commendable as it testifies to a deep and broad cross-campus dialogue that is supported by administration.

The Halau Program for Native Hawaiians, Maka’ala Intrusive Program, and Student Life office are to be commended. Student Services faculty and staff should be proud of this work.
The team finds that Leeward CC is substantially in compliance with Standard II.B. Student Services faculty and staff should be proud of this work. The Halau Program for Native Hawaiians and the Maka'ala Intrusive Program are to be commended. The team finds that Leeward CC is substantially in compliance with Standard II.B.

**College Recommendations**

None.
Standard II – Student Learning Programs and Services
Standard IIC – Library and Learning Support Services

General Observations
The self-evaluation report presents evidence that library and learning support services are be sufficient to support the institution’s instructional programs. The library provides a variety of accessible resources, as well as significant collections, and increasingly applies technology to enhance access. The Learning Resource Center provides multi-disciplinary tutoring and workshops, as well as the Kāko‘o ‘Ike (KI) program with a range of support functions for students with disabilities. The LRC also provides comparable services to Wai‘anae students, as well as web sites and a variety of online learning resources for both DE and traditional students. A separate Math Lab, which is an organizational unit of the Math and Sciences Division, provides math tutoring for Leeward students, as well as online tutoring for traditional and DE students using the Smarthinking service. It is clear that Leeward CC is responding to the developmental needs of their students through extensive learning support services in Math — through peer tutoring occurring at both campuses, as well as English and Reading—also evident through peer tutoring.

A robust technology infrastructure is managed by the Educational Media Center and the Information Technology Group, which also maintains ample computer labs for Leeward CC and Wai‘anae student use. The distance education program is also supported by the college’s technology infrastructure, and technology training and support is available for both traditional and online instructors. The Information Technology Group maintains the campus network and networking services, the Help Desk, and the Leeward CC and Wai‘anae test centers where the COMPASS assessment test is available to online and onsite students. The evidence shows that faculty and staff of the Academic Services units are making every effort to provide equivalent library and learning support services to Leeward students regardless of location or mode of learning.

A recent and very significant development related to library and learning support services is the renovation and conversion of the former library into the Learning Commons. The renovated space will enable the expansion and enhancement of college learning and support services and better meet the needs of a growing student population on campus. This project was accomplished over the last few years in response to identified institutional needs and through a lengthy and comprehensive planning process. A challenge the Academic Services units will face in the year ahead is assessing the effectiveness of the renovated space in mitigating functional problems and service gaps identified in previous APRs and implementing needed improvements brought to light through the assessment process. Another challenge facing Academic Services faculty and staff will be the proposed renovation of the third floor library, currently in the planning phase.

Findings and Evidence
The Self Evaluation Report provides evidence that the College meets standard II.C.1. Sufficient library and learning support services are available to students whether they attend classes at the main Leeward campus, at the Wai‘anae site, or online via distance education. The library’s physical collection is maintained on the third floor of the recently renovated Learning Commons.
on the Leeward campus, and library materials are routinely delivered to the Wai‘anae campus as requested. A small self-service collection of relevant materials is also maintained by staff at the Wai‘anae site. Furthermore, a wide array of electronic information resources is equally available to online and onsite students. In addition, all Leeward students have access to any of the library collections in the University of Hawai‘i system throughout the state. Similarly, each of the other units in the Academic Services area strives to meet the needs of both DE and traditional students. Tutoring is available on both the Leeward and Wai‘anae campuses, as well as online for DE students. Learning support services at Wai‘anae also include a testing center, a computer lab, a study center, and K.I disability services.

All Academic Services units participate in the Annual Program Review process, helping to ensure that educational equipment, materials and services contribute to the mission of the college. This process includes dialog with faculty and other advisory bodies. A significant contribution of the library to the mission of the college is embodied in its information literacy program, which includes reference services, online tutorials and online exams, and assesses identified SLOs. The information literacy program has been integrated into the English 22 and 100 curricula, and all students enrolled in English 100 must pass an online exam that tests their information skills. Librarians have also created a website for the information literacy program, which extends the service to Wai‘anae and DE students. Faculty and staff of the college’s Academic Services units have gone to great lengths to make sure library and learning support services are available to the fullest extent possible to all Leeward students. Service hours on the Leeward and Wai‘anae campuses appear to be adequate to meet current demand, although student feedback indicates that more hours would be welcome. Nevertheless, limited hours are augmented by online access to a wide variety of electronic resources and virtual services, all easily accessible from the college’s website. (II.C.1.b; II.C.1.c)

Library and learning support services appear to be relatively well maintained and secure. Library collections on the Leeward campus are secured by an electronic detection system and video surveillance. The consolidation of the main collection onto a single floor of the new Learning Commons has surely contributed to improved maintenance and security. A security officer now patrols the Wai‘anae facility, which provides added security for equipment, materials, faculty, staff, and students housed there. Access to networked resources and student data is password protected, and much of the equipment in the computer labs and elsewhere is on a regular replacement schedule. The Information Technology Group is responsible for maintenance and security of computer equipment, systems and the campus network on both the main and Wai‘anae campuses. The college benefits in this regard from its affiliation with the University of Hawai‘i system. Collaboration with other public higher education institutions as a member of the UH system also greatly benefits the library. Local library services and collections are augmented by system-wide purchases of electronic resources and collection management tools, as well as by a system-wide interlibrary borrowing service for books and other library materials. (II.C.1.d)

Mechanisms currently in place at Leeward CC to evaluate library and learning support services appear to be extensive and assessment plans are more than adequate. Evaluation is an integral part of the Leeward Academic Services APR and the UHCC system wide ARPD, both of which incorporate the assessment of identified SLOs. The College meets substantially Standard II.C.2. It appears from the evidence presented that evaluation processes and assessments are slightly
inconsistent across the various library and learning support services in the Academic Services area. For example, the most recent data reflecting satisfaction with library services are from a survey conducted in the fall of 2010. This is primarily due to the administration of a campus wide Employee Satisfaction Survey in Spring 2011. Results from the survey indicate 86.5 percent of faculty and staff are satisfied or very satisfied with library services. The evidence presented in Standard II.C shows no assessment of the satisfaction of DE students and faculty with library and learning support services. However, DE students are routinely surveyed for satisfaction with learning support services including the library resources. Evidence of these surveys is found in Standard II.A. (It should be noted that there is a relatively new DE Strategic Plan, which may address this gap once fully implemented.) Furthermore, in the 2011-2012 APR, only four of the seven units presented evidence of assessment of the SLOs identified in the college’s self evaluation report. An additional two units provided evidence of assessment in the 2010-2011 APR. Examination of the Academic Services APRs also reveals a perception that needs identified through the process of assessing support services often are not addressed in the allocation of institutional resources. In 2011-2012, three Academic Services priorities were funded by the college based on the 2011-2012 APRs. These priorities included the 1, 2, and 4 priorities for Academic Services as noted in the FY 2013 Operational Expenditure Plan on the Budget site on the intranet. In order for continuous improvement to be sustained, effort will be needed in these areas.

Conclusion
The college substantially complies with Standard II.C. Work remains to be done in order to ensure sustainable and continuous quality improvement of library and learning support services. The college’s Academic Services units are to be commended for the level of service and support provided to Leeward, Wai’anae and DE students. However, the team encourages the continued development and routinization of assessment activities and processes in order to garner the resources needed to make improvements. This will be particularly important in evaluating the effectiveness of the new Learning Commons in mitigating problems and shortcomings identified in previous APRs, particularly in the library. The team also encourages full implementation of the new DE Strategic Plan, which shows promise in providing a path for continuous improvement of DE support and services.

College Recommendations
None.

UHCC System Recommendations
None.
Standard III - Resources
Standard IIIA - Human Resources

General Observations
Leeward CC is one of seven community colleges within the University of Hawaii' system (UH System) which also includes three baccalaureate institutions. The college relies primarily on the personnel policies, procedures and authority, of the UH System Office as set forth by the University of Hawaii' Board of Regents (UH BOR). For State Civil Service employees, the State of Hawaii' is the highest authority.

When a position is approved by the State Legislature, funding for salary and benefit costs follows. There have been situations when authorized positions by the State Legislature do not have funding attached. These situations are rare. However when this occurs, the college is responsible to fund the salary and benefits from their tuition and fee revenue. Leeward CC may hire and fill positions that are not authorized by the State Legislature. However they must fund the position from tuition and fee revenue. Funding an unauthorized position includes the cost of benefits. (III.A.1.d)

The UH BOR establishes positions and delegates this authority to the UH President, the highest ranking system administrator. The UH Office of Human Resources ensures that the duties and responsibilities of positions fit with organizational and functional statements for Leeward CC. Faculty position criteria are defined by the UH BOR, while the University of Hawaii' Community Colleges define the responsibilities of faculty and their classification ranks derived from a faculty classification plan. Position job descriptions have academic input and review, and through this process the faculty makes recommendations to the Chancellor regarding job descriptions. A listing of agreed upon minimum qualifications for the Community College faculty establishes a consistent standard for each academic discipline and type of position.

Leeward CC has been successful and creative in establishing new positions for the college. Through a reorganization and reallocation of funds within the Leeward CC budget, the position of Enterprise Operations was established. This position oversees facility use, space utilization, parking, risk management, contracts, college phones, and emergency operations. Leeward CC is the only community college that has this position. The college was also successful in establishing the Office of Planning, Policy, and Assessment (OPP). The College was allocated a new administrative position with funding for salary and benefits for the Dean of Career and Technical Education. The College also reallocated an administrative position for the director of OPPA. The DPPA is a unique position to the community college system and Leeward CC is the only community college with this position. Leeward CC administration, faculty, and staff are creative and visionary as they lead and advance the college.

Competitive recruitment processes, interview processes, and systematic evaluations of faculty and staff are formalized through UH policies and procedures and carried out at the college. In addition, Leeward CC adheres to the six bargaining unit agreements. Faculty evaluations must be made at least every five years. Evaluations are more frequent for faculty if they are applying for promotion or tenure within the five year cycle. Administrative/Professional/Technical staff
are evaluated on an annual basis by their supervisor as are other Civil Service employees. Leeward CC’s annual APT evaluations are 100% complete and current.

Human Resource planning is integrated with the annual program review (APR) process. Each college department must complete an APR. Staffing needs are identified and justified by the departments through this process. Ultimately, if a new position is requested and approved by the Legislature, the funding for the position salary and benefit follows. The Leeward CC Chancellor may approve a position and use existing resources to fund the position, rather than using the legislative process which makes decisions based on all of the college’s submitted priorities. In these cases, the cost of benefits must be covered by the college. Executive positions are evaluated annually using the 360 evaluation. UH System HR tracks the evaluations and is accountable to inform when evaluations are due. There is regular follow up by HR to assure that evaluations are completed. The HR department is very diligent in their routine follow up on evaluations.

Findings and Evidence
All positions at Leeward CC are designed to be aligned with the College’s mission and job descriptions ensure positions support the six principles of the mission, which include access, teaching and learning, workforce development, personal development, community development, and diversity. At Leeward CC, personnel positions include executive and managerial; faculty; administrative, professional, and technical; and civil service. (III.A.)

To assure integrity and quality of programs and services, Leeward CC employs people with the required education, training, and experience, to support the student learning programs and services and improve its institutional effectiveness. The UH BOR defines faculty personnel criteria and the UH community colleges (UHCC) provide a faculty classification plan which directs the principles and goals of the Community Colleges.

The faculty classification plan was updated and approved by the BOR in November 2007. The document was updated to recognize the duties and responsibilities of non-credit Continuing Education and Training faculty members. In addition, some of the responsibilities in the areas of institutional service, professional service and public service were clarified. Also, the responsibilities of the Community College faculty as they relate to student learning were clarified and include language pertaining to SLOs. The classification plan now states that, when appropriate, faculty are responsible for designing and assessing learning outcomes, providing evidence of student learning, and working to improve student achievement and success. Designing and assessing learning outcomes, providing evidence of student learning, and working to improve student achievement and success are part of the faculty evaluation. However, it is not included in the collective bargaining agreement. At Leeward CC there was substantial dialog indicating an understanding by faculty of their role in student achievement and outcomes. (III.A.1.c)

The UH BOR defines personnel criteria for administrative, professional, and technical positions and the UH system provides a classification and compensation plan for these employees. The plan is detailed and includes position classification, descriptions, and compensation based on four levels of complexity. The UH system also provides a classification and compensation plan
for civil service positions. The plan describes positions and the state determines position qualifications. The college has created a workbook which is designed to guide staff on writing clear and accurate job descriptions to fit with the mission and functions of the colleges. Leeward CC recruits employees according to policies and procedures established by the UH BOR for executive and managerial staff and by the UH system for faculty and other administrative, professional and technical staff. The policies include steps to follow to ensure that qualified candidates are interviewed, transcripts are reviewed to assist to substantiate an applicant’s minimum qualifications, and job experience is verified. Official transcripts from institutions accredited by recognized U.S. accrediting agencies are required. A degree from a non-U.S. institution is recognized only if equivalence can be established. Jobs are widely advertised. (III.A.1.)

Interview priority is established based on applicants who meet minimum qualifications and further meet desirable qualifications. Faculty position applicants are requested to demonstrate effective teaching. Peer evaluations are one way this is judged. The screening committees are diverse, and for faculty hires will have at least one faculty who has the subject matter expertise in addition to gender and ethnicity diversity on the committees.

At present, job announcements are not specific for hiring faculty and staff for Distance Education (DE) offerings. Faculty who teach DE are selected from existing faculty. In addition Leeward CC does not require staff with DE experience to be involved with new personnel recruitment. (III.A.1, III.A.1a)

Leeward CC’s self-evaluation describes four types of staff evaluations. The four types of evaluation are designed for the employee type. Executive and managerial evaluation, faculty evaluation, administrative, professional and technical evaluation, and civil service evaluation are the four distinct evaluation processes. The UH system and UH BOR policies and the bargaining unit agreements provide guidelines for evaluation.

Executive and managerial employees are evaluated annually by a supervisor and also are required by the UH HRO to receive a 360 assessment which is a confidential and anonymous survey of peers, subordinates and others working with the employee. The Chancellor is evaluated by the UH President and the Vice President for Community College system (VPCC). The VPCC evaluates the Chancellor prior to the joint meeting with the UH President. Goals, accomplishments, strategic plans, and budget are discussed among other issues that may arise. Also, the Chancellor is evaluated on how well his college is doing relative to achieving the five funding outcome based goals. The five funding goals for the UHCC’s are driven by the UH system strategic plan and incorporated into Leeward CC Strategic plan and the APR.

The UH BOR and the University of Hawai‘i Professional Assembly which is the exclusive bargaining agent for all faculty of the UH system establish the evaluation criteria for faculty. Tenured faculty are evaluated once every five years unless they are applying for promotions and then evaluations are more frequent. Student evaluations of the instructor are encouraged. Results are summarized and presented to the faculty member. The evaluation may be done electronically or paper-based. Instructors teaching DE courses are to complete a 16 question evaluation. Faculty is encouraged to obtain feedback through peer instruction evaluations. For
non-tenured faculty, there is a requirement that at least two evaluations per semester as well as student evaluations be included.

The evaluation process for administrative, professional, and technical employees as well as civil service staff are conducted annually and at regular intervals guided by written policies and procedures established by the UH system, the UH BOR, the State of Hawai’i and the appropriate bargaining units, and the Civil Service Performance Appraisal system when appropriate. Employee supervisors perform the evaluation. The Human Resource department tracks all evaluations to ensure they are completed systematically. (III.A.1.b)

The creation and assessment of student learning outcomes for courses and programs at Leeward CC is the responsibility of the faculty. The UH through its policies and procedures formalize the faculty evaluation process and content. While the faculty classification plan for the UHCC includes language pertaining to SLOs, the UH BOR policies state that assessment is focused on institutional performance rather than evaluation. Individual faculty evaluations do not specifically include an aspect on SLO evaluation, rather, SLO assessment and evaluation is the implied as a primary focus. The UHCC tenured faculty guidelines require that faculty discuss the impact and contributions they have made toward achieving their professional goals and toward meeting their students’ needs. Faculty are expected to discuss their role in SLO assessment when they are evaluated through the contract renewal, tenure, and promotion processes. Leeward CC adopted a Policy on Assessment which requires all staff to participate in the assessment of outcome measures for academic and support areas. Leeward CC demonstrates its commitment to SLO ongoing assessment through the classification plan and assessment policy. The job descriptions require that faculty design measurable or observable learning outcomes and assess and provide evidence of student learning. The guidelines for faculty application for tenure or promotion require that it is the faculty’s obligation to clearly show how they meet the expectations of the rank and criteria at which tenure is requested. This includes their SLOs have been designed and measured. (III.A.1.b, III.A.1.c)

Leeward CC adheres to the State of Hawai’i and UH for professional ethical standards. The State of Hawai’i by mandate created a State Ethics Commission who is responsible for reviewing ethical violations, informing state employees about ethical behavior, and implementing ethical themed laws. Annually, employees at Leeward CC are required to read and sign Ethics Commission disclosure forms and Security and Protection of Sensitive Information forms. Leeward CC must also follow ethic policies from UH which define educational related ethical behavior. The educational related ethics include an Executive Policy for the Use and Management of Information Technology Resources. The UH Information Technology Office provides annual video meetings for all staff on technology security and student data confidentiality. (III.A.1.d)

Leeward CC does not control staffing levels. Staffing levels are determined by the State of Hawai’i, the UH system, and the UHCC system. The organizational structure of Leeward CC is defined by the UH organizational charts and functional statements for authorized positions. Unauthorized positions which are funded through tuition and fee revenue and have not been authorized by the State Legislature are not on the official State of Hawai’i UH organizational chart. The Annual Program Review process allows for staffing priorities and staffing needs to be
identified. The UH system determines, in dialog with the Council of Chancellors, campus priorities. The Annual Program Review tracks, on a year to year basis, the personnel requests for the college units, funding requested, and if the request is funded or deferred. Staffing is sufficient for the college operation. (III.A.2)

Leeward CC follows primarily policies and procedures generated by the UH system. The UH BOR policies, executive memoranda/policies, administrative procedures, and community college policies are all followed. Leeward CC’s Human Resource Office ensures that personnel policies are administered consistently. The Human Resource Office also is the equal employment opportunity/affirmative action coordinator and is responsible for equitable and consistency compliance with existing personnel policies and procedures.

The employment opportunity/affirmative action officer is also responsible for the employee sensitive information while the information technology specialist at Leeward CC is responsible for security and confidentiality of electronic data issues. The UH BOR directs the policy on Security and Protection of Sensitive Information. The policy addresses information that needs to be safeguarded and the consequences of compromises involving personal and confidential information. Student sensitive information is the responsibility of the dean of student services. (III.A.3, III.A.3.a, III.A.3.b)

Leeward CC’s self evaluation report states and evidence supports that the college has in place programs, practices, and services which they have named “Actions to Support Equity and Diversity.” As part of new employee orientation at the beginning of each semester, all employees review policies, legal issue, and the appropriate grievance/complaint procedures of the college related to equity, diversity, workplace violence and sexual harassment. Many campus organizations provide diverse opportunities for dialog and advocacy. Union guidelines exist to direct fair treatment of administration, faculty, and staff. The organizations represent the numerous members of the college community such as permanent and adjunct faculty, administrative, professional, and technical employees, clerical employees, and Native Hawaiian related issues. The college follows the Joint Statement on Rights and Freedom of Students for its treatment of students.

The gender of faculty and staff align closely with the gender of the student population. Further evidence shows the results of an Employee Satisfaction Survey conducted in the spring of 2011 asking if the college provided programs and practices that support its diverse personnel, 84.2 percent of those responding answered agree or strongly agree. The employment opportunity/affirmative action officer is charged with identifying and targeting underrepresented groups for hiring. This officer generates employment equity data of current personnel to determine hiring priorities. (III.A.4, III.A.4.a, III.A.4.b, III.A.4.c)

Leeward CC operates an Innovation Center for Teaching and Learning (ICTL). The college allocates resources to fund a full-time, tenured, staff development coordinator. Evidence validates that Leeward CC, through the ICTL, provides a number of programs and activities for professional, institutional, and personal development for their faculty, staff, and administrators. An ICTL Advisory committee oversees the staff development programs. It is a diverse and inclusive committee composed of faculty, staff, and administrators representing the entire
college. Leeward CC proudly notes in the self-evaluation that in 2011 they received the Institutional Merit Award from the North American Council for Staff, Program, and Organizational Development. This award recognized Leeward CC’s excellence in the delivery and impact of their staff, program, and organizational development programs and in the promotion of their programs.

The college allocates $40,000 annually for professional development programs in addition to funding the ICTL. Faculty and staff are encouraged to attend professional development events off campus as well as they are encouraged to create new professional development events and activities on campus. Many programs that have been developed at Leeward CC are shared with the entire UHCC system. Professional development programs are in place for Distance Education faculty and staff as well as programs focused on assessment of student learning outcomes (SLOs).

Leeward CC uses a standard evaluation form to assess the impact of professional development programs and activities. They use the evaluation results to improve their programs and activities to better meet the needs of their diverse staff. The evaluation includes a SLO assessment measure for ICTL and is used to identify what was learned from each professional development program that can improve SLOs. DE staff development programs are evaluated in the same manner.

All SLO evaluations are used to evaluate the professional development program through the Annual Program Review process. The college has processes in place to identify, implement, and evaluate professional development programs and continue to develop indicators of success for professional development activities relating to achievement of SLOs as part of their continuous improvement efforts. (III.A.5, III.A.5.a, III.A.5.b)

Human resource needs are identified through the Annual Program Review process. The process relies on evidence and data to drive decision making and budget priorities. A specific funding category identifies personnel and staffing needs. A position may be re-described as program needs change and evolve. A vacant position may be redirected as program needs change. (III.A.6)

Conclusion
Leeward CC meets the standard. Leeward CC demonstrates that it is innovative in its creation of new positions to serve the college students, faculty, and staff. Efficiency and safety are high priorities and have been demonstrated by the creation of the Enterprise Operations position. Recruitment, hiring, evaluation, staff development, and staff advancement are in place at Leeward CC. The college community generally seems passionate about the mission of the college.

College Recommendations
None.

UHCC System Recommendations

UHCC Recommendation 3: Student Learning Programs and Services and Resources

39
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).

Standard III – Resources
Standard IIIB – Physical Resources

General Observations
The college has done a great deal of work since its last visit in 2006. The college has encouraged a robust planning and implementation cycle to ensure that the institution provides safe and sufficient physical resources regardless of location. A Program Review process informs institutional planning and budgets by developing both current and future needs improvements related to facilities. It also has a computerized system that identifies, reports, and reviews facilities requests.

The college has a scheduled maintenance plan for facility related equipment and systems repair working through a facilities renewal resources model. The College has done a significant job in securing resources for additional space and renovations of current space including for the Wai‘anae Center. There are several processes to ensure input from the campus community to both inform and seek information regarding the college about facility needs, improvements and current projects. The College provides for an accessible, safe and secure environment.

Findings and Evidence
The college has developed an initial identification and review of facility service requests via a computerized maintenance system; daily facilitates assessments and the integration of facility planning into the annual Program Review Process. The college has done a fine job in being proactive in enhancing the awareness regarding facilities enhancements and demonstrates that it meets this standard. (III.B.1.a)

Through the annual program review process the college has approved several important renovations and modernization projects to assure effective utilization and continuing quality necessary to support its programs and services. A creation of a learning commons in the Library, renovation of the theatre, renovation in several areas in student services, the development of a model classroom, and ongoing renovation of restroom facilities have all been enhanced with modernization projects. College administration have also secured funds to build a new building at Leeward CC, allocate funds for both the current expansion of an existing center space at Wai‘anae and secured funds for the building acquisition for Wai‘anae. The College uses the planning process in place to support the development of new facilities and the renovation of existing facilities and more than meets this standard. (III.B.2.b).

The college provides access, safety and security for a healthful learning environment. There is an updated plan for Disability Access in place, elevators are in working condition and students, staff, faculty with special needs appear to be served. A high –capacity transit project will bring much needed access to the college while currently on a slower completion track will be a much
needed relief. An evacuation plan has been identified and college community members are informed. Campus security is on duty 24 hours a day 7 days a week at Leeward CC and contracted security maintains safety at the Center along with a security alarm system. There is an emergency operations plan, and Emergency Guide posted in appropriate buildings and offices. Cleary reports are published and available to campus constituents. The college meets this standard. (III.B.1.b).

The college has taken on a healthy understanding of the planning cycle as it evaluates its facilities and equipment on a regular basis. There are various committees making recommendations on capital improvements, facilities repairs and projects. The college uses this planning process through a significant dialog to make needed improvements. The college meets this standard. (III.B.2.a)

Improvements in physical resources appear to have a significant agenda regarding sustainability-related initiatives. Planning has led those efforts to make the campus an eco-friendly environment with broad based participation that includes dialog about solar energy opportunities, a yearly Sustainability Fair and Green Energy Enhancements and Leed Certified new buildings. It appears that the physical resource planning has an integrated approach with institutional planning, campus dialog, and efforts to link that dialog with planning to better serve the college as they provide for a welcoming environment with an older campus plant. The college meets the standard (III.B.2.b)

Conclusion
The college has done a fine job developing a planning process for Physical Resources and appears to meet the merits of this standard. They have worked on developing a Program Review Process, made access, safety and security a priority and have been advocates in securing new resources to remodel, enhance and build new facilities at both the main campus and at the Wai’anae Center. There is an eco-friendly sustainable program that has a focus in several areas including the possibility of solar entrepreneurial opportunities. The campus community including student government is able to be involved if interested. Dialog appears ongoing throughout this process.

College Recommendations

Recommendation #2
In order to continue to improve educational access for students at Wai’anae, the team recommends the college move forward expeditiously to develop and execute plans for an expanded facility that will adequately serve the community. (III.B.2.)

UHCC System Recommendations

None
Standard III - Resources
Standard IIIC - Technology Resources

General Observations
The college offers an outstanding array of technology and services in support of students, faculty, and the college overall. However, several items of evidence provided in support of the institution’s response to a standard did not align with or were not directly relevant to the subject matter. A few evidence links were broken.

The Information Technology Group (ITG), the Education Media Center (EMC), the library and the Learning Resource Center (LRC) provide a wide range of services in support of learning and teaching. The homepages for these and other services, including the main homepage for the college are well-designed, easy to navigate and offer useful and current information.

Laulima, the college’s online collaborative and learning environment, is well developed with many tools and resources available for faculty and students. Developed by the University of Hawai‘i using the Sakai open source platform, Laulima evolved from best practice models in support of DE/CE programs.

The various student academic services (Library, Ki Office, LRC, Test Center and Help Desk) by themselves offer excellent technology resources for students. Bringing these services together with a shared identity as part of the Learning Commons greatly enhances their value to the students as well as the college. Increased awareness and easy access to the technology offered by these services should lead to positive results in both student and college achievement.

Findings and Evidence
Leeward CC ensures that its various technology needs are identified through consultation and surveys conducted by academic support services (ITG, EMC, LRC and library). The ITG coordinator consults with divisions to review technology needs for determining a priority list. A recent priority list was provided as evidence during the external evaluation team visit to the college. The Annual Program Review (APR) process is another means of identifying technology needs.

Surveys are also used to evaluate the effectiveness of the college’s technology. Surveys from various service units were provided as evidence during the external evaluation team visit to the college.

A technology fund was created in 1999 to support the college’s technology needs. The fund is used to enhance the operation and effectiveness of the institution by assuring that computer hardware and software are upgraded or replaced on a regular basis. The acquisition of technology resources is not limited to this fund (III.C.1.a and III.C.1.c).

The academic support services provide technology training and technical support for faculty, staff and students. In particular, the EMC provides training for DE instruction. In addition to various training modules for Laulima, EMC staff referenced “Tech It Out Day” as one of the
more popular forms of training for DE instruction. The webpage for this training offered over 30 hands-on sessions of different technology tools for instruction (III.C.1.b; III.C.1.d).

Long-range technology planning is performed by the Information Technology (IT) Standing Committee. Faculty, staff and students are members of the Committee. APR’s are reviewed annually by the Committee. A letter is drafted by the Committee to the Vice Chancellor of Academic Affairs with recommendations for technology needs. The recommendations are used to create a prioritized planning list that results in an institutional plan. An IT Standing Committee letter dated March 31, 2011 was provided as evidence during the external evaluation team visit to the College (III.C.1.c).

A noteworthy item of evidence entitled Convocation Roundtable Summaries, Spring 2012 was impressive as it pertains to SLOs and institutional dialog. The evidence consisted of responses to accreditation standards resulting from roundtable discussions at the Spring 2012 Convocation. The discussions provided the college with knowledge of what it is doing well and where it needs to improve. The college’s DE Strategic Plan resulted from the roundtable discussions. Per EMC staff, the plan was completed at the end of the 2012 spring semester and a committee will soon convene to take action on implementing the plan (III.C.2).

A review of the current APR process facilitated by the OPPA to improve resource allocation decisions related to the College’s revised mission statement is noted as an actionable improvement plan (AIP) for Standard III.C.2. This AIP is shared with Standard III.A.6.

Conclusion
The College meets Standard III.C.

College Recommendations
None.

UHCC System Recommendations

IH 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).
General Observations
Leeward CC is one of seven Community Colleges in the University of Hawai‘i (UH) system along with three baccalaureate institutions. The State of Hawai‘i and the UH system are the highest level of authority over the CC’s, governed by a Board of Regents. The UH system carries out a number of administrative responsibilities on behalf of all of the UHCCs. The UH Strategic Plan provides the framework for Leeward CC’s Strategic Plan. System financial planning, budgeting, accounting, purchasing, risk management, contract management, maintenance and operations, equipment replacement and repair are UH system office functions at the highest level of the UH system. Leeward CC is responsible through their strategic planning and Annual Program Review (APR) to operationalize these areas on their campuses. Both the Board of Regents (BOR) of the UH System and Leeward CC establish policies and procedures. Those policies established by the UH system level are the highest authority. Leeward CC’s self-evaluation report identifies the areas of responsibility that resides with the college and demonstrates through evidence how operationally the college strategic plan, mission statement, (APR) and assessment are integrated and align resources to meet the mission and goals for the success of the students of Leeward CC. It is an interesting organization with several layers of authority beginning with the Board of Regents, followed the UH System, then the UHCC System, and finally the individual Community Colleges of Hawai‘i.

Findings and Evidence
Leeward CC’s mission statement, Strategic Plan 2008-2015, Annual Program Review (APR) process and Long Range Development Plan (LRDP) are the foundation of institutional planning at the college. The plans describe the long-range college goals and provide direction and stability. The planning begins at the beginning of the fall semester. All divisions and units complete APRs and submit to the OPPA. The Vice Chancellor of Academic Affairs facilitates the prioritization of instructional priorities. The State Legislative sessions begin in January. During the Spring, all unit heads submit their APR to Leeward CC’s Vice Chancellor of Administrative Services or the Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs depending on their reporting lines. The Vice Chancellors hold a day long “Advancement Day” with their unit heads and their second and third level staff to review each unit’s APR. Each unit plan is presented by the unit head and recommended priorities are described and justified to the entire group. At the end of “Advancement Day”, the administrative and academic units come to consensus on priorities that will advance to the Campus Council, next to the Council of Chancellors for their review and final prioritization to be submitted to the UH System and State Legislature.

The UHCC Strategic Planning Council creates the framework for each of the seven individual community college’s Strategic Plans. It aligns system goals and performance measures. The Leeward Community college Strategic Plan is aligned with the UHCC System and the UH System Strategic Plans to establish a focus on critical issues affecting the colleges and the State and to set budget priorities. This unified approach provides a structure for the integration of assessment, planning, and budgeting processes for the college. Identified performance measures
with benchmarks and projected targets provide evidence of the College’s progress toward meeting its strategic outcomes.

Assessment results are integrated into the APRs and used as a part of the evaluation of programs and units. All college units prepare and submit to the Campus Council prioritized lists of resources and budget requests for the improvement of college services, programs, and overall college effectiveness. The Campus Council along with administrative team of the college review the prioritized lists and validates data with input from the Information Technology and Space Management and Facilities Planning standing committees. After review and final discussions with the Campus Council, the prioritized and integrated document becomes Leeward CC’s institutional plan. From this plan, budget and resource decisions are made. The self evaluation provides evidence of decisions and their impact in the College Effectiveness Report and the comparative Community College Inventories.

Leeward CC’s strategic plan and institutional plan link financial planning to both short and midterm plans. (III.0.4) Long-term planning relies on the UH system. (III.D.1, III.D.1.a, III.D.1.c) The major revenue sources for Leeward CC’s operating budget are State General Funds, Tuition and Fees, Community College Special Funds and Federal Funds-Education Stabilization. (III.D.1.a) The State funds are appropriated by the legislature based on biennial legislative appropriators subject to the governor’s allocation. Hawai‘i’s Council of Revenues projects revenue. Increased student enrollments and scheduled tuition increases have increased tuition revenue materially in the past years. Reductions to State funding have been managed due to the increase in the tuition revenue. This balance between revenue sources provided the college with the financial stability to maintain existing funding levels for its programs and services.

In addition to state apportionment and tuition and fee revenue, a performance based funding model was implemented in 2010-2011. To receive the funding, Leeward CC had to meet or exceed five performance targets. Leeward CC met and exceeded the five performance targets and received 100% of its performance funding entitlement. The funds are part of the college’s annual operating expenditure plan. Another UHCC initiative approved in 2007 provides additional funds to the UHCCs for offering credit classes to meet student demand. Enrollment has grown by 34% percent and Leeward CC has received more than $2.9 million since 2007. (III.D.1.b)

Long-term liabilities and obligations are primarily the responsibility of the UH system or the state of Hawai‘i. Retiree benefit commitments are obligations of the State of Hawai‘i. General Obligation bond debt is on the books of the UH System and the obligation of the tax payers. Leeward CC has one long-term liability for which it is responsible to repay lease revenue bond debt for the purchase of a satellite campus at Wai‘anae. The UH system issued lease revenue bonds on behalf of Leeward CC since the individual community colleges do not have authority to issue debt independently. However, Leeward CC is responsible to repay the system for the debt service. The revenue bonds are to be repaid over 30 years.(III.D.3) Leeward CC budgets semi-annual debt service payments and has incorporated these payments in its short and long-term financial plans.
The UH system is responsible for funding building maintenance with funding requests from Leeward CC which are incorporated into a UH facility renewal reinvestment software tracking system. The facilities software management tool develops multi-year repair and maintenance schedules for the college. Leeward CC created a position, Enterprise Operations. One responsibility of this position is facility use and rent. The revenue generated from facility use and rent fees is used for repairs and maintenance needs that were not funded by the State. This revenue stream augments Leeward CC’s budget.

Leeward CC has incorporated into its annual budget and financial plan resources to reinstate a faculty salary cut of 5% percent in 2010. The 5% salary cut spanned two years. The faculty union negotiated with the UH system to reinstate the two years of 5% cuts and increase salaries by 3% in the third year. Leeward CC is committed by this agreement to a payment of $1.6 million in 2012 and 2013, and a $3.2 million payment in 2014. The college has planned for this liability in their operating budget.

Additionally, the college is planning for increased maintenance, janitorial, utility, and staffing costs associated with an Education Building currently under construction. Leeward CC has made a request for this additional funding from the State Legislature. If the request is not funded, excess tuition and fee revenue will be used to cover the costs. Leeward CC has set aside funds for this purpose should it not be funded through the State Legislative process. (III.D.1.c)

The Annual Program Review process is designed to ensure that all constituencies have adequate opportunities to participate in developing the institutional plans and budgets of the college. The budget development process and the APR process is explained on the Office of Planning, Policy, and Assessment website with results and reports online for all constituents information and review. An addition to the website in 2010 provides the details of the UH system budget process with accompanying timelines to give the college constituencies the entire process of the budgeting process and the relationship of the UH System with Leeward CC. It clearly shows that the financial planning and budget development are actually two processes. The first and overarching being the UH System that is based on the state’s planning and budgeting system and the colleges’ internal planning process that includes Leeward CC’s mission statement, their strategic plan, their Annual Program Review process and their Long Range Development Plan. (III.D.1.d)

Leeward CC has numerous avenues in place to share budget and financial information throughout the college. There are a variety of venues where budget, fiscal, planning, and audit results are communicated and shared. The Campus Council is the body that makes recommendation to the Chancellor for finalizing planning and budget matters, including program review, area plans, and budget prioritization of the college’s operational plan. The Campus Council is made up of the constituencies of the college. By the time the unit priorities are advanced to the Campus Council, most of the college community has participated in the prioritization process.

The Vice Chancellor for Administrative Services presents budget and fiscal information at the spring and fall convocations, at Division Chair meetings, Campus Council meetings and Faculty Senate meetings. In addition to formal fiscal and budget presentations, the budget and other
fiscal related information can be found on the college’s intranet. Detail operational expenditure plans are on Leeward CC’s intranet. Also, websites exist for the APR, Financial Management Information System, UHCC system budget website, and the UH website. The UH system’s Financial Management Information System includes each college’s operating budget information as well as annual audit reports. (III.D.2.b)

Leeward CC maintains a cash reserve balance in excess of what the UHCC’s reserve policy requires. The UHCC’s reserve policy requires a 5% cash reserve of unrestricted fund expenditures and encumbrances. Evidence is provided that validates that Leeward CC exceeds the 5% cash reserve requirement by a healthy amount over the past four years. At June 30, 2011, the most recent ending balance noted, Leeward CC had $3,605,046 over the required 5% of $1,898,154, or 14.5%. In addition to cash reserves held at the College, the UHCCs system has access to other sources of revenue should Leeward CC or any other of the seven community colleges need emergency assistance with cash flow. Some of these reserves are identified to cover costs that the State Legislature may not fund.

Leeward CC is not responsible to pay for insurance coverage for the college. The State of Hawai‘i, which includes the UH system of which Leeward CC is one of seven community colleges in the system, is self-insured and provides insurance policies and coverage for all State agencies. The UH Office of Risk Management administers the insurance programs and has oversight for insurance and risk management policies and procedures. (III.D.2.c)

Leeward CC has separate Funds from the General Operating Fund in their financial system to account for student activities, library, vending services, and food services. Revenue generated from scholarships and grants, donations, and fundraising activities are accounted for in accounts under the control of the UH Foundation and are subject to the internal controls of the UH Foundation. The UH has offices for Central Accounting and Research Services which are charged with overseeing grants and assuring that the grants requirements are met and grant regulations adhered to. These are not responsibilities of Leeward CC independently. (III.D.2.e)

The self-evaluation report describes the oversight of contractual agreements for Leeward CC as the responsibility of the UH system. There exist 99 UH Administrative procedures which set forth the guidelines for contracts and purchasing. Another UH Administrative procedure covers lease agreement guidelines. In addition, UHCC Policy and UH BOR Policies provide procedures on memoranda of agreement, and lease agreements. The amount of the contract determines the signing authority; whether the authority rests with Leeward CC or if the UH System Office of Procurement and Real Property Management. The threshold is $25,000. (III.D.2.f)

The UH system is externally audited on an annual basis. The external audit firm of Acuity Certified Public Accountants performs the June 30, 2011 audit. Included in the financial statements of the UH system are the statement of net assets and statement of revenue, expenses, and changes in net assets for the UHCCs. The report on Internal Controls for the UH System disclosed no material issues. The external auditors perform internal control tests on Leeward CC’s financial operations. No findings were identified. (III.D.2.a)
In July of 2012, the UH system implemented a financial information system, Kuali Financial System. The magnitude of this system implementation required a commitment of significant financial and personnel resources from the UH system and all of the CCs. The implementation is complete; however the work to tailor the system to Leeward CC administrative and reporting needs will be on-going. The college is committed to continued staff training on the new administrative software system. The Kuali administrative software system upgrade will provide a more reliable financial information system with more timely data from which to make decisions. (III.D.2.g)

Conclusion
Leeward CC meets the standard. Commendation for their on-going commitment and dedication to the linkage of their mission, strategic plan, Annual Program Review, assessment and budget needs prioritization. Leeward CC is commended for working transparently and collegially with the UH System and the other community college administrators and staff to collaborate and meet the strategic goals of the UH System and the State.

College Recommendations
None.

UHCC System Recommendations
None.
Standard IV – Leadership and Governance
Standard IVA – Decision-Making Roles and Processes

General Observations
Leeward CC is one of seven public, two-year community colleges in the University of Hawai‘i (UH) system. The UH System consists of three baccalaureate institutions and seven community colleges, including UH-Maui College, which offers two baccalaureate degrees. The University of Hawai‘i system serves as the administrative authority over the community colleges and is headed by the system president and the Board of Regents. The UH system office houses the Vice President for Community Colleges who serves as the administrative head for the community colleges and reports directly to the President. Leeward CC, as with the other community colleges in the system, develops and implements local policies and procedures to govern the college. Overarching system policies are developed at the system office and are approved by the Board of Regents.

The community college chancellors meet monthly in the Council of Chancellors with the Vice President for Community Colleges and President Greenwood. Chancellors are also part of the Council of Chancellors which includes the chancellors from all colleges and universities in the system. The community colleges, through this model, have a voice in the governance of the system as it relates to community colleges and resource allocations and policies for the system.

The self evaluation report submitted by the college was developed with broad participation by the campus community. Evidence links embedded in the text and the ability to access evidence has been very helpful. Dialog regarding the accreditation self evaluation report and the subsequent visit by the team was inclusive and pervasive throughout campus. Interviews with various campus individuals and constituencies served to validate comments in the self evaluation report regarding governance on campus.

Findings and Evidence
The Chancellor has established a governance structure that works with constituent groups to engage in shared governance of the college. Constituency groups have established committees where their voices are heard and allow for their concerns and input to be forwarded to Campus Council and the Chancellor. The College’s Shared Governance Policy # 3-30-2003 helps guide the participation of constituency groups on campus. The Organizational Structure of Leadership and Governance lists the student and staff groups represented in the new governance model. Further evidence was found in that interviewees representing faculty, students and employee groups feel they have a voice in the governance of the College and that there are processes of communication that ensure horizontal and vertical communication amongst groups. (IV.A.2.)

The three main shared governance structure constituency groups are the Associated Students of the University of Hawai‘i – Leeward CC (ASUH-Leeward CC), Faculty Senate, and Campus Council. The Campus Council is the superordinate committee on campus that includes campus wide representation. Role of these constituency groups are clarified on page #352 of the self evaluation report, however the Employee Satisfaction Survey suggests that not all employees are sure of the role of Campus Council. Though the survey suggests that faculty believe the Faculty
Senate looks out for the integrity of the instructional program and academic freedom. The Faculty Senate Charter and Bylaws, Article 1, Section 2 describes the role of the Faculty Senate with regard to areas where the Senate is primarily relied upon. In interviews with Student Government leaders, there is a consensus that the participation by students in governance has improved dramatically in the last three years. The Student Forum held on October 17, 2012 further demonstrated the involvement of Student Government in engaging in dialogue with the student community and communicating College information and programs to the student body. This serves as further evidence that validates the self-study. (IV.A.1; IV.A.2.b; IV.A.5.)

The Chancellor has further created an environment that encourages engagement in college governance that leads to creating a positive climate for learning. The creation of the Learning Commons and the development of the math emporium model are examples of innovative ideas that emerged from faculty ranks due to the environment that has been created that encourages entrepreneurship and risk taking to improve the learning environment. Further evidence of a culture of innovation is evidenced by the opportunity for faculty to secure mini-grants from the Student Success Committee to pursue goals for student success established by the Committee. (IV.A.1, IV.A.2.)

The college has further demonstrated that governance structures, processes and practices are in place to provide for an effective environment that lends itself to collegiality and collaboration in institutional governance. The college should continue to develop lines of communication to staff and students to ensure there is a perception of true shared governance and collegiality on campus and to ensure that constituent groups including students are apprised of important issues and decisions. (IV.A.3.)

Communications with the Accreditation Commission and adherence to Commission policies have been in compliance with commission policies and the college meets this portion of the standard. The college engages in grants and programs with state and federal agencies with honesty and integrity. (III.D.3.g. and IV.A.4.)

The Annual Program Review process (APR) continues to evolve and is fine-tuned on an ongoing basis as more cycles are completed with institutional effectiveness as a goal. Since the last visit in 2006 and with the implementation of the administrative reorganization, the administration, working with its campus constituency groups has undertaken efforts to evaluate the newly instituted processes and practices by initiating satisfaction surveys for both the college in general as well as a survey given by the Faculty Senate to the faculty that included questions on the role of the Senate in governance at the college level. (IV.A.2.).

On pages 156-157 under Standard IB.7 of the self evaluation report, the college outlines the process followed since 2006 to implement the new program review program to improve the planning and evaluation cycle. (IVA.5. Further review of Standard IB section pages 121-125 of the self evaluation report evidence items IB.14 and IB.15 discuss the processes for institutional discussion and the perceptions of the campus with respect to those dialogs. Eighty-seven percent of faculty stated that the round table discussions were valuable forums. (IV.A.2.a.).
Conclusion
The college meets the Standard. The college has made great strides in shared governance since the last visit that now includes robust engagement by students, employee groups and faculty by providing a voice to these groups in college wide dialog about institutional effectiveness. The college has also instituted the administrative reorganization approved by the Board of Regents approved in 2006. The administrative reorganization has brought stability to the college and has enhanced the implementation of participatory governance on the campus. The college should complete the reorganization by permanently filling the remaining interim director position.

College Recommendations:
None.

UHCC System Recommendations
None.
General Observations
Standard IV.B.1.a-3 describes the roles of the governing board, including its role in establishing policies, delegating to the chancellor (in this case President) the responsibility of exercising leadership on a day-to-day basis, and reviewing the performance of the President.

Findings and Evidence
There have been significant changes to the governance structure. The University of Hawaii is governed by a fifteen member Board of Regents. The Regents set policy and is the independent policy-making body for the UH including the community colleges. The UH system of community colleges is governed by the same regents. The current UH system organization is a result of the June 2005 Board of Regents reorganization. At that time a Vice President for community colleges (VPCC) was created. There is a dual reporting relationship whereby the chancellors report to the VPCC for leadership and coordination and concurrently report to the president for university system wide policy making and decisions impacting the campuses. All ten chancellors continue to report to the president and collectively meet as the Council of Chancellors to advise the President. The community college chancellors meet as the Council of Community College Chancellors. (IV.B, IV.B.1.a-j)

Several board members were interviewed. The board members appeared to be very much engaged with the UH. The members demonstrated a working knowledge and commitment to the mission of community colleges. They participated in the development of the self study and were familiar with the accreditation process. There is evidence of periodic reports to the Board in regard to the accreditation process. (IV B, 1, i) The Board has adopted several policies that uphold the standards of quality and integrity, while reinforcing its commitment to improved student learning. The Board has adopted and revised policies that support the College’s effort towards fulfilling its mission and ensuring institutional effectiveness as it relates to completion of course and program SLOs, institutional learning outcomes, and improved student success. (IV. B. 1.b,c) Policies and by-laws are maintained on a public website. (IV.B.1.d) The board has a code of ethics and stated process for dealing with unethical behavior. (IV.B. 1.h.) Board members were unsure of its own evaluation practices. (IV.B.1.e, IV.B.1.g.) The dual reporting relationship between the chancellors with the VPCC and University President by all accounts is working. There was a concern expressed about the retirement of the VPCC. As a long term, well respected colleague could this dual reporting relationship be maintained or be as successful. The UH President will need to plan for succession and monitor the current reporting relationship with the replacement.

The current Chancellor assumed the role of Interim Chancellor in March 2007 and then was appointed to Chancellor in June 2008. He is the first faculty member of a Hawai’i community college to assume the position of Chancellor at his home campus, and the first Native Hawaiian chancellor of the college.

The Chancellor is very adept at managing the institution. He has established an esprit de corps that is evident throughout the campus. There were many comments by faculty and staff
remarking on his openness and the climate that he has established. In addition, he developed the current administrative structure and has been able to fill seven of the eight positions on a permanent basis. In addition he established an Office of Planning, Policy and Assessment. The creation of this office demonstrates the Chancellor's commitment to data and institutional planning. (IV.B.2.b)

The Chancellor has regular, individual meetings with each Vice Chancellor. He also conducts monthly meetings with the administrative team. The Chancellor delegates authority appropriately. There is a Campus Council that makes recommendations to the Chancellor based on an institutional plan.

The Chancellor also participates in regular meetings with UH and UHCC colleagues. He is aware of policy development, budget priorities or constraints and new or revised policies. The Chancellor assures college compliance. (IV.B.2.c.)

The Chancellor oversees the budget development and meets regularly with his staff to monitor expenditures. The college has a cash reserve of three to four percent of the unrestricted fund. He takes an active part in discussing the budget in a variety of settings and always relates his comments to the planning process. (IV.B.2 d)

The Chancellor has a presence on campus and in the community. He serves on a number of boards and attends many community functions. He also encourages the college to host events and to be open, in general, to the community. (IV.B.2.e)

Conclusion
The roles of the Board of Regents, President, and Chancellor are clearly defined and followed. Appropriate delegation of authority is practiced in a positive environment. There is regular and clear communication between the UH and the college. The college meets this standard.

College Recommendations
None

UHCC System Recommendations

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).
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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, c, 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).
INTRODUCTION

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, 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
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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 (I.B.1, I.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 (I.B.1, I.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 processes 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 (ER 11, 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
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 Hawai’i 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 UH from the UHCC. 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
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STANDARD IV
Leadership and Governance

B.  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 supervisory 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).