SUMMARY OF EVALUATION REPORT

INSTITUTION: Kapi'olani Community College

DATES OF VISIT: October 15 – 18, 2012

TEAM CHAIR: Dr. Brian King, Superintendent/President
                              Cabrillo College

A twelve-member accreditation team visited Kapi'olani Community College (KCC) October 15-18, 2012, for the purpose of evaluating how well the institution is achieving its stated purposes, analyzing how well the College is meeting the Accreditation 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 for the visit, team members attended an all-day training session on September 7, 2012, conducted by the ACCJC, and studied commission materials prepared for visiting teams. The team members were divided up by standard with a lead and a second assigned to each sub-standard. Team members read carefully the College's Self Evaluation Report of Educational Quality and Institutional Effectiveness, including the recommendations from the 2006 visiting team, and assessed the online evidence provided by the College.

Prior to the visit, team members completed written evaluations of the self-study report and began identifying areas for further investigation. Via email, team members began discussing the materials provided by the College.

During the visit, the team met with over 50 faculty, staff, administrators, members of the University of Hawaii (UH) Board of Regents (BOR), and students. The team chair met with the UH president, the KCC chancellor and various administrators. The team attended two open meetings to allow for comment from any member of the campus or local community.

The self-study report was lengthy and thorough. The self-study did provide appropriate information for the team to begin its review. College staff members were very accommodating to team members and available for interviews and follow-up conversations. The College was well prepared and ready for the team's visit.

Major Findings and Recommendations of the 2012 Visiting Team

As a result of the October 2012 visit, the team made the following commendations and recommendations:

Commendations

Commendation 1: The team commends the College for refining and implementing a mission statement that reflects the commitment of the College and the Hawaii system to meet the educational needs of the native Hawaiian people. The commitment to honoring and nurturing the native Hawaiian culture is reflected in the structure and activities of programs throughout the College. (I.A.)

Commendation 2: The College is commended for its success in career and technical programs as demonstrated by exceeding all six Carl Perkins Career and Technical Education Act Health Indicators of performance standards in 2009-2010. (II.A.2.a)

Commendation 3: The College is to be commended for the depth and breadth of the programs and campus cultural activities, and the contributions of these activities to an environment that honors Native Hawaiian faculty, staff, and students and encourages diversity and civic engagement for all constituent groups. (II.A.1, II.2.d, II.3.c)

Commendation 4: The College is to be commended for the broad participation of all staff in the accreditation process.

Recommendations

Recommendation 1: In order to meet the Standard, and the recommendation made in 2006, to ensure improvements in planning processes, including program review, are integrated with resource allocations, the team recommends that the College provide clear descriptions of the planning timeline to demonstrate integration with the budgeting process. (I.B)

Recommendation 2: In order to meet the Standards, the College planning processes should be effectively communicated to all College constituencies and reviewed on an annual basis to ensure that resource allocation leads to program and institutional improvement. (I.B.4, I.B.6)

Recommendation 3: In order to meet the Standards, the team recommends that the College assess student learning outcomes for every course, instructional program, and student support program and incorporate the findings into course and program improvements. (ER 10, I.B, I.B.1, II.A.1.a, II.A.1.c, II.A.2.a, II.A.2.b, II.A.2.e, II.A.2.f, II.A.2.i, II.A.3, II.B.4, II.C.2)

Recommendation 4: In order to meet the Standards, the team recommends that the College utilize student learning outcomes assessment to support institutional planning decisions. (I.B, I.B.1, II.A.1.a, II.A.1.c, II.A.2.a, II.A.2.b, II.A.2.e, II.A.2.f, II.A.2.i, II.A.3, II.B.4, II.C.2)

3

Recommendation 5: In order to fully meet the Standards, the team recommends the College: 1) identify student learning outcomes for all student services programs, 2) assess student attainment of these outcomes, and 3) conduct dialogue to use assessment results to implement program improvements. (II.B.4, II.C.2)

Recommendation 6:

See UHCC Recommendation 3.

Recommendation 7: In order to meet the Standard, and the recommendation made in 2006, the team recommends that the College fill the vacancies deemed essential to the running of the College and remedy the time lag between the verbal commitment and an employee's start day of effected employees. (III.A.2)

Recommendation 8: In order to meet the Standard, the team recommends that the College develop a technology plan to identify technology needs and inform the budgeting process. (III.C)

Recommendation 9: In order to fully meet the Standards, it is recommended that the College clarify and strengthen the review, assessment and planning recommendation roles of the Policy, Planning and Assessment Council to better serve and inform the College community and better align governance decision-making structures with those of the UH System. (IV.A., III.D., IV.B.)

System Recommendations

Please note the UHCC report is appended to the end of this report and is made part of the College's report.

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)

4

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)

5

ACCREDITATION EVALUATION REPORT

FOR

KAPI'OLANI COMMUNITY COLLEGE

Introduction

Kapi'olani Community College (KCC) is in the University of Hawai'i (UH) System. The UH system includes 3 universities, 7 community colleges and community-based learning centers across Hawai'i. The KCC campus is situated on 52 acres located on the slopes of Diamond Head.

KCC reports that it was established in 1946 while Hawai'i was still a territory as Kapi'olani Technical School. The school was administered by the Territorial Department of Instruction. Its first program was food service. By statehood in 1959, three additional programs were added: practical nursing, business education and dental assisting. The technical school realigned its programs and became part of the open door community college system of the UH in 1965 and was renamed KCC. More than 11,600 students annually enroll in day, evening and weekend credit programs at the campus. An additional 25,000 students enroll through its extensive non-credit programs.

Evaluation of Institutional Responses to Previous Recommendations

Recommendation 1: To more fully integrate planning, the College must:

A. Define the role of the institutional research office in planning processes and use data as the basis for institutional planning (Standard IB.6). (page 69 of self-study)

In response to recommendation 1.A to define the role of the institutional research office, KCC developed and established an Office for Institutional Effectiveness (OFIE). Since formation of the office in 2006, a number of planning and evaluation processes have been facilitated. KCC's response to recommendation 1.A references two key initiatives: Planning and Evaluation Processes and Resource Development. OFIE is also involved in facilitating assessment of student learning outcomes. To help the College determine progress towards meeting ACCJC Standards for planning, program review, and assessment, OFIE crafted rubrics mapping the criteria. An important component of the effort to move the institution forward in planning is the role the system-wide office plays in setting the direction for planning and program review. Not only must OFIE work in concert with the policies and procedures of the system office (e.g., UHCCP 5.202), but the office must also communicate the processes to the KCC faculty, staff, and administrators.

The information provided by OFIE on the website and in reports supports the recommendation though the team found the OFIE website somewhat difficult to navigate. Institutional effectiveness measures and progress towards strategic planning goals are quantified and reported. A communication concern is that approximately half of the respondents to the survey regarding the actions of OFIE indicated that they were uncertain if the office facilitated certain key activities. KCC meets recommendation 1.A.

B. Refine the objectives in the College's tactical and strategic plans so they are measurable, have obtainable benchmarks and assessment methods, inform the allocation of resources, and then regularly assess progress and use the results for improvement (Standards I.B.2, I.B.3). (page 71 of self-study)

[See integrated response below.]

C. Evaluate the College's planning processes using a self-reflective dialogue that leads to improvement. (Standards IB.6, IB.7). (page 74 of self-study)

In 2008, KCC began dialog in the planning process to align the College strategic plan to the UH system's five strategic outcomes. This began a process of simultaneously developing a meaningful plan for the College while aligning with the direction of the UH system. As a result of College-wide input, the Committee to Update the Strategic Plan formulated eight strategies, each with multiple performance measures. The College further refined the program review and tactical planning processes. Departments conduct an annual review of program data (ARPD) where strengths and weaknesses in developing student achievement indicators are identified. The ARPD are supposed to provide direction for tactical planning, which in turn is to influence

resource allocation. At this point, the evidence is incomplete with regard to the linkage between ARPD/planning and resource allocation.

Furthermore, because the College is in the process of modifying their program review process (annual and comprehensive) as it relates to tactical planning, there is some confusion among department chairs and coordinators as to how the process is supposed to work. Interviews with key stakeholders provided evidence that there is a lack of transparency with regard to how resources tie back to program review. Recommendations 1.B and 1.C are partially met.

Recommendation 2: The College should complete, implement and then evaluate three curriculum oversight reforms:

A. Redesign of the curriculum approval and revision process (Standard. IIA.2.a). (page 75 of the self-study)

The College has implemented multiple curriculum reforms in response to this recommendation. These include: establishment of multiple curricula submission deadlines; addition of a "pre-submission checklist"; and the implementation of Curriculum Central, a curriculum management software program. The checklist, as confirmed by the team, ensures consultation with library and learning resources and technology resources and that planning and identification of resources occur as part of the approval process. Interviews with faculty members during the visit found that Curriculum Central has been institutionalized. The team also corroborated the fall 2011 faculty survey findings that although all course proposals are now submitted through Curriculum Central, the majority of faculty members found it to be somewhat or very difficult to use. The team found that the College had redesigned the curriculum approval and revision process and meets recommendation 2.A.

B. Full implementation of the five-year curriculum review process (Standard II.A.2.e). (page 76 of the self-study)

The team found that approximately 90 percent of all courses were current and had been reviewed within the last five years. A subset of these courses included courses targeted for revision by the College in 2009. The College reported in the self-evaluation report that only 79 percent of the targeted courses had been updated as of May 2012. It is highly recommended that the College pursue updating of the remaining 10 percent of all courses, especially those specifically identified by the College. As for evaluation, faculty survey results indicate that faculty are aware of the five-year curriculum process.

The team found that the College has a plan to bring all courses up to date and within the required five-year currency date. However, as of the team visit, the College had not fully implemented the KCC Five-Year Curriculum Review Schedule cycle (Document #654, Sec F.16). The curriculum review schedule staggers the courses to be reviewed over a five year period of time beginning 2012-2013 and ending 2016-2017.

8

The team finds that College has established a plan to monitor and implement an on-going five-year curriculum process, but has not yet completed a full implementation in accordance with this this recommendation. Fully 10 percent of courses within the College curriculum have not been reviewed within the past five years, including courses scheduled for updating and review as far back as 2009. KCC partially meets recommendation 2.B.

C. The process for establishing and validating course pre-requisites (Standard II.A.2.b). (page 76 of the self-study)

The College has established a process for identifying course prerequisites through the curriculum review process. A course proposal template in Curriculum Central requires faculty members to determine the essential skills needed to be successful in the course in order to justify prerequisites. The course proposal template guides faculty through consideration of: necessary basic skills; amount and level of reading and writing; amount and level of quantitative and logical reasoning; and necessary background knowledge to inform the identification of prerequisites.

Prerequisites may also be adjusted when courses are updated during the curriculum review process, based on achievement data in program reviews and data collected and analyzed during the course learning assessment process. (II.A.1.a and I.A.1.c) The fall 2011 survey data (Data Book Two, p. 16, Question 11) indicate that the vast majority of faculty are aware of the importance of critical reflection in identifying the essential skills needed for their students to be successful in the courses. The next step will be to demonstrate that this awareness is translating into action.

The team found that the College has completed and implemented a course pre-requisite process. However, evaluation of this process' efficacy was based solely upon the subjective measure of faculty reflection of the criticality of prerequisite skills to a given course rather than evidence of improved student success following implementation of specific prerequisites. Evidence was not provided to confirm the validity of imposed prerequisites.

The team found that the College has established practices to complete, implement and then evaluate the process for establishing and validating course prerequisites, but had not yet fully implemented an on-going validation process. As such, the College lacks a demonstrated connection for evaluating and validating course prerequisites and the improvement of instructional courses and programs. KCC partially meets recommendation 2.C and partially meets recommendation 2 in its entirety.

Recommendation 3: To create continuity and to improve communication, the College must:

A. Develop a written description of its governance structure that defines the roles of constituent groups in governance (Standard IV.A.2). (page 77 of the self-study)

The College completed a Governance at KCC document in December 2010, and revised it last April (2012) to improve its clarity and include elements pertaining to Kalaualani (a body

representing native Hawaiian faculty, staff, and students established in Dec. 2011). It is intended to guide the College in problem-solving and decision-making, using principles of shared governance. It specifies the various roles of the Authorized Governance Organizations (AGO) and includes appropriate means for all campus constituencies to provide advice (both solicited and unsolicited) on policy matters. This document specifies faculty primacy in academic and professional matters as follows: important policy decisions are the result of consultation among the BOR, the chief executive, and the faculty, among others. This decision making process is referred to under the rubric of shared governance. The faculty appears to have a more prominent consultation status than other groups with the CEO and BOR making final decisions.

The governance document also includes a description of standing councils and ad hoc committees to advise administration on various long-term and on-going College-wide issues. This document, including the organizational map, provides evidence KCC meets recommendation 3.A.

B. Finalize, implement reorganization, fill positions, and evaluate the reorganization (Standard IV.B.2.a). (page 78 of the self-study)

The 2006 evaluation report recommendation 3 addressed two specific issues for Standard IV.B when it recommended that in order to create continuity and to improve communication, the College must:

- Finalize, implement and then evaluate its reorganization and fill all acting and interim positions in a timely manner. (IV.B. 2.b)
- Record and widely disseminate recommendations and decisions of its governance bodies.

The vice president for the UH Community Colleges (VPCC) approved KCC's reorganization plan and functional statement in the spring 2009. All vacant interim positions were filled a year later. The College further completed its detailed description of the College's governance processes, evaluated their effectiveness and has engaged the College community in the development of improvement plans and the establishment of performance measures (KCC Participatory Governance).

The College has substantially met the first part of recommendation 3.B by implementing the reorganization, filling the positions and commencing the engagement of governance entities in developing improvement plans. A remaining challenge reflected in Recommendation 7 is to fill remaining vacant positions. The 2011 reorganizational related surveys were conducted to test the perceived effectiveness of the various authorized governance organizations and advisory councils. Results clearly indicate the institution's need to more effectively communicate the purposes, roles and responsibilities of these planning and governance groups. (KCC, "2012 Accreditation Self Evaluation Data Book Two, Faculty and Staff Survey Results Disaggregated by Faculty and Staff Responses" pp.62-68, Questions 43-48).

KCC appears to utilize a limited integrative process for planning and budgeting given the lack of implementation of an assessment and recommendation role for its Policy, Planning and

10

Assessment Council (PPAC). In order to fully meet Standards and conform to the tenets of the 2006 team recommendation 3, the College and the VP for UHCC may wish to engage authorized governance organizations and advisory councils in developing more meaningful integration of planning and budgeting processes.

The College has partially met the second part of recommendation 3.B by attempting to increase communication about the activities of the PPAC, Administrative Council and Faculty Senate. Evidence suggests agendas and minutes need to be consistently written and posted in a more timely order for the campus community to better understand proposed recommendations and decisions by the governance bodies.

C. Record and widely disseminate recommendations and decisions of its governance bodies (Standard IV.B.2.b). (page 78 of the self-study)

See response to recommendation 3.B above.

D. Regularly evaluate the College's governance and decision-making structures, widely communicate the results of these evaluations and use the results as the basis for improvement (Standard IV.A.5). (page 79 of the self-study)

The College relies heavily on comprehensive annual surveys of faculty and support staff to evaluate its governance and decision-making structures. The most recent survey results (from the fall 2011 survey) show that faculty and staff feel that most of the authorized governance organizations do not effectively communicate with their respective constituencies. The Faculty Senate came out most favorably, but even here only 50 percent of those faculty who responded believed that that organization was either very or somewhat effective in communication. In terms of the constituent groups' view of these organizations' effectiveness, no group registered a high degree of confidence. The most frequent response to questions of effectiveness by far was Don't know (Data Book 47 – 59). The data contained in the surveys was consistent with impressions shared by faculty and staff during the site visit.

The College surveys faculty and staff about their involvement in governance and decision-making as its means of evaluating its governance and decision-making structures. Results of the latest survey reveal that in general faculty and staff do not understand and are not very much involved in developing departmental plans. Although the departments are not directly identified in the decision-making and governance structures, activity at this level is fundamental to planning and decision-making.

Survey results, which were available to the College community, indicate that the College needs to improve communication between the authorized governance organizations and the constituencies they represent and demonstrate improved effectiveness. The College should consider developing effectiveness measures in addition to surveys to better assess its governance structures. KCC partially meets recommendation III.D.

11

Eligibility Requirements

1. **Authority:** The evaluation team confirmed that KCC is a public two-year college operating under the authority of the State of Hawai'i and the UH BOR. UH is governed by a 15-member BOR. The BOR are appointed by the governor of Hawai'i with the approval of the state legislature. Membership on the BOR is controlled by state law (Chapter 304-3, Hawai'i Revised Statutes - §304-3).

2. **Mission:**
The evaluation team confirmed KCC's mission statement was reviewed and revised as part of the process for updating its strategic plan for 2008-2015 and was formally approved by campus governance bodies before being approved by the UH BOR on May 20, 2010. The mission statement, along with vision and values statements, is broadly communicated to the public via the College's homepage and catalog page.

3. **Governing Board:**
The evaluation team confirmed that the functioning governing board for the College is the UH BOR. The Bylaws and Policies of the Board of Regents define the duties and responsibilities of the Board and its officers and committees.

   The UH BOR is an independent policy-making body reflecting constituent and public interests in Board activities and decision-making. A majority of the Board members have no employment, family, ownership, or other personal financial interests in the University. The BPR adheres to a policy governing conflicts of interest, assuring that those interests are disclosed and that they do not interfere with the impartiality of the governing board members or outweigh their greater duty to ensure academic and fiscal integrity of the University and the College.

4. **Chief Executive Officer:**
Since his appointment by the UH BOR beginning August 1, 2007, Dr. Leon Richards has been the Chancellor and Chief Executive Officer at KCC. He is a full-time administrator who does not serve on the governing board of the University system. He has the requisite authority to administer board policies.

5. **Administrative Capacity:**
The administrative staff at KCC is made up of fourteen members, nine of whom are in executive (E) positions. The administrative staff supports the services necessary to carry out the institution's mission and purpose. The administrative staff also includes a representative from Kalāualani (a governance body representing Native Hawaiian faculty, staff, and students at the campus and UH System level).

6. **Status:**
KCC is fully operational and has been in continuous service since 1946. Since 2006, KCC has experienced steady enrollment growth to more than 9,00 students in fall 2011. Resident and non-resident enrollment and tuition growth, general fund allocations, and

federal funding have helped the KCC remain fiscally sound. KCC serves a diverse multi-ethnic population seeking certificates, degrees, transfer, and personal enrichment opportunities.

7. **Degrees:**
KCC offers a wide range of courses that fulfill program requirements for Associate of Art and Associate of Science degrees or certificates. KCC offers an Associate in Arts (AA) degree, and Associate in Science (AS) degrees, Certificates of Achievement (CA), Certificates of Completion (CC), Academic Subject Certificates (ASC), and Certificates of Competence (CO).

8. **Educational Programs:**
The principal degrees of KCC are congruent with its mission to prepare students to meet personal enrichment goals, rigorous degree requirements and employment standards, and for lives of ethical and social responsibility. The degrees are based on recognized higher education disciplines, 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.

Degree programs require at least two years of academic study. Degree programs on campus are carefully and professionally developed to articulate with UH baccalaureate degree granting institutions.

9. **Academic Credit:**
KCC uses the definition of academic credit hour established in UH Executive Policy – Academic Affairs, E5.228, dated August 1, 2011. KCC also uses the generally accepted Carnegie unit as the basis for awarding credit: one semester hour (one credit) is equivalent to one hour of lecture per week. Additional equivalences also follow established practice: two hours of lecture/lab are equivalent to one credit. Three hours of lab are equivalent to one credit.

10. **Student Learning Achievement:**
All instructional programs at KCC have student learning outcomes at the degree and program level, and learning competencies at the course level. Course competencies are assessed by instructors and grades awarded based on student attainment of the outcomes. Students are required to attain at least a 2.0 grade point ratio in all the courses required for degrees and certificates.

Liberal Arts majors and other students who transfer to four-year institutions in the UH System demonstrate the attainment of the program outcomes by their success in subsequent courses. Degree, program, and course learning assessments were in the process of being integrated into ARPD in Fall 2011.

13

11. General Education:

All associate degrees at KCC require successful completion of General Education courses. Associate in Science degrees require a minimum of 15 credits of General Education: three credits in communication, three in mathematical reasoning, and three in each of the following: Humanities, Natural Sciences, and Social Sciences; the 2010-11 Catalog lists the courses in the major discipline areas. Courses required for written communication and mathematical reasoning are found in descriptions of the individual programs.

In 2009, five new General Education Student Learning Outcomes were developed and approved by the Faculty Senate and administration:

1. Thinking/Inquiry
2. Communication
3. Self and Community/Diversity of Human Experience
4. Aesthetic Engagement
5. Integrative Learning

General education course listings are found in the catalog. Course outlines for language and quantitative reasoning courses are available through Curriculum Central. KCC is actively engaged with the Association of American Colleges and Universities and uses their best practice literature to refine general education learning outcomes and develop assessment strategies.

12. Academic Freedom:

KCC guarantees its faculty the freedom to teach and its students the freedom to learn. The freedom to engage in academic inquiry and to express ideas freely are both necessary to effective and meaningful learning experiences. All students and faculty, regardless of their country of origin, are members of an academic community dedicated to the pursuit of truth and the development of critical thinking. The College has made this commitment through an Academic Freedom statement included in the College Catalog's policies and procedures.

13. Faculty:

KCC employs qualified faculty with full-time responsibilities for program development, program delivery, and learning support. Faculty responsibilities are listed in position descriptions in job advertisements, and include student advising and professional development. Faculty must meet Minimum Qualification as determined by the UHCC system.

14. Student Services:

KCC provides a range of student services consistent with its student population supporting student learning and development within the context of the institutional mission.

15. Admissions:
The admission policy of KCC is consistent with BOR policy and with KCC's mission to provide open access. Anyone 18 years of age or older, or who has earned a high school diploma or equivalency, meets the criteria for eligibility to attend KCC. Other eligibility requirements apply to high school students participating in the Running Start or Early Admit Programs, and international students on F-1 visas.

16. Information Learning Resources:
The Library and Learning Resources Unit (consisting of the Library, Open Computer Labs, and a Testing/Placement Center) supports the vision and curriculum of the KCC by providing an innovative environment for learning and research. Internet access, system wide borrowing at any UH Library, and remote access to electronic resources are provided without charge to students and faculty.

17. Financial Resources:
KCC is supported by and dependent upon multiple sources of revenue. The revenue categories include State of Hawai'i general funds, tuition and fees special funds, continuing education special funds, summer session special funds, revolving funds, grants, and donations. The funding is adequate to support student learning programs and services, improve institutional effectiveness and assure financial stability. The budget is balanced and reflects reserves in excess of 5 percent.

18. Financial Accountability:
Annual financial audits are conducted by externally contracted certified public accountants. The annual audit is performed on the UH centralized financial accounting system that services each of the ten campuses of the UH system. As part of the annual financial audit, a separate schedule is prepared for the community college campuses in order to comply with the Standards of Accreditation.

The BOR reviews these audit reports annually. The financial audit and management responses to any exceptions are reviewed and discussed in public sessions. In addition, intermittent audits have been prescribed by the Hawai'i State Legislature on specific programs or funds of the UH, including the KCC campus.

19. Institutional Planning:
Under the direction of the Chancellor, the Office for Institutional Effectiveness (OFIE) systematically coordinates and facilitates institutional planning and program evaluation for all Academic Programs and Administrative and Educational Support Units at KCC. Each program implements three-year tactical plans for improvement aligned with the College strategic plan for 2008-15.

20. Public Information:
KCC publishes an official catalog, which includes the following: general information such as official name and address, telephone numbers, and website URL; mission, vision and values statements; admission, eligibility, attendance, tuition/fee and registration

15

requirements; degrees, programs and length of programs, courses; financial aid policies, refund policies; academic freedom; and student-support services, regulations, and available learning resources. The catalog also lists College policies and procedures; as well as academic credentials of faculty and administrators and names of advisory committees and members. The catalog is carefully checked for accuracy and updated regularly. Schedules of classes and the College website include abridged versions of this information.

21. Relations with Accrediting Commission:

KCC has consistently adhered to the eligibility requirements, Accreditation Standards, and policies of the Accrediting Commission for Community and Junior Colleges, Western Association of Schools and Colleges.

Standard I- Institutional Mission and Effectiveness
Standard IA-Mission

General Observations:

The team recognized the strong and influential culture of the KCC community and how connected it is to the mission of the College. Every program and activity on campus authentically drives the College's mission, vision, and values. The College's mission statement, combined with the vision and values, encapsulates the Hawaiian culture of the community. In addition, the mission incorporates the Queen Kapi'olani's motto to "strive for the highest" (the College's namesake) and the educational ideals honored and valued by the College community. With these combined elements, the College strives for a perpetual evolution through self-reflection and improvement in establishing high standards for student learning and engagement. The mission clearly defines the College's educational purpose, the intended student population and its commitment to student learning.

Findings and Evidence:

The mission statement is generally included with the College's vision and values and incorporates the Hawaiian culture of the community within the goals of the College. The College strives to have an open access policy and to provide an exemplary education experience for the Hawaiian people. The College's mission statement includes three statements regarding student learning. These statements have three distinct purposes related to student learning: degree requirements, employment standards, and educational partnerships. It is through these statements that the College strives to provide an atmosphere of learning through effective and measureable goals. (1A.1A.1)

The College's mission statement, vision, and values are published in the catalog, the 2008-2015 strategic plan, and is viewable on the College's home webpage. This mission statement was approved on May 20, 2010 by the UH BOR. The mission statement review and revision process began in 2007 coinciding with the updating of the 2003-2010 strategic plan for 2008-2015. KCC policy (K4.200) requires the College to review and revise if necessary the mission statement in conjunction with the strategic plan at least every six years. (1.A.2, 1.A.3)

The mission of the College clearly drives the strategic planning process. To demonstrate the strong alignment of the mission and strategic plan, the College developed an alignment matrix that shows how the eleven statements of the mission statement support the six themes of the strategic plan. Every statement of the mission statement aligns with at least two goals in the strategic plan. The College utilizes this type of information to guide the development of the tactical plans for the College's administrative, academic, and educational support units. As part of the tactical planning process, units align goals of the units to the goals of the strategic plan, which align to the College's mission statement.

17

Conclusions:

The College meets this standard. The College's mission statement demonstrates the commitment to student learning and engaging by embracing the strong Hawaiian culture of the community. The mission statement is reviewed and revised as needed on a regular basis and approved by the BOR. The mission statement is included in the College catalog and website. The College's mission clearly drives the strategic planning process in which the campus units establish goals and activities based on the College's mission, vision, and strategic plan.

Commendation 1:

The team commends the College for refining and implementing a mission statement that reflects the commitment of the College and the Hawaii system to meet the educational needs of the native Hawaiian people. The commitment to honoring and nurturing the native Hawaiian culture is reflected in the structure and activities of programs throughout the College.

Recommendations: None

Standard I- Institutional Mission and Effectiveness
Standard IB - Institutional Effectiveness

General Observations:

The self-evaluation of standard IB provides a description of the recent history of strategic planning, program review and assessment of student learning. There is evidence of dialogue at different levels across the College and UH system. The College is producing and evaluating data regarding progress towards planning targets and measures of institutional effectiveness.

An important factor that currently shapes the planning process is the role the UHCC system office plays in setting the direction for establishing planning priorities and in the type and use of program review data. KCC began a dialogue in 2008 to develop a new strategic plan. During this timeframe there was a shift towards a centralized (UHCC system) reporting of academic, academic support, and student services program review data. The program review process and tactical planning processes were revised as well. Added to the new program review and planning processes was the College dialogue and development of assessment of student learning outcomes. These overlapping changes are important in a number of ways to understand the status of the institution. With a number of new processes, a need to respond to the UH system program data, and the need to integrate assessment of SLOs into the College dialogue there is an element of confusion among various stakeholders with regard to planning and resource allocation.

Findings and Evidence:

The College has established program review, tactical, and strategic planning that align with the UH system. Through the governance groups and College councils, in addition to ad hoc groups, College processes are reviewed, though there is limited physical evidence of the review and conclusions resulting in implementation of improvements. Dialogue has begun around the cycle and use of student learning data with support of faculty coordinators of assessment. Assessment of student outcomes is in place for some courses and programs. Evidence suggests that the chancellor meets with various College constituencies to inform the College, for example, with reorganization and system funding. There are four standing councils that facilitate the governance process. The key council in planning is the PPAC. This council reviews strategic and tactical plans and progress towards goals of these plans. The council also is charged with reviewing program review data and the College budgeting process. (I.B.1, I.B.4)

The current planning processes and program review are a result of evaluation and dialogue about existing processes; in particular, the program review and tactical planning processes are being revised to ensure better clarity and transparency. The current strategic plan (2008-2015), which is aligned with the UHCC strategic plan, provides six major outcomes and twenty-nine performance measures. The institution reflects on progress towards these goals with the strategic plan scorecard. Individual departments completed tactical plans for the recent time period 2009-2012, which identify strategies and performance measures for the specific units. Academic and student services use data provided from the UH system office for annual planning (ARPDs),

while academic support and administrative services use local data. Because the current process includes departmental tactical plans for the timeframe 2009-2012, it is not clear how well the yet to be implemented new process will work to make programmatic or institutional improvements. Indicators of improvement made are needed. (I.B.1, I.B.2) The planning processes for the most part appears to be inclusive, though less so for staff. (I.B.1, I.B.4)

To assess progress towards achieving goals there are a number of planning mechanisms (limited to academic and student services). Annually, data provided from the system office are provided to academic units in the area of demand, efficiency, and effectiveness; CTE programs also evaluate Perkins Core Indicators. The data are scored by a rubric to characterize programs as healthy, cautionary, or unhealthy. In response to these data and scores, programs develop strategies for improvement or maintenance. Student service programs develop their own local measures aligned with those in academic affairs, though there is no rubric for scoring their performance.

KCC requires that programs complete a comprehensive program review (CPR) every three years, the scope of the CPR is 2009 – 2012. The next update is scheduled to occur in 2012 – 2013. The UHCC Instructional Program Review Council (IPRC) oversees the review of instructional programs at all the community colleges, yet it does not provide input into the linkage between program review and resource allocation. (I.B.3)

In addition to programmatic level planning and evaluation, the College employs institutional level qualitative and quantitative data for student achievement indicators. (I.B.3) Every two years the College conducts the Community College Survey of Student Engagement (CCSSE) to measure five areas of engagement. Quantitative data are measured through the Institutional Effectiveness Measures (IEM). The self-evaluation reports progress on the strategic plan progress towards outcomes, as well as progress on the IEMs, and has identified areas that need improvement. (I.B.2, I.B.3, I.B.4)

Evidence that the College reviews and evaluates the planning and resource allocation processes is limited. The Institutional Improvement Matrix was developed by the OFIE to align planning processes, but it is not an evaluation tool. As a result of evaluation of program review and tactical planning, it was determined the CPRs should be tied to tactical planning in the future. Going forward, the College indicates that effectiveness of planning will be reviewed by the PPAC annually (I.B.6). Cited evidence of evaluation planning is a document, "Evaluating our Evaluation Systems", yet interviews with PPAC members did not support the claim. Likewise there is limited evidence that the College assesses its evaluation mechanisms. Evaluation of the effectiveness of the planning process is conducted through review of the strategic planning scorecard, which is tied to the actual outcomes, but not necessarily the cycle of planning processes. The system office will be responsible to review the measures and content of program review; evidence that this has taken place is limited. (I.B.7)

The linkage between planning, program review and resource allocation is not well connected. The self-evaluation provides examples of spending and sources of funds, but there is no specific linkage between program review resource needs and resource allocations beyond verbal

20

narration. Because assessment of student learning has not been included in program review in a systematic way, there is no linkage between results of assessment and resource allocation. (I.B.3, I.B.4)

Conclusions:

The College partially meets this standard. The College should be commended for providing support for the OFIE, which provides useful data for evaluation of strategic planning. The College is encouraged to provide training in the use of data, as it is clear from the survey results and interviews that there is not broad scale understanding of how to use data and where to find it. However, there appears to be an unclear link between resource allocation and planning. The self-evaluation states that PPAC is where planning and budgeting recommendations take place, yet faculty members of PPAC could not confirm this assertion. Nor are there minutes to evidence and provide transparency into the planning and budgeting processes. Assessment of student learning outcomes has started, but is not fully implemented across all programs and is just now being integrated into program review. To a large extent the new planning process is a work in progress and the impact and effectiveness are not fully determined.

Recommendations

Recommendation 1: In order to meet the Standard, and the recommendation made in 2006, to ensure improvements in planning processes, including program review, are integrated with resource allocations, the team recommends that the College provide clear descriptions of the planning timeline to demonstrate integration with the budgeting process. (I.B)

Recommendation 2: In order to meet the Standards, the College planning processes should be effectively communicated to all College constituencies and reviewed on an annual basis to ensure that resource allocation leads to program and institutional improvement. (I.B.4, I.B.6)

21

Standard II- Student Learning Programs and Services
Standard IIA – Instructional Programs

General Observations:

KCC is a comprehensive community college offering a wide variety of general education, career technical, developmental, and transfer programs. It is highly regarded for the quality of its instructional offerings and is a statewide leader in Hospitality, Culinary Arts and Tourism; Nursing and Health Sciences; Hawaiian Studies and Science; and Technology, Engineering, and Math (STEM). The College is the largest community college of seven, and transfers a large number of its students to the UH four year universities. The College's General Education Student Learning Outcomes reflect the institution's service as a Native Hawaiian serving institution and stress core graduation competencies in the areas of thinking/inquiry, communication, self and community, aesthetic engagement, and integrative learning.

Findings and Evidence:

The team verified that the College offers high quality instructional programs in recognized fields of study that culminate in identified student learning outcomes leading to degrees, certificates, employment, or transfer to other higher education institutions or programs consistent with its mission. (II.A)

The team found the College programs reflected both breadth and depth typical for a comprehensive community college of its size and complexity. The College has also identified and established specific programs, support services and initiatives that will help preserve the state's native language and culture and support the diverse student population. The College has the largest transfer liberal arts program in the system; an exemplary Associate in Science in Natural Science (ASNS) degree for students preparing to transfer to four-year programs; innovative Science, Technology, Engineering and Mathematics (STEM) program; model programs in Nursing and Health Sciences; and robust career technical programs such as Hospitality and Tourism, and Culinary Arts.

The College offers all programs at the KCC main campus on Oahu, with nursing offered at satellite campuses at Leeward and Windward Community Colleges. KCC is unique in that it serves as the statewide training center for Health Sciences and the Emergency Medical Services program and is the only one in the UH System to offer Paralegal Education, Travel and Tourism Operation Management, Exercise and Sport Science, and Biotechnician. The College offers multiple delivery modalities including traditional classroom-based, hybrid, online, internet and television. It has significantly increased the number of distance education sections taught online over the past several years. The number of sections offered in an online or hybrid mode essentially doubled between fall 2008 and fall 2010, and now representing approximately 18 percent of all courses offered.

The team found that the institution has made exemplary strides to meet the varied educational needs of its students consistent with their demographics. The College relies heavily on research

22

and analysis to identify and provide programs and services in support of student needs. Comprehensive Program Reviews (CPR) are completed every three years and are current for all programs, and each program receives an annual update as an ARPD report. It must be noted, however, that student learning outcomes assessments have not been a part of the program review or institutional planning processes. SLOs are scheduled to be included in CPRs or ARPDs beginning fall 2012.

The College employs a myriad of data sources to identify student learning needs and track the achievement of stated learning outcomes. As examples, the Community College Survey of Student Engagement (CCSSE) results are integrated into the measures of institutional effectiveness for course success, persistence, and academic progress. The College's Achieving the Dream (AtD) national initiative from 2007 to 2011 provided data that informed the design of targeted interventions to improve success in remedial/developmental math and English courses, especially Native Hawaiians. Carl Perkins Career and Technical Education Act Core Indicators indicated that KCC was the only campus in the seven-campus UHCC system to exceed all established goals.

Of particular note is the College's recognition of its role in serving Native Hawaiian students and its integration of the principles of Native Hawaiian learning into the curriculum and governance structure. The College is also particularly adept at meeting the needs of students through program development that supports both the demographics and economy of its community. As an example, to attract Native Hawaiians and other underrepresented into areas of workforce need, the College developed a rigorous transfer program based upon the principles of Native Hawaiian learning to increase the number of STEM graduates. The program adopted an evidence-based approach resulting in a dramatic increase in the number of students majoring in natural science. In response to the Second Decade Project (SDP) report which projected future industries and workforce shortages, KCC developed a New Media Arts program, added courses to its historic hospitality program, added satellite programs in Nursing at Leeward and Windward community colleges, and developed articulation agreements with the UH at Manoa for teacher preparation pathways. (II A.1.a)

The College offers a variety of instructional delivery systems including traditional classroom based, online, hybrid, televised courses with online support, and internet learning. Distance education activities are integrated into the College's mission statement and planning processes. These alternative delivery strategies now comprise approximately 18 percent of enrolled students and are the result of a focused strategy to increase online enrollment and ease enrollment pressures. Over 50 percent of the courses for liberal arts and business degrees and certificates may now be taken via distance learning in order to reach students in underserved regions and students who are unable to come to the campus. The College reviews suggested methods of instruction and delivery during the curriculum review process and then utilizes student success data to compare the effectiveness of alternate modes of instruction following implementation.

Conflicting data pertaining to the comparative rates of student success, completion, and withdrawal between online students and those enrolled in traditional face-to-face courses was found in the College's OFIE website, posted under KCC distance education report for academic

23

years 2008-2012 and the self-evaluation report (page 134). This makes the data more difficult to use for college planning and decision-making. (II.A.1.b)

At the time of the accreditation visit, the College had established outcomes for all courses and instructional programs for all delivery modes but had not yet completed a full assessment cycle. Course student learning outcomes are referred to as course competencies rather than course learning outcomes. This inconsistency makes it difficult for some faculty, and potentially students, to recognize course outcomes and may make the assessment process more complicated than needed.

As provided to the team during the visit, 66 percent of courses and 100 percent of programs had been assessed. The self-evaluation report states that, "All programs are scheduled to complete the first cycle of assessment by fall 2012" and that assessments for programs and courses will be included in the fall 2012 ARPDs and CPRs. Several programs had, however, begun assessments and use of the findings to improve student learning. Programs of note include the Cornerstone Project, a piloted interdisciplinary approach to assessing students in their final semester of the liberal arts degree; Hospitality, Travel and Tourism; Marketing; and the Health Sciences.

The team finds that College has established an institutional framework and organizational structure to support the continued development and implementation of assessment results. However, the College did not provide evidence that institutional decision-making includes dialogue on the results of student learning outcomes assessment. At the time of the visit evidence was not presented that could confirm "widespread institutional dialogue about the results of assessment."

The College states that it is, "...at the Proficiency Level for Student Learning Outcomes Assessment" (page 70, 2012 Accreditation Self Evaluation) and that it "Meets the standard." The team finds that insufficient evidence was presented to support these statements and concurs with the College's Actionable Improvement Plan to, "...continue to develop student learning outcomes and assessment strategies for those courses and programs that have fallen behind in SLOs development and implementation." At this time, the team determined that the College does not meet this standard. (II.A.1.c)

The team found that the College had established practices to design, identify, approve, administer, deliver, and evaluate courses and programs using learning outcomes, but had not yet fully implemented the assessment cycle. As noted by the College in the actionable improvement plan, the first cycle of assessment of course competencies is scheduled for completion in spring 2012 and program learning outcomes have begun. As such, the College lacks a demonstrated connection for courses and programs between the assessment of student learning outcomes and the improvement of instructional courses and programs.

The central role of its faculty for establishing quality and improving instructional courses and programs, however, is clear. Procedures established by the Faculty Senate Constitution, Faculty Senate and its Curriculum Committee ensure appropriate depth, rigor, currency, sequencing, and

transferability of courses with the caveat that 10% of the courses are not up to date. In addition, the system recommendation addresses issues relating to the CTE degree. (II.A.2.a)

Regarding the role of advisory committees in identifying competency levels and measurable student learning outcomes for courses, certificates, and vocational education programs, the team found evidence that annual meetings are held for vocational/career program qualifying for VTEA funding. Review of a sampling of advisory committee meeting minutes from 2011 and 2012 indicates that committees contribute meaningful input into program curricula and serve as vehicles for sharing general information regarding industry trends and programmatic developments. Overall, there is evidence that these committees play a meaningful role in identifying competency levels and measurable learning outcomes for vocational courses, certificates, and programs. (II.A.2.a, II.A.2.b)

The team confirmed that although isolated examples of the regular assessment of program outcomes exist (e.g. Respiratory Care, Occupational Therapy Assistant programs, service learning), regular, systematic and institutionalized processes have not been established for the majority of courses or programs. Efforts towards establishing regular assessment protocols are evident in piloted cornerstone assignments by liberal arts faculty and the increased percentage of completed course learning reports and course assessment plans between January and June 2012. Service learning is an area of note as the only area where faculty and staff have completed a second cycle of assessment and evaluation. (II.A.2.b)

The primary means cited in the College self-evaluation report for ensuring that high quality instruction and appropriate breadth, depth, rigor, sequencing, and time to completion is the hiring of qualified instructors, periodic review of their teaching, professional development opportunities, and review of outcomes for courses and programs. It was unclear to the team how faculty performance reviews are linked to SLO and assessment.

The team found evidence of course sequencing patterns within the curriculum development process and review program through the designation of courses as Preparatory, Introductory, or Applied. Documentation was also confirmed by the suggested course pathways included the College catalog and program articulation agreements with the four-year partners within the UH. Time to completion for certificates and degrees data was not readily available, however, the 2012 accreditation self-evaluation data books include numerous tables that illustrate the academic progress of student cohorts and the College utilizes nationally accepted norms.

A review of the faculty Peer Evaluation Form found only "suggested areas of comment" relative to outcomes within the evaluation section for faculty preparation and organization. Interviews with faculty and administrators revealed the lack of a common understanding and expectations regarding the role of student learning outcomes as a "component of faculty evaluation." While aggregate data concerning student performance, degree completions, and transfers are strongly suggestive that many, if not most programs are effective, the faculty evaluation instrument's role in facilitating the identification of high quality instruction and assessing achievement of course and program outcomes is not consistently understood.

While aggregate data concerning degree completions, transfers, and the performance of transferring students at four-year institutions are strongly suggestive that many, if not most programs, are effective in this regard, thereby indicating standard II.A.2.c may in fact be met, insufficient mechanisms utilizing course and program outcomes assessments are in place to fully differentiation between effective and ineffective programs. The planning agenda contained in the self-evaluation report fails to address this deficiency.

The College noted that professional development opportunities contribute to quality instruction but did not include the 2012 Faculty Confidence and Engagement Survey results within this standard. Although representing a small sample size, the survey results did provide feedback as to which professional development activities had the most significant impact and solicited improvement strategies that may support quality instruction. (II.A.2.c)

The College utilizes lecture, lecture-lab, lab and learning in the workplace strategies through online, hybrid, televised and internet delivery strategies. The faculty, in consultation with the department, department chair, and the dean, determine delivery methodologies. The team reviewed the fall 2011 faculty survey results which illustrated the broad utilization of teaching methodologies such as group work, small group discussions, and performance activities as well as assessment techniques.

The team confirmed that the effectiveness of these delivery modes and teaching methodologies has been assessed for specific groups such as a pilot for accelerated delivery of writing courses and distance education. In addition, results are evident in the College's promotion of the educational attainment of Native Hawaiian students through initiatives such as first year experience pathways, Achieving the Dream initiative, and a National Science Foundation-supported science, technology, engineering and math (STEM) pathway for Native Hawaiian students.

Regarding assessment of teaching methodologies, the College states that student feedback via eCafé surveys is utilized to gather qualitative and quantitative data. In addition, the assessment of course competencies and program learning outcomes has yet to be integrated into a systematic, institutionalized assessment of teaching methodologies and delivery modes as stated in the College's self-evaluation report. The actionable improvement plan for this substandard fails to address this deficiency. (II.A.2.d)

The College evaluates programs for relevance and appropriateness utilizing three-year Comprehensive Program Reviews (CPR) and the robust ARPD. According to the College, CPRs were redesigned in spring 2012 and merged with program's three-year tactical plans, effective fall 2012. Current CPRs include strategic goals such as "complete a cycle of learning outcomes assessment" which have not yet been accomplished. To date, CPRs do not employ student learning outcomes assessment to systematically improve student achievement.

The ARPD reports are quite robust and include key enrollment management and student achievement indicators? for relevance and appropriateness such as demand, efficiency, and effectiveness, as well as online success rates and Perkins Core Indicators. Also included are

26

plans, resources needed and the identification of SLOs and measurements but, again, no analysis of SLOs. The only evidence of analysis of learning outcomes was found separately, in course learning outcomes reports, of which only 47 percent were complete as of June 2012.

The three-year CPR cycle combined with the annual ARPD supports program currency and relevancy, particularly with respect to most vocational programs as well as academic programs in rapidly changing fields such as the physical and life sciences. Based on a team review of the content of several program reviews conducted between 2006 and 2012, without the inclusion of achievement data for learning outcomes it cannot be concluded they constitute a comprehensive, ongoing, and systematic review.

The College has made several positive changes to it planning processes within the last year. The three-year CPRs have been merged with tactical plans and redesigned beginning fall 2012, and SLOs are to be integrated into both CPRs and the annual ARPD. These modifications will support systematic review and the achievement of student learning and provide a comprehensive analysis, but not for at least three years. Therefore, while this deficiency may be addressed by the revised program review processes beginning fall 2012, the College does not meet the standard for systematic review that includes SLOs at this time. (II.A.2.e)

Based on evidence provided by the College, the team concluded the process of measuring achievement of its stated student learning outcomes for courses, certificates, and programs has begun but outcomes assessment been not been documented for the majority of courses and programs. The Faculty Senate Ad Hoc Committee on Student Learning Outcomes was established in 2006 and was charged with accomplishing this task under the direction of two faculty coordinators. The committee formulated a framework and a plan for assessment which has resulted, as of the team visit, in approximately 66 percent of courses and 100 percent of programs with documented assessments.

The College has recently restructured its planning processes to measure the achievement of SLOs by incorporating assessments into the CPR and ARPD. This new process, while promising, may take years to come to fruition and enable the College to demonstrate improvement in outcomes. (II.A.2.f.)

The team did not find evidence supporting use of departmental course and/or program examinations. Consequently, the College complies with the commission standard, which calls for validation of the effectiveness of such instruments in measuring student learning and minimizing test biases. (II.A.2.g.)

Because the institution has not assessed student learning outcomes for the majority of its programs, it is indeterminable whether credit is being awarded and degrees and certificates conferred based on their achievement. The self-evaluation report indicates the College follows the generally accepted norms or equivalencies in higher education in its determination of the units of credit awarded to each course and units of credit required to fulfill degrees and certificates.

27

The self-evaluation report also states that the faculty rely on students' achievement of course competencies, or SLOs, when determining grades. Without the majority of courses and programs having documented student learning outcomes assessments, the College cannot be awarding credit based upon student achievement of the course's stated learning outcomes. The team concurs with the College's actionable improvement plan to continue to develop a mechanism for ensuring that it awards degrees and certificates based upon student achievement of a program's stated learning outcomes. (II.A.2.h, II.A.2.i)

The College's philosophy of general education is clearly stated in its catalog and includes two primary tenets: Ma ka hana ka 'ike (knowledge through discipline) and He puko'a kani 'aina (a community is interconnected). The catalog contains a list of five core student learning outcome areas adopted in 2009 for general education, which also serve as the College's institutional learning outcomes. The College's general education learning outcomes have also been mapped to AA, ASNS, AS, and ATS degree requirements, making evident the College's commitment to ensuring that students achieve basic content and methodology for major areas of knowledge.

The evidence has led the team to conclude that the institution does systematically engage in the placement of courses into the general education pattern during the curriculum process. Faculty place courses into one of three hallmark areas: foundation, focus and diversification, and course competencies are considered in this determination. However, without the assessment of the general education outcomes, the appropriateness of a given course into the general education curriculum cannot be determined. (II.A.3.a, II.A.3.b, II.A.3.c)

The team reviewed the College catalog and other College documents related to degree programs. Based on the program descriptions contained in the course catalog, the team concludes that all degree programs include focused study in at least one area of inquiry has been met. (II.A.4.)

Data pertaining to pass rates on licensure examinations support the conclusion that students completing vocational and occupational certificates and degrees demonstrate technical and professional competencies that meet employment and other applicable Standards. Only a limited amount of data from employer surveys indicating their degree of satisfaction with program graduates were made available to the team. (II.A.5)

The course catalog contains a brief description of each career and certificate program offered by the College. Additionally, the College includes student learning outcomes for each course and program as well as information regarding types of occupational fields students might enter completing any given educational program. In this way, the institution assures that students and prospective students receive clear and accurate information about educational courses and programs and transfer policies. (II.A.6)

Data pertaining to student transfer to four-year institutions indicates the College is doing an outstanding job. As of 2010-2011, KCC ranked first out of the state's seven community colleges in the number of students transferred to the UH system. The team applauds the institution for the high number of its students who successfully transfer to the UH system. (II.A.6.a)

Evidence reviewed by the team indicates the College does have clearly delineated policies related to program termination in BOR policy Chapter 5, Section 5-1.g. Students officially enrolled in programs scheduled for discontinuance are allowed up to two years for associate degrees. Programs scheduled for termination receive a comprehensive program review to confirm workforce needs. The College noted during interviews that one program, eBusiness, was terminated due to lack of relevancy to employment demands. (II.A.6.b)

The College appears to be representing itself clearly, accurately, and consistently to prospective and current students, the public, and its personnel through its catalogs, statements, and publications. (II.A.6.c)

Statements on academic freedom and responsibilities of faculty are included in the 2009-2015 Agreement between State of Hawai'i, the UH BOR and the UH Professional Assembly. In addition, the team confirmed that the College's commitment to academic freedom is made public through inclusion in the 2012-2013 catalog. The evidence suggests that the institution meets the Standards pertaining to academic freedom, integrity of the teaching-learning process and objectivity on the part of faculty. (II.A.7, II.A.7.a)

Document reviews indicate that the College establishes and publishes clear expectations concerning student academic honesty and the consequences for dishonesty. The institution's statement on Academic Dishonesty, Cheating, and Plagiarism are published in the catalog and can be found online. In addition, a review of course syllabi found that some instructors include Student Conduct Code in their individual course syllabi. (II.A.7.b)

As stated in the College's self-evaluation report, the institution does not require conformity to specific codes of conduct that seek to instill specific beliefs or world views. (II.A.7.c)

The team confirmed that the College does not currently offer courses or programs in foreign locations to students other than U.S. nationals. (II.A.8)

Conclusions:

The team verified that the College offers high-quality instructional programs and has an excellent record of accomplishment for career technical programs and transferring students to four-year institutions of higher learning. Its programs and services appear to reflect both a breadth and depth appropriate for an institution of its size.

The College has developed student learning outcomes for courses, programs, and general education, and assessed all programs. Course student learning outcomes, known as course competencies, lag programs as only 66 percent had completed assessments at the time of the team visit. The College made significant progress in the year prior to the team visit establishing and assessing outcomes, as well as redesigning already robust CPRs and ARPDs including outcomes. These changes to be implemented in the future are encouraging and may increase transparency, facilitate achievement of outcomes, and create connections to the planning process.

29

However, because the team found little evidence that demonstrates the use of outcomes assessment in the planning and budgeting process, the team concludes the College partially meets this standard.

Commendations

Commendation 2: The College is commended for its success in career and technical programs as demonstrated by exceeding all six Carl Perkins Career and Technical Education Act Health Indicators of performance standards in 2009-2010. (II.A.2.a)

Commendation 3: The College is to be commended for the depth and breadth of the programs and campus cultural activities, and the contributions of these activities to an environment that honors Native Hawaiian faculty, staff, and students as well as encourages the diversity and civic engagement for all constituent groups. (II.A.1, II.2.d, II.3.c)

Recommendations

Recommendation 3: In order to meet the Standards, the team recommends that the College assess student learning outcomes for every course, instructional program, and student support program and incorporate the findings into course and program improvements. (ER 10, I.B, I.B.1, II.A.1.a, II.A.1.c, II.A.2.a, II.A.2.b, II.A.2.e, II.A.2.f, II.A.2.i, II.A.3, II.B.4, II.C.2)

Recommendation 4: In order to meet the Standards, the team recommends that the College utilize student learning outcomes assessment to support institutional planning decisions. (I.B, I.B.1, II.A.1.a, II.A.1.c, II.A.2.a, II.A.2.b, II.A.2.e, II.A.2.f, II.A.2.i, II.A.3, II.B.4, II.C.2)

Standard II- Student Learning Programs and Services
Standard IIB – Student Support Services

General Observations:

Overall, KCC provides excellent student support services based on identified needs and there is a concern for access, progress, learning and success of the students served. The College provides counseling and advising through a decentralized model based on three academic clusters as well as targeted special populations. Discussions about access, progress, learning and success take place at the departmental level. To assure coordination among the decentralized counseling and academic advising services provided, the Counseling and Academic Advising Council discusses and makes recommendations. There has been work on the development and assessment of program student learning outcomes over the past three years and this work continues to be in progress.

The level of student engagement in student activities that promote personal and civic responsibility and personal development is very high and is to be commended. The types of outside-the-classroom opportunities available to students - including extensive service learning and peer mentoring programs - make the college experience at KCC a rich one.

Findings and Evidence:

There is an ARPD and a three year comprehensive program review which includes Demand, Efficiency, Achieving the Dream, Effectiveness and CCSSE Indicators. Based on these data, the student services area develops a tactical plan for improvement. These data are for three years and provide good trend information for evaluation of services to assist in determining if they are enhancing the mission of the College. (II.B.1)

The College catalog has all of the required information for students – general information on the College, academic requirements (program and course descriptions) as well as all of the major policies affecting students. The website serves as a primary source for information on policies for students. There is a concern about having the catalog on-line prior to fall registration and this appeared as an improvement plan. (II.B.2)

The student services area uses a variety of means to identify learning support needs – through the Community College Survey of Student Engagement (CCSSE) to determine both satisfaction and importance of services, through placement testing to identify academic preparation needs, from student services staff on needs identified in the departments, and from data prepared by the OFIE which includes at least three year trend data. Implementation of SLOs and assessment will provide additional valuable information to ensure services are meeting student needs and supporting the College mission. There are a wide variety of programs that have been developed to support student needs (12 special programs listed) and student presentations indicated the programs met their needs and provided an outstanding college experience. (II.B.3)

31

With respect to location or method of delivery in providing services, student support is provided both in-person and on-line. Students have access to MyUH Portal which allows them to register for classes, view financial aid, sign up for tutoring and update personal information. Instructors use Laulima – the UH online course management system – to communicate with students. An on-line advising/degree audit system called STAR is available for students to check progress towards degree and certificate completion. Students can also use WebAdvisor as a part of Banner and counselors communicate with on-line students using Skype, Blackboard Collaborate, email and phones to provide advising. The only "off-site" program is the nursing program offered at Leeward and Windward CC. The student services at these two community colleges provide students with support. (II.B.3.a)

The College provides a wide variety of student activities to promote personal and civic responsibility, intellectual and aesthetic development and personal development. There is an extensive service-learning component that is nationally recognized and has served over 10,000 students since January 1995. A student engagement coordinator promotes collaboration among students through co-curricular activities and there is a peer mentor program serving a wide range of students. There are numerous events to promote student activities. Students from these programs, including ASKCC Student Congress, Board of Student Activities, Peer Mentoring, Phi Theta Kappa, STEM, Service Learning/Pathways, Freeman Scholars in Japan, Korea, China, and Vietnam, and Competitive Culinary Team, were very clear in how these outside-the-classroom experiences changed their lives. The College's focus on making certain students have a wide range of engagement opportunities is commendable. (II.B.3.b)

The College provides an extensive counseling and advising program for its students – with thirty-one full-time counseling faculty – and services including academic, career, personal, crisis intervention, diversity, and outreach counseling. Students are able to use the STAR advising tool and are able to chat or use Skype to communicate with counselors. The Counseling and Advising Council (CAAC) provides a communication link among all of the counselors. Within their specialty areas, the counselors have developed and are beginning to assess student learning outcomes. (II.B.3.c)

The College serves a diverse population of students and is committed to diversity as stated in its mission and provides a variety of services to support this area including student learning outcomes for programs which address appreciation of diversity, creating the Malama Hawai'i Center as a gathering place for Native Hawaiian and Pacific Island students, supporting the Office of International Affairs where international students gather (International Café), and promoting student clubs which celebrate diversity on campus. (II.B.3.d)

For assessment and placement, the College uses ACT COMPASS Placement Test for English and math courses. System-wide cut scores are validated periodically. The Nursing Program uses the NLN Pre-Admissions RN exam and evaluates graduation; persistence and licensure exam pass rates to address admissions policies. (II.B.3.e)

Student records are stored in compliance with UH BOR policies. Prior to electronic student records, permanent record cards (PRC) were used. These are stored in locked, fire-proof filing cabinets and there are back-up copies for the PRCs. And, there has been an information security specialist identified to assure FERPA requirements are followed. (II.B.3.f)

With respect to evaluation of student support services, the College uses 1) tactical plan updates, 2) program reviews and 3) CCSSE data. With respect to achievement of student learning outcomes, the self-evaluation mentions student development outcomes (SDOs), however it was unclear where the College was in the process of developing, assessing and revising them based on campus dialogue in this document. During the visit, a report entitled "Office for Student Services Assessment Presentations of Student Development Outcomes - April 27, 2012 and August 3, 2012" was reviewed. This document indicated the following programs had completed some work on developing, assessing and presenting information on program SLOs: Business, Culinary, Hospitality, and Legal Counseling, Health Sciences & Nursing Counseling, Kahikoluanmea Counseling, Maida Kamber Center, Honda International Center, Peer Mentoring, and Disabled Student Services. A new reporting structure for program SLOs has been developed by the UHCC which includes a listing of: SLO, expected level of achievement, courses assessed, assessment strategy, results of program assessment, and next steps. This report is due to be completed by all programs by December 1, 2012 so it has not yet been completed by student support services. The student services area partially meets the proficiency level for SLOs. (II.B.4)

Special Request from the Commission:

The Commission asks that the team comment on two special areas:

- the institution's progress in developing student learning outcomes, measuring them, and using the results of measurement to plan and implement institutional improvements; and
- the degree of institutional dialogue about student learning and student achievement as well as about institutional processes for evaluation and plans for improvement; evidence of a culture and practice that supports continuous improvement of educational quality and a focus on improving student outcomes.

Although the self-evaluation mentions SLOs, clear information was not provided in the evidence section about the level of proficiency. Counseling was the primary area where SLOs (SDOs) were mentioned in the Self-Evaluation, so it is unclear from the self-evaluation what the progress in developing student learning outcomes has been in all of the student support areas. During the site visit and following meetings on campus, it was determined that:

Two very extensive training sessions - Counselor Assessment Academies - were conducted in March 2009 and April 2010 to provide counselors with background information on how to establish and assess student learning outcomes.

The SLOs have primarily been assessed by the decentralized counseling programs; there was little data completed on programs outside these counseling areas. It is anticipated that the other

33

areas in student services will be developing them. A list of the "programs" for student services will be important to be developed so the program SLOs can be identified and assessed. Program SLO reports are due to the UH system office by December 2012. These reports include Expected Level of Achievement, Courses Assessed, Assessment Strategy, Results of Program Assessment and Next Steps - this will provide useful data to evaluate the progress on SLOs (it is just a few months after the site visit).

Again, the SLOs were not well defined in the evidence sections, with the exception of some very general SLOs for counseling, so before the site visit, it was unclear what the institutional dialogue about student learning has been. On page 206 of the self-evaluation report, there is a mention of SDOs which were developed in spring 2007 and little other mention of SLOs. When arriving on campus, a report entitled "Office for Student Services Assessment Presentations of Student Development Outcomes - April 27, 2012 and August 3, 2012" was reviewed. This report included seven PowerPoint presentations that were provided to all of the counselors, assessment coordinator and vice chancellor of student services on two dates in April and August. This allowed the opportunity for the counselors to have dialogue on their SLOs and how they were being assessed.

Conclusions:

The College partially meets the standard. The team observed numerous areas of excellence regarding the extensive student support services at the College. Counseling services are provided to students in three academic clusters which provide direct connection between the instructional faculty and the counselors. This decentralized model allows for increased follow-up as the counselors interact closely with faculty in conversations about access, progress, learning and success. The College is involved with Achieving the Dream, has a first year experience program, and provides extensive peer mentoring.

Student engagement is a high priority on campus. There are a number of programs related to at least ten (10) target populations. The service learning program has been nationally recognized. Reports from students indicate that the College is definitely succeeding in its efforts to provide engagement opportunities.

The student services area compiles an ARPD which includes a dashboard of data that indicates three year trends. It is a good way to track the overall success of the programs – providing excellent data related to student satisfaction and student achievement indicators for review. SLO assessment results are not yet a part of program review and planning. Much of the reporting is done as "combined" student support services. It is difficult to ascertain how individual services are performing.

The College substantially meets the standard. Of primary concern in the review is the status of the SLOs in student support services. Work on SLOs has been completed primarily by the decentralized counseling units. Some have completed an assessment cycle, while others need to do so. And, there are several student support services programs that appear to be missing

34

assessment data. It will be useful to develop a list of the student services programs and for these programs, identify the SLOs, assess them and conduct the dialogue.

Recommendation

Recommendation 5: In order to fully meet the Standards, the team recommends the College: 1) identify student learning outcomes for all student services programs, 2) assess student attainment of these outcomes, and 3) conduct dialogue to use assessment results to implement program improvements. (II.B.4, II.C.2)

Standard II – Student Learning Programs and Services
Standard IIC – Library and Learning Support Services

General Observations:

KCC's Library and Learning Support Services are integrated throughout the organization and support the mission of the College. The services included in this standard comprise the Library and Learning Resources Unit, a variety of separate tutoring services and the Center for Excellence in Learning, Teaching and Technology (CELTT).

The Library and Learning Resources Unit contains the Library, its computer Lab and the campus Testing Center. The Library and Learning Resource (LLR) unit's range of collections, facilities, programs, services and activities respond to and meet the needs of KCC. The library's computer lab is the primary open computer lab for students. The testing center provides placement testing services, online testing for on-campus classes, distance learning testing, accommodation services for special students, and make-up testing. The testing center also provides fee-based proctoring services for KCC students for certain repeat placement tests and nursing ATI tests. The library's instructional program includes course-integrated information literacy sessions, online tutorials and research guides, and "Secrets of Success" (SOS) workshops on academic, technology and personal development topics. The library's website provides access to the library catalog, a range of online resources and links to selected learning support resources. The unit's mission statement emphasizes its support for student learning and its role in the College as a "one-stop, go-to, gathering place – physically and virtually" for the campus.

Customized tutoring is provided in several locations by a variety of program areas for students in particular academic programs. These programs provide tutoring (peer and/or faculty), computer access, specialized supplemental instruction and software, as well as student support services and student engagement activities. Tutoring centers include: Mālama Hawai'i Center (for Mālama Hawai'i students), Kahikoluamea Center (for students in the Kahikoluamea developmental classes); TRIO Student Support (for TRIO Students), Health Science (for Health Science Students), Business (for Business and Computer Science students), Culinary Arts (for Culinary Arts Students), Hospitality (for Hospitality Students), Economics Lab (Econ Students) and STEM Center (for Science Technology Engineering and Math students).

CELTT provides support and maintenance for the College's computer labs and learning centers. Challenges faced by the library and learning support services include resource allocation, heavily used facilities, consistent evaluation and assessment of services and SLO assessment overall and/or for individual learning support services.

Findings and Evidence:

The College satisfactorily meets the Accreditation Standards regarding library collections, library services and equipment. The self-study documents the ways librarians collaborate with faculty and review student requests to inform selection of print and online materials for student learning needs. The library collection development policy prioritizes items purchases by

36

relevance to the curriculum and College priorities. New acquisitions are announced on the library's website. Locally and through the UH system, a variety of online resources are available to meet the needs of students and faculty. These databases also serve the needs of distance education students and students attending via off campus sites. The library administers and analyzes the results of annual student surveys requesting feedback on the library collections and services. Since the last site visit, the library has filled key positions, completed an inventory, a collection evaluation, a de-selection project and increased their collection of e-book titles. Additionally, fifty laptops are available for students to borrow for use in the library, provided that the user has a UH System library card. Donations and grants have enabled a 4 year replacement cycle for these computers. (II.C, II.C.1.a, II.C.1.c)

The College partially meets this standard for its other learning support services. The 2006 accreditation evaluation team recommended the College should assess the need for coordinated, formalized tutorial services that support all classes and disciplines and to consider an overall plan for tutoring services that includes a funding strategy and a timeline for implementation. The site visit verified the analysis provided in the self-study and evidence that the diversity of services and multiple access points for tutoring may result in the College being better able to meet students' needs for the services. However, the lack of coordination of administration, assessment and communication among tutoring services may be confusing for students and presents challenges for planning and resource allocation. The self-study describes the need for expanded tutoring services for transfer-level courses and support for the hiring of a learning support coordinator to oversee tutoring throughout the campus. The evidence does not show the College has assessed the need for more comprehensive or coordinated tutorial services or developed a funding strategy to continue its existing grant-supported specialized tutoring programs (e.g. STEM and Peer mentors). (II.C.1, II.C.1.a, II.C.1.c)

The self-study reports tutoring services remain "de-centralized, not systematically supported, and offered by departments or programs who have funds to support tutoring". Since 2006, the College has developed and implemented new targeted tutorial programs including the STEM Center for science, technology, engineering and Math pathway students, and Kahikoluamea Center for remedial and developmental education students. Both are 'full service' learning support centers that integrate computer labs, tutoring space, peer mentors, faculty offices, dedicated counselors and also provide student support services and student engagement activities. The self-study evidence and site visit confirm these programs are heavily used. The evidence shows some programs gather usage and satisfaction data, student achievement and some assessment of services to evaluate the relationship between the service and intended student learning. The College has recently implemented Smarthinking online tutoring and a grant-funded peer mentor project. The project hires and trains student 'peer mentors' who receive consistent training and evaluation and work at several learning support and tutoring centers. Peer mentors are trained as tutors for discipline classes and they also receive training to guide and support students as peer advisors and mentors. (II.C.1.a, II.C.1.b, II.C.1.c)

The Library and Learning Resources unit provides a variety of traditional and innovative instructional services to support the library's three information competency learning outcomes. SLOs for information retrieval and technology are also included in the College general education

37

learning outcomes for the Associate in Arts degree. College librarians work with faculty to provide orientations and teach course specific library instruction classes focusing on information competency skills. In collaboration with English faculty, the library developed innovative "Research Challenge" hands-on workshops focused on course and library information literacy SLOs and incorporating their class research assignment. Most faculty teaching English 22 and English 100 (developmental and transfer level classes) participate. Their work is assessed by the librarian and their professor based on mutual learning outcomes. The Secrets of Success workshops (SOS), sponsored by the library, cover a wide range of academic and personal development topics from reading strategies to software basics, to test anxiety and library research. Evaluations are conducted following each workshop, and the workshops have been rated very highly by students. (II.C.1.b)

The Library and Learning Resources unit mostly meet the standard for providing adequate access to their programs and services. KCC students have access to system-wide collections directly or through intra-system loan. The library's collections of e-books and databases have increased and are available 24/7 through the library website. KCC has highest (of all Oahu CCs) circulation to students and shows the most full text articles retrieved. Since the last site visit, library hours have increased to be open one hour later. Library and testing center hours are extended and include Sunday during final exam periods. (II.C.1.c)

Renovations and reconfiguration of furniture completed in 2007 improved access to the library's collections and formed a quiet zone on the upper level. A library elevator provides access to the second floor book stacks. Adaptive equipment and software are available for hearing impaired and visually impaired students, including some captioned media, a large screen television with closed captioning, Kurzweil software, and a video phone. The library's web site is designed to meet the federal guidelines regarding web content accessibility and web services to the disabled. (II.C.1.c)

Use of the library's testing center for proctored exams has increased significantly, creating long lines and long wait times. Faculty teaching both face-to-face and online classes can arrange for students to take proctored exams at the testing center. Faculty report advantages of this service for face-to-face classes include less 'loss of class time' and the opportunity for longer testing periods and convenience for students. Expanded hours and testing days have been added to meet the demand during final examination periods; however demand for the services is expected to continue to grow. (II.C.1.c)

The College meets the standard for providing effective maintenance and security for its library and learning support services. The books and materials are secured by an electronic book detection system. A complete inventory of the library's collection was performed, with low loss. Signage reminds students to watch their belongings and their responsibility for borrowed library laptops. The library building was renovated to correct maintenance problems and more efficient and secure windows were installed. CELTT provides maintenance of computers and equipment and implements College policies and practices related to network and computer security. (II.C.1.d)

The College participates in a variety of state and regional consortia and collaborations with UH and other libraries outside the system to provide the benefits of cooperative and shared library services and resources. By participating in consortiums, the library brings increased access to resources to the College's students and faculty at greatly reduced costs. These collaborations and agreements are documented and evaluated on a regular basis. (II.C.1.e)

The College meets the Accreditation Standard for evaluating library and other learning support services. This standard requires evaluation of these services on a regular, on-going basis, particularly in relation to continuous assessment of established SLOs. The Library and Learning Resource unit contributes to the annual review and also submit 3-year tactical plans that outlines their outcomes, performance measures and strategies and means of assessment. The Library and Learning Resources unit's program reviews and additional evidence presented on site document instructional and activities related to the library's SLOs and include assessment, dialog and analysis of these activities for improvement. Since 2005, the library has administered, analyzed and incorporated into its planning an annual student survey which provides consistent assessment of student satisfaction with library services and collections, valuable comments, and some assessment of library SLOs. Evidence clearly outlines the assessment methods, results of assessment and "next steps" for the three library SLOs. (II.C.2)

The self-study states "all nine [tutoring] programs except one gather quantitative data, and several gather qualitative data, to assess and improve services". (p 217). It is anticipated that full implementation of the SARS program will improve data collection for the next reporting cycle. Evidence of evaluation of tutoring, computer labs, workshops, and other support services are documented through program review and annual and tactical plans. Evidence summarizes some qualitative and quantitative data but it does not fully document the degree assessment is on-going or how it is used in planning and resource allocation. Evidence does not show consistent development of SLO statements, or documented on-going assessment, reflective analysis and dialog of student learning outcomes for all learning support services. The self-study evidence acknowledges this situation, stating, "While the college has made progress in tracking students who use the service but assessing the effectiveness of tutoring support remains a challenge" (#554) and by indicating the College partially meets standard. To fully meet the standard, learning outcome and student achievement data on tutorial services must to be collected more systematically to assess and improve tutoring services. (II.C.2)

Conclusions:

The College substantially meets the standard. The evidence and site visit show the quality of library, tutoring and learning support services continues to be high. The College has addressed the library facilities and technology issues identified in this standard by the previous site visit. The library has also increased collaboration with discipline faculty, more fully developed library SLOs and documented progress on assessment of SLOs. As stated above, evidence does not fully document the degree assessment is on-going or how it is used in planning and resource allocation for tutoring and other learning support programs and services. Evidence does not show consistent development of SLO statements or on-going assessment, reflective analysis and dialog of student learning outcomes for all learning support services. Continuing challenges

39

relating to this standard include coordinated planning and assessment of the various tutoring and learning support programs and services to ensure adequate resource allocation, to provide equity in access for all students, to support demand and to encourage assessment of student learning outcomes for continuous improvement. These planning and SLO assessment issues are addressed in other recommendations for the College.

Recommendations: None

Standard III – Resources
Standard IIIA – Human Resources

General Observations:

KCC employs qualified personnel who support student learning programs as well as provide support for those services wherever they are offered. Personnel are treated fairly and evaluated on a regular, systematic basis. There are numerous opportunities for professional development for faculty, classified staff, and executives. The College is clearly committed to the educational role persons of diverse backgrounds play in their institution, and has been making some progress in increasing the diversity of the staff, particularly native-born Hawaiian and Filipino. It is not completely clear how well human resource planning is integrated with institutional planning.

Findings and Evidence:

KCC employs personnel who are appropriately qualified to provide and support their programs and services. Minimum qualifications (MQs) and desirable qualifications (DQs) are developed following appropriate guidelines depending on the position. It was slightly unclear to what extent "faculty and staff participate in the discussion" of DQs, a theme that recurs throughout standard IIIA. Evidence includes Guidelines for Tenure and Promotion; documents at the Department of HR Development; BOR policies. (III.A.1)

KCC ensures that well-qualified personnel are hired through a well-laid out "multi-layered" selection process, with each constituent group following a very specific procedure (including civil service personnel who are hired and regulated by the State of Hawai'i). This includes publicly stated job descriptions that are related to the institutional mission. (III.A.1.a)

APT are hired in accordance with the UH system policy, and College civil service personnel hirings are coordinated with Hawaii's Department of Human Resources Development and regulated by the state. (III.A.1.a)

The Office of the VPCC oversees the hiring of chancellor and vice chancellors and college executives are hired in accordance with the UH system of recruitment and personnel. (III.A.1.a)

Faculty plays a significant role in the hiring of faculty by serving on screening and interview committees. Faculty develops the rubrics that are used to evaluate applicant's paper work, interviews, and teaching demonstrations. (III.A.1.a)

All employees are evaluated regularly, using written criteria which seek to assess effectiveness and encourage improvement. The criteria include Board policies, Performance Appraisal Systems, Guidelines for Tenure and Promotion, 360 Degree Performance Assessment, and APT employees who are all assessed in this way. (III.A.1.b)

Newly-hired faculty go through a process of peer evaluation and other assessment; however, it was unclear whether student evaluations are a significant part of probationary faculty evaluation.

41

In contrast, "student feedback surveys" are used to evaluate lecturers every semester. The self-evaluation report indicates that "peer evaluations may also be required" to evaluate lectures, but the conditions under which these evaluations occur is not clear. (III.A.1.b)

The faculty continue to be evaluated every five years as required by Board policy.

Executives at KCC are evaluated annually and the evaluations include self-assessment and the 360 Degree Performance Assessment – a nine-question survey answered by the executives peers, people they oversee, and outside observers. The chancellor reviews their performance with the executive. There is faculty sentiment that the process of evaluating executives should be more open, with more written contributions (to protect anonymity) and open discussions about the evaluation. Faculty is currently working on a proposal to change this part of the evaluation system (III.A.1.b)

APT personnel are evaluated using Board policies and are rated in three areas. The method of evaluation is the APT Broadband online system. (III.A.1.b)

The College cannot demonstrate that it fully meets the requirement for inclusion of SLOs in evaluations. There is a lack of clarity about the role that student learning outcomes play as a component of faculty evaluation. Interviews with management and faculty together and separately; inspection of faculty evaluations (with the names redacted); and analysis of the "contract renewal checklist" suggest some of the complex reasons for the disagreement, confusion, and a considerable amount of anxiety, frustration, and fear among faculty when it comes to the role SLOs play in individual faculty evaluation. Faculty believe that the use of SLOs for evaluation lacks transparency and fears that the use of SLOs among management is inconsistent and therefore anxiety-producing. (III.A.1.c)

Part of the cause of this problem is the "proposed course level assessment plan" which KCC's Faculty Senate adopted in November 2010: "Assessment results are [not] intended …[for] the evaluation of individual faculty members. Under no circumstances should the data from assessment be used in the contract renewal, lecturer self-assessment, tenure, or promotion process." A meeting together with faculty and management indicated that they all thought this policy had been signed and was in force. However, separate meetings with the chancellor, VPCC, and deans indicated that SLOs are used frequently to evaluate individual teachers. As a result of this lack of clarity, in order to meet the Standard, the team recommends that the constituent members of the College clarify the role of SLOs play in faculty evaluation, consistently use SLOs in an agreed-upon fashion, and make transparent the roles SLOs will play in the evaluation of faculty.

A serious concern is whether the College has sufficient staff to provide support services; this was reflected in the survey and on numerous discussions during the accreditation site visit. In addition, BOR minutes of June 15, 2012 reiterate that "KCC needs to expedite the recruitment and hiring of unfilled staff positions. (III.A.2)

Part of the problems lies in the time lapse that occurs regularly between newly hired employees receiving a letter of intent that they have been hired, and their ability to actually start work. The time lapse is occasionally as much as six to eight months, and happens most frequently with IT future employees. Interviews suggest that the frustration is a cause of real concern and more than once an employee has "quit" before he or she start the job. In addition, on site interviews expressed frustration with the lack of civil service and APT positions, particularly in human resources when the lack of enough personnel might account for some of the lag time in hiring. In order to meet this standard, the team recommends that the College remedy both the time lag between the verbal commitment and an employee's start day, and in filling the vacancies essential to the effective running of the College. (III.A.2)

There is some disagreement about whether the College has sufficient number of qualified staff to provide the services necessary to support the College's mission and purposes. The report states the College employs a sufficient number of full-time faculty; however, there is some disagree about this point. As well, College administrators appear to disagree with faculty and staff about whether the College has a sufficient number of administrators. (III.A.2)

The self-evaluation reports that nearly 29 percent of the surveyed faculty and staff disagreed or strong disagreed that the "institution treats them in a professional and equitable manner" and, in response, the report indicates that the College was going to investigate the matter; however, there is no indication that this investigation has or will take place. (III.A.3)

The mission, hiring practices, professional development activities, education policies, and the strategic plan as well as the tone and ethos of the self-evaluation report demonstrate a commendable commitment to and appreciation of diversity at the College. This was observed throughout the accreditation site visit as well – in the way we were greeted, welcomed; in the way colleagues treated each other students. It was both observable, immeasurable, but deeply felt.

The two underrepresented groups that the College has focused on for improvement are Native Hawaiians and Filipinos and between 2006 and 2011 there have been improvements, sometimes statistically significant, in hiring instructional faculty, faculty in other categories, and APT employees. (III.A.4)

The report acknowledges both the improvement in their personnel numbers, but also that they are well below their implied goal: that the College personnel reflect the population of state in these racial categories. The improvement in the numbers suggest that their methods are working, but also imply that there might be other methods the College could employ to further diversity their personnel. (III.A. 4)

The College creates and maintains numerous programs to support its diverse personnel including the following: Malama Hawai'I Center, International Education Week, the Safe Zone for LGBYTI faculty and staff, support of Domestic Violence Awareness Month and Sexual Assault Awareness Month are some of the programs that are indicative of this. (III.A.4.a)

43

The professional development activities described in the self-evaluation report mostly focus mostly on new faculty. These activities allow new faculty a number of ways to improve their teaching, engage with experienced faculty, and build collegial relationships. (III.A.5, III.A.5.a, III.A.5.b)

Distance education support is one of the functions of the Center for Excellence in Learning, Teaching, and Technology. As the College moves towards its goal to deliver 30 percent of its course offerings online, it has offered professional development opportunities for instructors teaching or planning to teach online. (III.A.5, III.A.5.a)

It appears the main way full-time, tenured faculty participate in professional development is through sabbatical leave time, assigned time, and "other."

It is difficult to gauge the success of the professional development programs as there seems to be a great number of activities and sometimes broad participation but it is unclear how the College systematically evaluates professional development and uses the results as the basis for improvement. (III.A.5.b)

Overall, there is a good deal of focus on student learning and teacher methodology in the early part of faculty members' careers, but it tapers off after faculty are granted tenure. Professional development is planned, implemented, and encouraged with support from administration and staff. Extensive surveys are conducted to assess professional development programs and the results are the basis for improvements in the program. (III.A.5.a, III.A.5.b)

The report indicates that starting in fall, 2012, program review will track the impact of initiatives to improve student learning but this date too soon for the team to examine during the site visit.

The College targeted three outcomes in their strategic plan to integrate human resource planning with institutional planning and the results are noteworthy. (III.A.6)

Progress toward achieving Strategic Outcome A is notable, as the College hired two new faculty in Hawaiian Studies. New positions were created to assist Native Hawaiian students in the developmental education program, and the College used National Science Foundation funds to increase the numbers of Native Hawaiian students in the STEM program.

Conclusions

The College substantially meets standard IIIA. Faculty, staff, and managers support teaching and learning at the College, and all aspects of the hiring and evaluation process are done regularly, systematically, professionally, and appropriately. Professional development is conducted and available to APT, executives, and faculty, though its planning and assessment are not completely clear. The College is clearly dedicated to its mission and diversity and this is reflected in its human resource practices though an emphasis on better integration of HR

planning with other college planning processes is needed. However, the College needs to clarify and improve its use of SLOs in the evaluation of faculty.

Recommendations

Recommendation 6:

See UHCC Recommendation 3.

Recommendation 7: In order to meet the Standard, and the recommendation made in 2006, the team recommends that the College fill the vacancies deemed essential to the running of the College and remedy the time lag between the verbal commitment and an employee's start day of effected employees. (III.A.2)

Standard III – Resources
Standard IIIB - Physical Resources

General Observations:

Set on forty-four scenic acres, KCC is located in east Honolulu on the slope of Leʻahi (Diamond Head). The College's physical facilities include twenty buildings that house approximately 390,000 square feet of floor space. Facilities consist of ninety classrooms (including three portable classrooms), a former military chapel (used for dance and music classes), labs, computer labs, workrooms, conference rooms, storage rooms, and offices. In addition, the College has satellite facilities on Oʻahu island which includes Leeward and Windward CCs as well on the neighboring islands of Hawaiʻi, Maui, and Kauaʻi.

The College challenge with incorporating facility and equipment planning as part of the institutional planning process is evident. Currently, this aspect of the College's planning process is lacking a comprehensive facilities plan that includes a systematic and assessment process. As stated earlier in this report, the College is transitioning from a two part reporting process (ARPD and tactical planning) to a single reporting mechanism. The College plans to modify the ARPD including elements of the tactical plan and also additional data about outcomes and assessment. This process will also include an increased focus on the importance of institutional planning and campus wide communication.

One of the challenges the College faces is a limited budget allocation from the system level to address facility and equipment needs. This College is attempting to address the College's facility and equipment needs with the realization that the funds from the system level for this purpose will be limited. In addition, communication from administrative leadership to faculty and staff regarding budget decisions and rationale from the system level appears to be minimal at best. This presents a challenge to the College in providing budget information in transparent manner to the College community. As a result, the College community does not receive consistent communication at the campus level regarding the budget allocation process at the system level or rationale for these decisions.

Findings and Evidence:

As the second largest of ten post-secondary institutions in the UH system, the College is striving to maximize space and leverage resources. Currently, the College's enrollment is at 4955 FTES, essentially at the designated facilities design limit of 5000 FTES. During peak periods of 7:15 am to 3:15 pm, the College has also observed that facilities and classrooms are maximized during this time. As a result, the College has introduced several initiatives to address demand such as increasing the enrollments in distance education classes and utilizing nearby parking areas. (III.B.1)

The College's vice chancellor for Administrative Services (VCAS) and the associate vice president for Administrative Affairs (AVPAA) of the UHCC hold the primary responsibility to ensure the safety for the College campus and all satellite campuses. The campus cooperates with

46

the UH System to ensure that occupational and environment health and safety standards are met. The College has several programs that are housed in facilities off site, such as at Leeward or Windward CC. The administrative units at these local community colleges oversee the facilities and equipment needs at these sites. (III.B.1)

The area of administrative services has established a several processes that include appropriate criteria in determining the safety of the College's facilities and equipment. This process includes maintenance of its fire, first aid, lighting equipment, hazardous materials, and incident reports. This process as delineated by the VCAS establishes criteria to assist the campus in identifying gaps related to facilities. The process includes reviewing work request order forms and facility and equipment information located in the tactical plan reports. This information assists the administrative services office to assess the need of facility and equipment needs of the campus. PPAC and administrative staff also review requests for facilities and equipment that have been identified in the tactical plans before recommendations are submitted to the chancellor. (III.B.1)

CELTT is critical to the success of distance learning. Established in 2005, the facility located in the Naio building offers support services to faculty teaching distance education courses (online, hybrid, teleconference), provides one-on-one training, and group training sessions. The CELTT also provides additional supportive resources to faculty such as the television recording studio that enables faculty to record instructional demonstrations for their students. The College provides support to the College's distance education learning management system, Laulima that is hosted by the UH. The College also utilizes BlackBoard Collaborate which provides virtual classrooms, offices, and meeting spaces for students, faculty, and counselors. Both the CELTT tactical plan and the College's strategic plan address the technical needs for campus learning and securing advanced technologies for student engagement. (III.B.1)

Program services and needs are identified as tactical plans. Regular repair and maintenance needs are submitted in work request forms to the office of administrative services. Needs centered on health and safety of the campus have the highest priority and are addressed immediately. This planning process includes annual updates and ensures that the programs are assessing their needs on a regular basis. Needs for facilities, equipment, maintenance, upgrades, and replacement are included in this program assessment. The College attempts to fulfill as many requests as possible with the limited funds available for this purpose. Due to the budgetary restrictions set forth by the systems office, the College may not be able to address a program need in a timely manner. As a result, the College has sought external funds to assist programs with needs related to equipment or facilities. (III.B.1a.)

The College adheres to all state, federal and UH system polices regarding the general safety and welfare of the campus. All students and College personnel have access to campus during normal College working hours. Although the demand for parking is high, the College has established several strategies to address this demand. The College has agreements with local merchants to utilize their parking lots and has also increased the enrollment in distance education classes. To address the parking need, the College included plans to increase parking spaces as part of the college's long-range development plan (LRDP). (III.B.1.b)

The VCAS and the Auxiliary and Facilities Services Officer (FSO) review and assess facility and equipment needs as stated in programs tactical plans and submitted work order forms. Included in the ARPD may be information that leads to a discussion of a facility need. This process was discussed in the self-evaluation, but no evidence was presented to the team to support this claim. Regular inspection of the College's facilities is also conducted on a regular basis by the VCAS and FSO. The College has received millions of dollars in external funds that have improved facilities and equipment on campus. These include CIP funds, Title III funds, and other sources such as ARRA (American Recovery and Reinvestment Act) funds. (III.B.2)

The College's LRDP and strategic plan assist in establishing how major building projects are prioritized. The 2010 LRDP is a result of a collaborative process between the College and community members. This process included a College appointed advisory working group, the College's PPAC, two periods of design activity, and informational meetings with surrounding neighbors and neighborhood boards. The planning for the Culinary Institute of the Pacific was intentionally excluded from the LRDP because it is a long-range capital project already determined to be built near the College campus will utilize the former military officers' Cannon Club. (III.B.2a)

Although the self-evaluation report included narrative referencing the ARPD and tactical planning process, the team found little evidence to support these claims. ARPD reports and tactical plans do exist and include information relative to facilities, but evidence was not provided to the team to demonstrate how these reports were connected to institutional planning. Through the interview process, the team discovered that these reports help assist with identifying areas of need, but a formal systematic assessment utilizing the tactical plans does not exist. An integrated planning process that clearly defines how physical resource planning is integrated with institutional planning should be developed for the College. (III.B.2b)

Conclusions:

The College mostly meets this standard. KCC has appropriate facilities to support its programs and services. The College has been successful in obtaining external funds to make improvements to the College to provide addition resources for faculty, staff and students. Physical resource information included in the ARPD reports and tactical plans are loosely part of the College's planning process. The College has established a thoughtful and insightful long-term plan for physical resources as stated in the College's LRDP. However, no campus-wide planning process exists that reviews the physical resource needs of the campus on a regular basis. In addition, the limited funds and communication from the system offices is a challenge for the College in providing adequate facilities to the campus.

Recommendations: None

Standard III - Resources
Standard IIIC - Technology Resources

General Observations

The College provides integrated support for technology through the CELTT, which is a complex unit comprised of faculty, professional and clerical staff, student interns, and volunteers. The following list, from the CELTT Technology Resources System Program Review Fall 2010 to summer 2011, shows CELTT's full range of responsibilities: "CELTT coordinates, develops, and implements the College's technology plans; develops and maintains the College's voice, data and video networks; develops and supports local area networks within instructional and administrative facilities; develops and coordinates faculty and staff professional development activities; conducts demonstrations to familiarize faculty and staff with equipment available and to enable them to operate equipment; supports the development and delivery of distance education using a variety of media, such as broadcast television, cable television, web-based instruction, or other forms of digital delivery; supports curriculum innovation using computers or media technology in the classroom; develops and maintains computing programs and services for both academic administrative uses; works with College program heads to formulate budget requirements especially in the area of technology and technology uses; evaluates and makes recommendations on the purchase of technology; maintains and repairs media and computing equipment, including the development and implementation of preventive maintenance programs; trains faculty and staff in various computer applications and use of media; provides telephone/telecommunication services; and develops and implements applicable policies and procedures."

While short term planning occurs in the strategic and tactical plans, the process for long term planning or dedicated technology allocation or budget was not clear. The College relies primarily on grants and one time state funding to support technology needs. CELTT has continued to provide effective service while hindered by many vacant positions.

Findings and Evidence

The College uses the tactical and strategic planning processes to identify technology needs. The strategic plan 2008-2015 includes performance measure 2 for strategic outcome F: "Establish minimum technology standards for all campus learning and administrative spaces. Bring all classrooms, labs, and offices into compliance by 2015. Secure advanced technologies for student engagement." CELTT works with program heads to formulate budget requirements for technology and technology uses. According to evidence provided during the site visit, "CELTT is consulted on all administrative computing needs and provides specifications and solicits vendor quotations based on current and future support policies and practices as well as the end user's needs. For learning spaces, minimal standards were set with renovation projects completed in 2009 and 2010. For typical learning spaces, a basic standard technology suite includes a teacher's computer, DVD/VHS player, ceiling mounted projector, built-in or pull-down screen, sound system, and remote controls. Based on instructional needs, an interactive or

traditional whiteboard may be included. These standards are documented in the Distance Education Substantive Change Request." The College evaluates the effectiveness of its technology resources through the tactical plan process, satisfaction surveys, the Annual Report of Academic Support Services Program Data, and the CELTT Technology Resources System Program Review Fall 2010 to summer 2011. (III.C.1.)

Programs make decisions about technology needs in the tactical planning process. CELTT supports all individual department requests and keeps a list of technology requests so that when additional funding becomes available the College can move forward with the requests. The College does not have a technology plan or budget. Distance learning courses are offered completely online, through cable TV, and off-site. The faculty and staff survey asked faculty and staff who had taught distance courses since 2009 to rate "the support for your equipment needs in the distance delivered classes that you have taught." Of the seventy-six respondents, 69.7 per cent stated they were "very satisfied" or "somewhat satisfied." The College uses Laulima, the UH's online course management system; CELTT provides technical support and training. In the PowerPoint presentation "University of Hawai'i Community Colleges Overview, Accreditation Comprehensive Visit, Fall 2012," the last slide identifies current issues in distance education, including the infrastructure. In addition to providing technical support for instruction, CELTT supports the communications systems on campus, including the telecommunication system, network, wireless network and devices, campus servers, and video and audio conferencing. The College implements and CELTT provides support for UH policies on reliability, disaster recover, privacy, and security. (III.C.1.a.)

CELTT provides training for faculty and staff and facilitates training for students. Training depth and variety appear to be strong. Methods for assessing training needs depend on communication with the constituent groups. Information about student training needs comes from student organizations, instructional faculty and counselors, data collected via outcomes assessment, and instructional technology like Laulima and Blackboard Collaborate. Training for students, provided by the Library and Learning Resources unit and Kahikoluamea, includes a student technology support help desk, support lab, Secrets of Success learning to use technology workshops, and online information on topics like the Microsoft Office Suite and internet searching. Information about College personnel training needs comes from direct requests, trends and issues in higher education and industry, and technologies identified during the strategic and tactical planning process and course and program review process. CELTT uses feedback surveys and usage data to assess effectiveness of training. The assessment plan is part of its tactical plan. (III.C.1.b.)

Apart from the tactical plans and the strategic plan, the self-evaluation does not include evidence that the College has a technology plan which is linked with other planning process and resource allocation. CELTT is responsible for management, maintenance, and operation of the College infrastructure and equipment and provides appropriate systems for reliability and emergency backup. (III.C.1.c.)

The College uses its strategic plan, tactical plans, and CELTT's annual Academic Support Services Program Review Procedures and Measures to make decisions about use and distribution

of technology resources. The College implements and CELTT provides support for UH policies on reliability, disaster recover, privacy, and security. The College does not have a long range plan for keeping the infrastructure reasonably current. Based on inventories, assessments, and surveys, the College meets its current technology needs. Approximately 70 percent of survey respondents strongly or somewhat agreed that CELTT enhanced the campus capacity to offer online and hybrid courses. (III.C.1.d.)

Technology planning is integrated with institutional planning as CELTT develops its own tactical plan and provides advice for other program tactical plans, though integration to budget appears ad hoc at times. The strategic plan 2008-2015 includes performance measure 2 for strategic outcome F: "Establish minimum technology standards for all campus learning and administrative spaces. Bring all classrooms, labs, and offices into compliance by 2015. Secure advanced technologies for student engagement." CELTT reports, however, that "the unit [CELTT] is in the process of developing an overall technology vision for the campus as well as a proposal for the centralized procurement, inventorying, maintenance, licensing, etc. of campus technologies, including budgeting. There is currently no dedicated technology allocation or budget." The College assesses its effectiveness, but it is not clear how that assessment feeds into the improvement cycle. (III.C.2.)

Conclusions

The College partially meets the requirements of Standard III.C.

Recommendation

Recommendation 8: In order to meet the Standard, the team recommends that the College develop a technology plan to identify technology needs and inform the budgeting process. (III.C)

51

Standard III – Resources
Standard IIID - Financial Resources

General Observations:

KCC is the second largest of ten post-secondary institutions in the UH system. It is part of a complex public finance system overseen by the UH BOR, the UH president and the vice-president for community colleges, the state legislature and governor. The College continued an extended transitional phase with reorganizations at both the system and College levels and the development and implementation of a comprehensive performance based planning and budgeting process. During the past several years the College, as part of the unified UH, experienced adverse resource impacts due to the general malaise of the state and national economy. The College has managed to work through this turbulent environment and achieve final conversion to the Kuali financial system. The College, throughout, was able to maintain its status as an appropriately financed and funded institution. (III.D)

Since 2008-2009, the College has experienced a significant decline in general fund revenues, from $25,167,336 to $19,470,830 in 2010-2011 representing a 26.2 percent reduction. Concurrently, the College increased its tuition and fees special fund from $10,028,930.00 to $14,475,430 representing a 43 percent expansion. Still, overall general fund and tuition-based revenues declined 3.5 percent for the same period. The College's strategic plan scorecard 2012 reflects its aggressive pursuit in significantly increasing non-state funds, grants, professional development monies and private philanthropic partnerships. During the same time frame, the College has maintained unrestricted funds reserves in excess of the 5 percent and for FY 2012 projected a 13.55 percent cash reserve. (UHCC BLS Expenditure Plan FY 2012).

Based on the analysis of the self-study report and documented evidence, the College has met the Accreditation Standards in regards to financial resources. The self-evaluation provided much useful evidence yet was found lacking in the completeness and currency of financial information at the campus level. It did substantiate that the institution is moving forward with improved integration of planning and resource allocation.

Findings and Evidence:

KCC's institutional mission, values and goals set the tone for the integrated planning process. The revised UH system strategic plan (2008-2015), UHCC strategic plan (2008-2015), the KCC strategic plan (2008-2015) along with biennium budgetary requests (2011-2013, 2013-2015) and College unit tactical plans continue to be major source documents guiding institutional and financial planning. KCC's PPAC is the central coordinating committee where maintenance and development of institutional planning and essential budgetary review occur. It is the only campus body which includes a cross section of academic, support, authorized governance organizations (Faculty Senate, Student Congress, Kalaualani and Staff Council) and administrative personnel but the body lacks a defined role in making recommendations to planning and budget. It is has potential to be an integrative and centralized mechanism for review, discussion and analysis related to matters of policy, planning (tactical, strategic and long-

term), budgeting and program assessment. The PPAC reviews and discusses planning and budgeting priorities with the chancellor. In an effort to make the process more inclusive, the then interim chancellor, in October 2006, directed the PPAC to post its meeting agendas and minutes for College community access and this practice continues in the present. (III.D.1)

The self-evaluation report, College plans and processes indicate that the institutional mission serving students and the community, instructional support services and resultant performance measures fuel a more integrated institutional planning/budgeting approach. The College, through its instructional, student, community relations and administrative services components, aligns the campus level planning efforts with those of the UHCC and UH system in the development of inter-locking strategic plans and financial operations. The UHCC coordinates this alignment for KCC and other community colleges. Ultimately the local institution's planning and financial operations are analyzed and reviewed, in aggregated form, by the president of the UH, BOR and the State Legislature. Hence, for KCC participants, the continuous planning cycle is a long, complex closed loop system involving three governance structures (KCC, UHCC and UH System). For the past several years, since the last accreditation cycle, all three have continuously restructured their planning efforts to become more inclusive and improvement directed. While apparently structurally improved, at the local level there appear concerns about how effective the planning/budgeting processes work and a substantial lack of knowledge among faculty, staff and even some administrators about resultant financial decision-making. KCC's faculty and staff survey results (Data Book Two) and department chairs, unit heads, and administrators survey result (Data Book Three) indicate, for example, that in excess of 66 percent of faculty neither understood their department's budget and determination nor its relationship to the division's tactical plan, the College's strategic plan or long range development plan. 47.7 percent of faculty surveyed does not know whether the Faculty Senate is fulfilling its responsibility in speaking for faculty in budget planning and implementation policy. 39.3 percent of department chairs, unit heads and administrators survey (28), did not understand how their department/unit budget was determined. It is apparent that a good number of faculty and some administrators are either confused as to the process or how results impact departmental and unit level budgeting. Further, the "don't know" responses frequently outweighed those who ventured an opinion as to the effectiveness of financial planning thus indicating a need for improved institutional planning communication and training. (III.D.1.a)

As previously indicated, authorized governance organizations including the Faculty Senate and its budget committee are part of the College resource planning process. Faculty and staff have been included in various special task forces focusing on financial and budget matters. The College's budget process adheres to the UH system's biennium budgetary processes. As such the financial planning process is completed in two-year cycles though maintained and monitored in annual fiscal year segments. The College and system have mechanisms in place, which may allow for supplemental funding or reallocations based on documented need. Further, the institution utilizes a strategic plan scorecard providing evidence that funds budgeted to target outcomes and performance measures result in improvements. (III.D.1.a)

53

KCC conforms to the UH and the State of Hawai'i Program Planning and Budgetary (PPB) system. This biennial and supplemental budget process identifies functional programmatic areas for financial planning and operations. In conformance with the BOR policies (Section 8-3), the UH system issues a biennium budget policy paper outlining strategic initiatives, performance targets, funding challenges, budget development strategy including capital improvements. (UH 2013-2015 Budget Policy Paper, May 2012) Component institutions such as KCC use this directive as impetus to develop their biennial budgets. (III.D.1.a)

As part of a large, complex state driven multi-college system, KCC's two primary sources of revenue are state general funds and UH tuition and fees. For the past several fiscal years, the UH System, the UHCC and KCC have experienced a decided shift in revenue and income sources. State general fund contributions have declined by nearly $6 million from FY 2009 to FY 2011. Tuition and fees special fund made up two-thirds of that loss with a nearly $4.2 million increase experienced in FY 2011. KCC and other Hawaiian colleges received federal Education Stabilization Funds from the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act in FY 2010 and FY 2011. By FY 2011, use of these time limited funds allowed the College to have primary source revenues equal to or exceeding FY 2009. FY 2012 projections indicated a planned addition of $2.1 million in general funds and $900,000 growth in tuition and fees special fund over FY 2011. As previously indicated, KCC has aggressively pursued additional revenue opportunities, consistent with its planning efforts, through UHCC system enrollment growth fund, grants, summer school tuition and fees and continuing education activities. While exercising local and mandated expenditure controls, the institution may have weathered the worst of the economic tsunami hitting the islands since 2008. Through its administrative budget office, the College and the UHCC system provides both projected and actual budgetary updates on at least a quarterly basis (budget level summaries) and the VPCC present annual status updates each spring to the institution as a whole. The College is participating in two major program improvement areas funded by additional state monies: the STEM initiative and Workforce Development. Planning and budgeting for all revenue initiatives, be they state general fund, tuition based or enrollment growth funds, are channeled through the planning and budgeting cycle and PPAC. Additionally, the College is using its performance measures scorecard to assist in budgetary priority setting. (III.D.1.b)

The tactical plan fueled biennium budget process is representative of the short-range financial planning process. The College in consortium with the UHCC system offices monitors all revenue and expenditures and is further linked in the biennium budget development process. In combination, the State of Hawai'i, the UH system and the UHCC system manage the College's long-range financial obligations and liabilities via review and approval of the College's LRDP. Collective bargaining, health and retirement benefit programs are managed by the State of Hawai'i. General liability and facilities self-insurance are coordinated between the state and the UH Office of Risk Management. Major capital improvement projects (CIP), including major renovations are also administered by the UHCC system though short-term deferred maintenance programs appear to be issued as grant funds to the local institution. KCC appears not to be responsible for revenue or general obligation bond debt service. Financial and program audits of

programs and projects are centered within the UH system and reviewed, accepted and controlled by the BOR. (III.D.1.c)

The institution has a well-documented and defined financial planning process and one that conforms to the UH and UHCC planning and budgeting policies and procedures. KCC planning entities include the PPAC and OFIE. Both maintain electronic websites with planning and budgeting processes either outlined or complete with requisite "maps" and formwork. Along with the VCAS, the authorized governance organizations interact with PPAC and OFIE in order to develop, monitor and impact the financial planning process. Much of campus life has been involved with the reorganization and development of integrated planning mechanisms. Several offices maintain electronic records of decision-making via committee and council agendas and minutes. The integrated planning/budgeting processes, described earlier, does allow for active constituent participation either through direct participation in the PPAC, active committee membership through either the Staff Council or Faculty Senate or via ones department or unit. Current College integrated planning and budgeting is a "limited integrated process" however. PPAC clearly works with the chancellor and vice chancellor on planning and budgetary matters. However, its role is limited to review and discussion and does not include analysis and recommendation. It is evident, via the interview process, that there exists great trust in the chancellor and his administrative team in representing the College well throughout the system planning and budgeting processes. However, feedback communication has been lacking as evidenced by survey results addressing knowledge and currency about the process. It is quite clear, the institution's constituents and groups continue to lack real knowledge of the planning processes and their outcomes. Further, it appears that confusion as to planning and budgetary pathways continues to impact the institution. For example, according to the College's own surveys of faculty and staff, only one respondent in three understand and engage in the budgeting process. Further evidence of this disconnect is indicated through surveys of department chairs and unit heads which demonstrate that about half of then do not understand or know how their departmental budgets are developed and determined. Even more startling is the number of faculty and staff who do not know that the OFIE (51.5 percent) facilitated the development of the tactical and strategic plan and that 69.6 percent of the faculty did not know whether the PPAC achieved its goals as a recommending (and authorized governance organization) body. The evidence suggests and concurs with the self-study assertion that "...the College needs to work on improving campus understanding of the planning and budgeting process." Additionally, it needs increased participation. (III.D.1.d)

As of July 1, 2012, the College, as part of the UH system, began its first phase implementation of the new Kuali (KFS) financial management system. The need for an improved financial management system was referenced in both the 2000 and 2006 accreditation reports. The previous system's mainframe technology and programming were neither web based nor included budget-to-actual reports, commitments, or workflow. Customized reports were difficult to develop which made for on-campus difficulty in analyzing financial status for revenues and expenditures let alone providing comprehensive budget level detail. KFS provides for electronic routing of all financial transactions and maintenance documents with appropriate attachments and notes. Newly implemented modules include a chart of accounts, general ledger, financial processing, labor ledger, accounts receivable, contracts and grants, purchasing, accounts payable

55

and capital asset management. These and customized reports should allow improved monitoring of budgets, improved data collection and program level budgets and funds report distribution relevant to the College's integrated planning and budgeting processes. The evidence suggests that despite the several flaws of the previous financial management system, the UH System and the College have been able to maintain responsible use of financial resources. The new system should provide improved internal controls including better "real-time" reports. A review of relevant financial data since 2006 suggests that the College and the UH system are on a strong financial footing. BOR finance and audit committee reports and discussions reflect this view as recent as April 12, 2012. (III.D.2)

Institutional financial documents reflect appropriate allocations and utilization of financial resources to fund instructional and student learning programs and support services. The College is part of the UH system biennium budgetary process and thus is dependent upon the system's timeliness as well as the appropriateness of equitable allocations within the UHCCs. Notwithstanding reporting issues with the previous financial management system, the College is encouraged to improve its communication about budget development and resultant departmental and College level decision-making. KCC exists within a state mandated and controlled financial management system and thus is required to submit expenditure approval through a complex, multi-faceted process. (III.D.2.a)

BOR policies reflect the high level of review expected for all annual audits. Annual audits are conducted at the UH system level. The BOR and its Audit Committee review the audit and discussions are held in public session and reflected in meeting agendas and minutes. Financial statement audit exceptions appear to be infrequent and no specific audit exceptions for KCC have been reported for the past several years. The BOR's Committee on University Audits (May 25, 2012) reviewed an information only report by the UH Office of Internal Audit regarding KCC Culinary Arts Program operations inventory management and related accounting and operational controls. The advisory nature of the report suggests that with the upcoming new culinary facility, the program may need to tighten its inventory control procedures and sales and cash receipts responsibilities. These and other suggestions were designed to maximize efficiency. With the recent purchase of inventory software and the advent of the KFS, it is anticipated that the tracking of culinary expenses will improve. (III.D.2.a)

The College continues to be impacted by from weaknesses in the flow of campus based financial information. This may be largely attributable to the old financial management system and its lack of ability to construct timely customized reports necessary to assist departments and units in budget management. Improvements in financial data reporting have been slowed by the elongated development and installation of the new KFS. Administration, faculty and staff are hopeful that the new system will speed budgetary data flow, which, in the past, has been a hindrance to the integrated planning and budgeting process. It appears the issue is less about the accuracy of financial information and more about appropriate timeliness. The 2006 self-study indicated that 89 percent of chairs did not understand their budgets and 67 percent stated that the process of finalizing the budget remained unknown. The current self-study indicated that 39 percent of the chairs and unit heads did not understand their budgets and its final determination. (III.D.2.b)

For the past three completed and audited fiscal years, analysis of financial trends data indicate cash reserves exceeded the three percent requirement and exceeded both the five and ten percent target figures through FY 2012. Projected ending balances indicate that FY 2012 may further add to the cash reserves. The ending balance of unrestricted funds for the past three years and projected into the current fiscal year indicates the College maintains sufficient reserves to adequately address any unanticipated emergencies. Additionally, should the need arise, the College could draw on system reserves through the UH System. Two revenue components, state general funds and tuition/fees, appear to have stabilized though the College and the system continue to remain dependent on enrollment driven tuition resources. Currently, the State of Hawai'i, the UH, the UHCC and KCC are analyzing the potential impacts of further increases in in-state tuition. All parties understand that a delicate balance between shrinking state general funding and increasing tuition and fees needs to be maintained. For individual colleges such as KCC, cash flow is sustained via the UH system and given its consistently strong financial position coupled with systemic expenditure controls, the College remains in a sustainable financial status. (III.D.2.c)

The state maintains a centralized risk management operation serving the needs of all of the colleges and university. Sufficient reserves exist for self-funded insurance components. Further, the state maintains a Risk Management Special Fund (RMSF) to address all legal expenses, pay settlements and judgments, pay the premiums for system wide insurance and self-insured retention (SIR). The UHCC are covered under State insurance programs and risk management program. (III.D.2.c)

Financial management is a centralized function based on the need to assure efficiency and equity for each of the universities and colleges within the UH system. Hence, all financial resources (general fund, tuition special funds, bonds, Certificates of Participation, auxiliary activities, fund-raising efforts and grants) are managed within the prescribed limits of the funding source. While the OFIE assists programs and faculty in the pursuit of grants, several external grants are co-managed by the College and the UH system. The VCAS manages and monitors grant transactions in consortium with the UHCC departments of budget, planning and finance. Policies and procedures are clear and precise and rest within the UH system and BOR purview. The institution, as part of the UHCC and UH system, follows rather precise and strict policy and procedural guidelines when administering extramural funding such as grants and endowments. The UH BOR consistently review external audit reports, management letters identifying any exceptions and maintains a rigorous auditing plan (external and internal). The institution is in compliance with student loan federal regulations related to student loan default rates and revenue strictures. Substantiation of past six years of external and internal audits indicates KCC has not experienced any relevant negative audit findings for this period. (III.D.2.d)

A review of external audits of the UH Foundation discovered no negative audit opinions as to its financial management. Further review has substantiated that the foundation and other auxiliary organizations have financially managed their operations in an appropriate manner. Institutionally, the College works within the proscriptive requirements of the BOR and the

UHCC policies and procedures related to fund-raising, grants management and foundation based activities. This standard has been consistently met. (II.D.2.e)

The College's current and past contractual agreement practices with external entities have been consistently validated by preceding accreditation entities as well as by external and internal auditors. As part of the institution's integrated planning and budgeting process (i.e. the execution of strategic and tactical plans), the college, in conjunction with the UH system Budget and Finance Office and the Office of Procurement, Real Property, and Risk Management administers contractual agreements with commercial construction contractors, technology firms and other necessary service contractors. Approval and signatory responsibility rests with the system officers. KCC's VCAS has a significant role monitoring local campus projects and services. Again, the UH system maintains strict policy, procedural guidelines for the execution of major and minor contractual services in behalf of the College. Expenditure of general obligation bond funds in support of the state initiative to "renovate to innovate" infrastructure and capital improvements are subject to tightly controlled system processes including internal and external audits. (III.D.2.f)

KCC, as part of a complex system of public higher education in the State of Hawai'i, in conjunction with the UH system and the UHCC system, regularly evaluates its financial management processes and those results are used to inform and improve financial management systems. The institution, adhering to BOR policies and practices, subjects its programs and financial systems to a variety of external and internal audits, comprehensive program reviews which may necessitate improvements of practice and process. (III.D.g)

As part of the institutional planning process, programs and services conduct annual and three-year comprehensive assessments of the effectiveness of their operations and appropriate utilization of financial resources. Use of performance measures, program assessments and strategic plan scorecards assists the institution in verifying the linkage of financial decisions with the results of program evaluation and stated service needs.

The participatory nature of the integrated planning and budgeting process allows for some input and review by various College constituent groups (i.e. authorized governance organizations such as the Faculty Senate) working with and through the PPAC. These practices have influenced utilization of financial management systems and clearly led to the requested replacement of its pre-existing FMS financial management system and installation of the KFM system. It is anticipated that the College, the UHCC and the UH will continue with self-improvement practices for planning and financial management activities. (III.D.3)

Conclusions:

Generally, the 2012 accreditation self-evaluation is a well-organized, nicely written and substantiated document. It is apparent throughout the report that KCC made a dedicated and sincere attempt to respond adequately to the 2006 recommendations. Related to standard III. D, the bulk of the institutional responses to the 2006 recommendations are contained in self-

evaluated Standards IB.6 (Effectiveness of Ongoing Planning and Resource Allocation) and in standard IV.B.2b (Dissemination of Recommendations and Decisions of its Governance Bodies).

The College mostly meets Accreditation Standards for financial resources. The self-evaluation occurred during an unusual period of financial disruption for the institution, its community college and university system. Except for the analysis of the integrated planning and financial management systems, the self-study did not develop any planning agendas for the standard III.D. Given the nature of system control over financial resources and the management thereof, the College continuously participates in the extended assessment of financial management policies, procedures and operations. Further, as one campus entity among ten within the UH, KCC has limited discretion over the use of its financial resources. Through the UH Council of Chancellors and other system governance structures, the College coordinates its financial management and planning activities within a complex financial environment.

Institutional financial management is well documented and guided by BOR policies and procedures and state administrative guidelines. Much of the success the College has achieved has been within the strictures of BOR policies and State of Hawai'i mandates. The development of effective programs along with improvement strategies has assisted KCC in the attainment of several of its institutional goals while increasing enrollments and tuition related revenues when confronted with declining state general fund revenues.

Clarity about budget development and decision-making processes is necessary. The institution's own internal surveys and analyses point to a need for the clarification and simplification of integrated planning and budgeting processes so that more constituent groups and individuals may better understand it and, thus improve participation. More frequent and documented communication about the integrated process is needed from the PPAC and other entities such as the Faculty Senate and instructional and service departments.

Recommendation

Recommendation 9: In order to fully meet the Standards, it is recommended that the College clarify and strengthen the review, assessment and planning recommendation roles of the Policy, Planning and Assessment Council to better serve and inform the College community and better align governance decision-making structures with those of the UH System. (IV.A., III.D., IV.B.)

STANDARD IV – Leadership and Governance
Standard IVA – Decision-Making Roles and Processes

General Observations:

The self-evaluation points out that the College's values statement includes its commitment to "Shared responsibility, effective communication, and partnerships in working with the educational, social, economic, and environmental betterment of the communities [it] serve[s]" (337). The evaluation claims that the College uses planning and assessment processes that encourage broad participation in setting goals for improvement, implementing strategies to attain them, and assessing outcomes to measure improvement and make improvements where necessary. To support this claim the self-evaluation includes survey results from faculty and staff that verify that College administrators, from department heads to the chancellor, encourage broad participation by faculty, staff, and students in planning and decision making. However, this survey also shows that less than 60 percent of faculty and staff at least somewhat agree that they participated actively in planning and priority setting in their departments or units.

Findings and Evidence and Conclusions

The College has a challenge with low rates of participation among support staff and students. Interviews with leaders from the authorized governance organizations indicate that the support staff members are reluctant to participate in Staff Council because of their high workload (due to some degree to understaffing) and their view that most governance issues affect instruction more than their own responsibilities. Student Congress participation is low because most students can not commit to the time necessary for participation. The charter for that organization requires that each campus club provide one member of this group while an equal number of members be elected at large. Finding these at-large members has been difficult; usually the student body elects only a few at-large members.

On the other hand, Kalaualani, the native Hawaiian organization, is growing in membership and influence as programs and activities for native Hawaiian students have developed and grown at the college and throughout the UH system in recent years. One goal of Kalaualani is including one member from each department and gain status equivalent to the Faculty Senate in policy matters (according to interviews with the leaders from Kalaualani and the Faculty Senate).

Thus the College has developed a governance structure that provides staff, faculty, administrators, and students ample opportunity to participate in College decision-making. Yet the College should continue to work towards achieving its goal to encourage all faculty, staff, and students to be involved in College governance.

The College's OFIE appears to provide data that faculty and staff find accessible and useful (see Data Book Two 22 & 62). OFIE documents are easy to access from the College web page. The College meets this part of the standard. On the other hand, the College would benefit from development of a plan to increase participation.

Governance at KCC (available from a link on its webpage) identifies groups that have an established ongoing role in governance and delineates the responsibilities of each (see above comments on response to previous team's recommendations). The self-evaluation describes each of the authorized governance organizations and standing councils in terms of its membership and function. Full implementation of the structure requires increased participation levels.

However, according to an interview with most of the members and former members of the PPAC, it became clear that the stated functions pertaining to planning and budget development listed for this group are not being (and never have been) carried out. Since this committee is the only organization that includes providing review and recommendations to the chancellor on "budget preparation and priority setting," a significant gap exists in the ability of the College community to participate in planning, budgeting, and setting priorities. The only means faculty and staff have for influencing decisions on budget is the tactical planning documents that departments and units develop as part of the College's planning process as opposed to its governance structure.

While the College appears to meet this part of the standard in terms of its written description of its governance structures, it needs to encourage the organizations to fulfill their respective described charges or redesign the College governance structure.

The self-evaluation describes the faculty's role in developing curriculum, establishing student learning outcomes, and using those outcomes to improve instruction. And it very generally describes the role of administrators in approving faculty recommendations in these areas. The faculty senate, through its curriculum committee, fulfills its responsibility to develop and periodically review courses and student support services. Interviews with faculty revealed no problems with this arrangement. The College meets standard IV.A.1b

The self-evaluation includes much survey data that shows that administrators, faculty, staff, and students work together to improve the College, but nearly half of the survey respondents reported that they did not participate in at least one governance body. Just over half of the respondents indicated that they had opportunities to provide input before College administration made decisions. Respondents varied in their responses for different governing organizations, with the Faculty Senate being rated as having the greatest input into most decision making. But even here, only 46.3 percent of respondents felt that the Faculty Senate had effective input in matters of budget planning and implementation, even though the Faculty Senate has a budget committee.

Interviews with faculty and support staff people confirmed that the Faculty Senate is the most influential governance organization. Its scope includes representing the faculty on all matters concerning educational programs and services, faculty personnel, academic freedom, community relations, and budget. An interview with the Faculty Senate president revealed that this committee has not been active for at least two years because budgets have not provided any significant discretionary money about which to make recommendations.

In general, the survey results (including many "Don't know" responses) show that the faculty and staff generally lack confidence in the effectiveness of the College's governance structures. The self-evaluation includes a statement that recognizes this problem and indicates that "the College needs to be proactive to improve the ways these [governance] organizations are communicating and carrying out their responsibilities" and that the College plans to "set benchmark goals for improvement related to communication...." Interviews with faculty support the intention of the College OFIE to help improve communication between governance organizations and constituencies they represent. While the self-evaluation claims that the College meets this standard, it appears to only partially meet it. The College should develop an actual plan for just how it intends to increase communication and participation in College governance.

The College describes in some detail how it provides honest information about itself to outside agencies. The College appears to meets standard IV.A.4

The self-evaluation briefly explains its use of the comprehensive survey it conducted last December, which generated most of the data in this part of the evaluation, as its sole means of evaluating the effectiveness of its governance structures. This survey will be administered every two years. The College meets this standard, although it might consider additional means of evaluation.

Conclusions:

The College substantially meets the standard.

Recommendations:

See team Recommendation 9.

62

Standard IV – Leadership and Governance
Standard IVB - Board and Administrative Organization

General Observations:

The KCC operates under the jurisdiction of the UH BOR. The UH system includes three four-year universities and seven community colleges. The community college chancellors have a dual reporting structure as they report to the UH VPCC for leadership and coordination and to the UH president for system wide policy decisions.

The BOR has in place policy regarding ethical responsibility that defines the board as an independent policy-making body whose primary duty is to represent the entire community in carrying out its elected responsibilities. The BOR consists of fifteen members, with nominees identified by the Regents Candidate Advisory Council, selected by the governor, and confirmed by the state senate. The BOR, in 2005, approved a system reorganization creating the VPCC responsible for executive leadership, policy decision-making, resource allocation, support services and reconsolidation of academic and administrative support units for the seven community colleges. The vice president is the primary liaison between the BOR and the standing Community Colleges Committee. A review of BOR and its Committee on Community Colleges agendas and minutes, for the past several years, reveal an active engagement with KCC regarding all aspects of its program operations, plans and goal attainment. The BOR meet annually on the KCC campus and the Committee on Community Colleges meets at least biannually at KCC.

Findings and Evidence:

BOR responsibilities for governance are outlined in the UH board policy and by-laws, most recently updated in 2010-2011. These procedures include: academic and facilities planning, appointing and evaluating the president, establishing the administrative structure, approving major contracts, approving new programs, reviewing fiscal audits, and approving the university budget. These were established in accordance with its mission and goals that support the mission of the university. (IV.B.1.a, IV.B.1.b, IV.B.1.c)

The BOR's mission, size, membership, terms of office, meeting dates, agendas, and minutes are available on that website as board policies and by-laws. A review of the BOR policies and by-laws found that they do not include a revision date. The UH does not currently have a formal procedure for regular evaluation of its policies but the BOR initiated and completed a review of all policies in 2010-2011. In addition, the board participated in a discussion with a representative of the Association of Governing Boards in 2011 following a review of policies and proposed revisions for improvement. (IV.B.1.d, IV.B.1.e)

The fifteen-member BOR terms of office are five years and a review of the website found that the terms are staggered. Currently, three terms end in 2012, four in 2013, two in 2015, three in 2016, and three in 2017. In February 2007, the BOR revised its election of officers' process from

yearly nominations to a permanent rotation system among all board members. BOR policy chapter 2, policy on board evaluation, requires that the board conduct a self-study of its stewardship every two years. The policy indicates that, "It shall be the responsibility of the President and the Chairperson to plan a special workshop devoted entirely to reviewing the Board's work." The team confirmed that that board conducted its last evaluation in 2008 with its next scheduled evaluation on October 18, 2012. This appears inconsistent with board policy.

The president facilitates an annual Best Practices for all Regents (conducted by the Association of Governing Boards), last offered in January 2011 and was attended by twelve of the fifteen regents, the president of the UH, the VPCC, several chancellors including KCC Chancellor Leon Richards. New regent orientation was last conducted in September 2011. The BOR developed the BOR reference guide as the primary source of reference materials for board members. Board members are encouraged to attend board development activities offered by state and national organizations. (IV.B.1.f, g)

The BOR's by-laws include standards of conduct, indicating that members of the board are "subject to the standards of conduct and financial interest disclosure requirements of Chapter 84, HRS (State Ethics Code) and must act in accordance with chapter 84, HRS." Upon review of chapter 84, HRS, the team could not find a clearly defined description for adjudicating board member behavior that violates this statute. (IV.B.1.h)

The board has been kept informed of the accreditation process for the college by the president. At board meetings, the president has informed the board about progress of the self-evaluation report throughout its development and presented final drafts for review at the BOR Committee on Community Colleges on June 15, 2012. The BOR approved the report on July 19, 2012. (IV.B.1.i)

The team verified that the district does have a formally approved hiring policy for its president, vice presidents, and college chancellors. The BOR evaluates the president annually at which time the board reviews the president's goals and self-evaluation. The responsibilities of the chancellor include budget development, human resources, long-term planning, community relations, and professional development. As part of an annual evaluation the chancellor provides an executive assessment to both the VPCC and the president, given the dual reporting structure of their position. (IV.B.1.j)

The chancellor has held his current position as chancellor and chief executive officer of KCC since 2007. The chancellor is very familiar with College operations and is the final authority at the College level. The chancellor provided leadership during the implementation of the system's 2008-2015 strategic plan that serves as the primary planning document for the College. The chancellor encourages dialogue throughout the college, and chairs the PPAC.

To ensure institutional effectiveness and academic quality, the chancellor initiated a significant reorganization and facilitated the effort to ensure all administrative positions were filled with permanent hires. During the reorganization, the chancellor established a robust research office, OFIE. As one assessment of the reorganization's effectiveness, the strategic plan 2008-2015

scorecard indicated that the College met or exceeded its benchmark goals for 15 of 27 quantitative measures. The institution bases its performance measurement primarily on the scorecard which itself may require periodic evaluation of its utility as an effective planning and assessment tool.

The chancellor has established an effective collegial process, values the input of the faculty senate, and invites classified staff and students to participate in the decision-making process. The College is to be commended for the broad participation of all staff in the accreditation process. This is an indication of how much the employees and students value the College in spite of a reported lack of participation in governance activities. (IV.B.2a)

Through the College's OFIE, the chancellor has supported the use of research and aggregated data in the planning and decision-making process. The OFIE website provides access to multiple surveys and reports which assess and support the improvement of teaching and learning.

The chancellor ensures that educational planning is tied to resource allocation and distribution through the College's program review, strategic, and annual tactical planning processes. The PPAC, convened by the chancellor, is the primary forum for reviewing and discussing institutional planning and implementation efforts according to KCC Policy K1.120. The PPAC's purpose statement indicates that, "The Policy, Planning and Assessment Council (PPAC) is inclusive of all levels of governance and management and serves as the principal mechanism for discussion, analysis, and recommendation related to matters of policy, planning, budgeting, and program assessment". Review of the few PPAC minutes revealed no analytical nor integrated planning recommendation functions have been performed. Through interviews with the standard IV self-evaluation committee co-chairs and the current PPAC membership confirms that PPAC performs solely as an information sharing group. (IV.B.2.a, IV.B.2.b)

The chancellor attends regular meetings of the Council of Chancellors, comprised of the ten college chancellors to advise the president on community college policy issues as well as individual meetings with the president of the UH and VPCC. The chancellor attends most BOR meetings and frequently represents KCC when policy and program decisions impact the institution. KCC hosts one BOR meeting each year and the BOR Committee on Community Colleges biannually. At the council meetings, the chancellor participates in policy decisions and formulation of recommendations to the president in conjunction with VPCC that comply with state statutes and the mission of the College. (IV.B.2.c)

The colleges' vice chancellors meet monthly as the Council of Chief Academic Officers (CCAO) to discuss common issues and resolve conflicts involving instructional programs at their campuses. The system, in conjunction with the Community College Senate, coordinates action in when one campus plans to develop a new center in another campus traditional enrollment service area so that long-term planning needs of the UHCC can occur.

The chancellor directs the implementation of statutes, governing board policies and by-laws through weekly meetings with the vice chancellors. The chancellor is responsible for the

financial operations of the College and is kept informed of income, expenditures, and budget projections by the vice chancellor of administrative services.

The chancellor is involved with the community by serving as a board member, commissioner, or chair for local, national and international non-profit and professional organizations. The chancellor communicates with the communities served by the institution primarily through major development efforts involving multi-stake holder groups. Examples of these projects include: the system's 2008-2015 strategic plan, update of the College's LRDP, and the major reorganization of the College.

Responses to a fall 2011 faculty and staff survey of the PPAC, which oversees tactical planning through an ongoing cycle of evaluation, integrated planning, resource allocation, implementation, and re-evaluation; indicate that 18.3 percent or 48/182 rated the council as very effective or somewhat effective in achieving its goals. However, as noted in the self-evaluation, 69.2 percent of the responses were "don't know." The chancellor, following receipt of the survey results, attempted to increase communication by directly emailing meeting minutes to all faculty and staff.

The team also reviewed the availability and currency of governance committee minutes and found Faculty Senate, Staff Council, Student Congress, and Kalaualani varied as to their currency and availability. Complete and up to date minutes for other important advisory committees were either not as accessible or far less accessible or non-existent. The team suggests that the College may wish to standardize its committee agenda and minutes format and to have all minutes posted within seventy-two hours of adjournment. In addition, as a proactive measure to measure the success of direct email, the team suggests that the College administer the survey again in spring 2013. (IV.B.2.c, IV.B.2.d, IV.B.2.e)

Some members of the team attended a formal presentation that provided an overview of the system's organizational structure given by the VPCC. The presentation included an overview of functional responsibilities and governance structures within the UH system as compared to those of a traditional multi-college California community college district. This confirmed the accuracy of the functional roadmap, UHCC campus-system functions map, as updated in January 2012 which delineates the responsibilities of UH system office, UHCC system office, the BOR, the State of Hawai'i, and the colleges. (IV.B.3.g)

The chancellors have a dual reporting structure. They report directly to the president for system-wide policy making and decisions and to the VPCC for leadership and coordination of community college matters. This reporting structure emanated from the UHCC Reorganization Memorandum, May 27, 2005. The chancellor, when interviewed by team members, confirmed this as an acceptable and appropriate reporting structure and one which allows him to directly communicate and advocate KCC programs and operations with the VPCC and the president of the UH system. (IV.B.3.f)

Much of the impetus for the development of accountability measures has emanated from the reorganization of the UHCC (2005) and through the coordination and leadership of the vice-

66

president for community colleges and the BOR Committee on Community Colleges. The development of program review, performance measures and the increasing coordination with biennial budgetary requests provides valuable assessment data and planning information for the VPCC to help guide the institution towards improved effectiveness. The UHCC and KCC Function Maps aids in the communication and understanding of institutional assessment and planning. (IV.B.3.g)

The system governance structure enables each campus to work independently in limited areas such as hiring, scheduling, and IT. The chancellor has full responsibility to implement and administer delegated system policies and is accountable for the operation of the College. The Office of the VPCC provides centralized support for a broad range of administrative and academic support services. A partial list includes academic planning, assessment, and policy analysis; career and technical education; student affairs; workforce development; budgeting, facilities, human resources, and marketing. (IV.B.3.a, IV.B.3.b, IV.B.3.e)

Conclusions:

The UH system, including the VPCC, is governed by the fifteen member independent policy making BOR. The BOR governs the system under a set of bylaws, establishes and administers system policies and periodically evaluates policies and its own performance. Board self-evaluation policy was adopted in October 2006. However, the BOR's last self-evaluation was conducted in 2008. The team was informed by College administration that the next BOR self-evaluation was scheduled for October 18, 2012.

There appears to be continued general satisfaction with the College and UHCC leadership in operating a well-received branch of higher education for Hawai'i. Even through difficult economic times, KCC has been able to obtain adequate funding via a combination of general funds, tuition and registration fees and extramural funding opportunities including grants, fund raising and entrepreneurial activities. The assessment, planning and funding environment is changing within the system and at the College. The governance structure has helped develop potentially effective responses to these changes, yet, at times, is a hindrance to a complete implementation of fully integrated planning, assessment and financing process. In order for KCC to completely meet Accreditation Standards, the College and the UH system may need to consider further refinements to its existing structures which would allow for full implementation of integrated planning and assessment.

While the KCC, the UH and the VPCC, in consortium, meet the requisites of standard IV. B, it could better achieve collaborative integrated institutional planning by unleashing tools and structures already at their disposal.

At KCC, full implementation of its integrative assessment and planning activities is limited due to the lack of a collaborative entity which can mediate tactical and strategic plans, assist in the development of institutional priorities, and result in an informed comprehensive biennial budget document aligned with system governance and funding structures. In order to achieve this, KCC may wish to fully implement KCC policy K1.120 (PPAC Purpose Statement) which declares the

67

PPAC is the principal mechanism for discussion, analysis, and recommendation related to matters of policy, planning, budgeting, and program assessment. A properly functioning PPAC would assist and advise the chancellor in developing a collaborative planning environment and one that would easily align with the VPCC.

Commendation:

Commendation 4: The College is to be commended for the broad participation of all staff in the accreditation process.

Recommendation:

See team Recommendation 9.