The Town Hall meeting was structured in two parts: 1) Discussion of the Follow-Up Report as a whole, section by section; and 2) a focused discussion on Recommendation 3 and the Distance Education Strategic Plan.

Chancellor Erika Lacro began the discussion of the College’s draft responses to recommendations from the visiting team, which had previously been posted for campus review, with a brief overview of process by which the report had been written. She also noted that there will also be responses to the system recommendations, which have been written by the Office of the Vice President for Community Colleges, and will be incorporated in each campus’ individual report. She also indicated that the administrative team, which wrote the report, is still working on pulling together the supporting documents (e.g., Standard Operating Procedures for Human Resources, report on Administrative Review.) Each member of the Chancellor’s team was tasked with working on specific sections (e.g., the Chancellor worked on the HR recommendations (Nos. 5 and 6), the Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs Russell Uyeno worked on the Recommendation relating to Distance Education (No. 3) with Ross Egloria and Wayne Sunahara.

The Chancellor also explained that the final section was created to provide further evidence of our having “closed the loop” in the process of assessment (i.e., responding to issues and problems identified through assessment by making changes and improvements in various contexts.) We will also include, in the introduction, new data sets that are disaggregated by various demographic factors, since that was also a criticism made by the visiting team.

In addition to feedback provided at this Town Hall, the campus is invited to provide comments up to Friday, September 27, by email to the Chancellor and the Accreditation Liaison Officer.

**DISCUSSION OF RECOMMENDATION 1: Program Review of non-instructional units**

This recommendation relates to the fact that administrative and other non-instructional units did not have SLOs or SAOs (service area outcomes) and were not doing annual assessments or program reviews. As a result of work done since last spring, all units now have SAOs, have identified means of assessing them, and have begun to gather data. Vice Chancellor for Administrative Services Brian Furuto and Dean of Student Services Katy Ho have each worked with their respective units on this, and have developed materials to guide the work of non-instructional assessment and regular review of all programs.

**FEEDBACK ON RECOMMENDATION 1:**

Q: How will results be reported to the campus?

A: The administration is looking at a possible merger of the Accreditation Oversight Committee and the Assessment Committee; as the Assessment Committee does currently, this committee should continue to look at all program reviews, including those for which annual data are
provided by the system (ARPD) as well as others. These results, where appropriate, will be shared with the campus, and will link back to the existing policy on program review. The policy is being updated to require that programs review a certain percentage of their PLOs each year.

Q: What is the “unit assessment guide” that is referenced as evidence in this section?

A: This is the guide created by the VCAS after the April 2013 Assessment workshop in which the whole campus participated.

Q: On page 2, reference is made to administrative assessment having been done, but the Closing The Loop section mentions it being done this semester. Isn’t this inconsistent?

A: We will check for accurate statements of chronology. While our report is due by October 15, the visit will come later, but which time our annual reports and program reviews will be done. We will have our own internal Program Review site in addition to what is posted on the system site (ARPD), since not all of our internal programs are supported by system-based data.

Q: Why is the Closing the Loop section at the end? Shouldn’t it be up front, or incorporated into the various sections?

A: The idea was to consolidate and reiterate all the ways in which the College does use assessment to work for improved effectiveness as an institution.

Q: Wouldn’t it be good to include specific examples within the narrative whenever possible, in addition to just linking to evidence?

A: Good idea. We will try to do that.

Also, The Executive Assistant to the Chancellor and the webmaster are working on creating a new page (modeled after Foothill College) that consolidates the various forms of SLOs/SAOs—course-level, program-level, student services, administration, institution.

**DISCUSSION OF RECOMMENDATION 2: SLOs and ASSESSMENT**

This recommendation, somewhat related to the first one, also looks at the need to do outcomes-based assessment. The requirement for programs to assess a percentage of their learning outcomes each year, and identify changes made as a result, is related to that. The focus on the SLO inventory forms developed in connection with the April is also a key factor here. We do not have 100% completed yet, and do not plan to post everything online, but will make hard copy available if requested.

**FEEDBACK ON RECOMMENDATION 2:**

Q: Won’t the visiting team expect to see them online before they arrive?

A: We can post some selected examples and cite and link to them in the body of the report.
Q: What about the institutional level—institutional effectiveness?

A: Chancellor Rota previously asked for a non-quantitative administrative assessment (that would be comparable to an institution-level assessment) but those who reviewed this initial plan thought there should be some data, so we will do that.

Note that the definition of our ILOs, and how we plan to assess them, will be discussed at the upcoming Planning Council meeting. Note also that the revision of how we change how we assess this level is itself a response to assessment.

Another element will be how we address the problems we are having in meeting our system-level Strategic Initiatives, especially as we did worse this year than last.

Q: Some of the language in the first and second sections (relating to the April assessment workshop) seems identical. Won’t that seem odd?

A: Different sections may be assigned to different members of the visiting team, but we can make some modifications.

Q/A: Reference is made to the perceived problems with the ARPD for Student Services. One place we should direct the readers is the minutes from the Assessment Committee, and our campus discussion about system data and how gathering them needed to be modified.

We can also require programs to respond to Assessment Committee feedback in their narrative.

RESPONSE TO RECOMMENDATION 3: DISTANCE EDUCATION

This will be discussed in more detail later, but the key was to have an overall view of Distance Education.

FEEDBACK ON RECOMMENDATION 3:

Q: How many people participated in the distance education/ hybrid format training that was offered via staff from KCC?

A: One faculty member.

Q: How many DE faculty members attended and participated in the Mandatory Orientation session in August?

A: Ninety-two percent of DE faculty attended this session. Note that the Chancellor has said that she is prepared to require that faculty do not participate in mandatory activities for DE, they will not be able to teach DE classes.

RESPONSE TO RECOMMENDATION 4: GENERAL EDUCATION
The campus is quite familiar with the extensive discussion around this issue, and the Chancellor provided an overview of changes that have occurred, some in response to the system mandate for “college-level” general education courses in the AAS degree programs.

It was suggested that reference be made to the ad hoc committee that consulted with the Chancellor during the summer as policy and catalogue were being finalized; the Chancellor will write up this concluding section.

A number of actions have gone through the Committee on Programs and Curricula this month to formalize some of the changes and updates made in the current catalogue, and the VCAA has created a spread sheet to track these and subsequent curriculum actions.

**RESPONSE TO RECOMMENDATION 5: HUMAN RESOURCES PROCEDURES**

A key issue here was that the handling of search committees had come a point of contention, and that the College needed to ensure greater transparency, consistency, and confidentiality in the management of this function. Members of the administrative team reviewed some of the problematic aspects of the process, such as size of committees, restrictions on where meetings could take place and how they were to be documented, and so on. The Chancellor consulted with the system offices’ EEO Officer, who helped her identify areas where we could have greater flexibility. New Standard Operating Procedures (SOP) will allow for more control to reside with Deans and Directors.

**FEEDBACK ON RECOMMENDATION 5:**

Q: Can students be on hiring committee?

A. Generally not, but the Chancellor will make note of ensuring some form of consultation, as appropriate.

Q. What else is in the SOP?

A. The issue of confidentiality is key; the assumed professionalism of committee members will be stressed. One idea is to train committee members once in order to certify their continued eligibility as screening committee participants, and to hold them to rigorous standards of accountability.

Q. Are there any data on how long it takes to hire someone now? Should the SOP include some statement about hiring being done in a timely manner?

A. We do not have those data now, but they can be gotten; the idea of benchmark data is a good one, so we can see if the new SOP will improve performance in this way.

Q. Can anything be done about last-minute hires? This is especially hard for faculty members who do not have sufficient time to prepare for teaching.
A. The Chancellor has indicated that we do not have to wait until a position is actually vacant, but can start searches if we know of impending retirements, for example.

The Chancellor also suggested that those interested in this issue work with administrators to look at what seem to be inherently “logical” procedures but should be challenged if they impede the process.

RESPONSE TO RECOMMENDATION 6: EVALUATION OF PERSONNEL

This recommendation concerns the way in which different categories of employees are evaluated. There are four basic categories, each governed by different contractual or other guidelines. One thing that may have triggered this recommendation was that at the time of the visit, not all APT evaluations were being done, when they should have been. The College will track APT and Civil Service evaluations to ensure that they are done when they should be.

FEEDBACK ON RECOMMENDATION 6:

Q: How can we ensure that supervisors have sufficient time to do good evaluations?

A: The only cycle that is fixed is the one for APTs, who are evaluated each October; this is a system-mandated window that we do not control. For Civil Service employees, evaluation is linked to the anniversary date of initial hire.

The Chancellor expects that employees will set goals that are related to student learning and success and to campus welfare.

Q: What about assessment of administrators?

A: Administrators are also evaluated individually on an annual basis through the “360” process and in consultation with their supervisors and the Chancellor. Performance by individual administrators also factors into the collective administrative assessment that is part of the Chancellor’s report.

Q: How are the 360 evaluators chosen?

A: Each administrator prepares a list of people in three categories: subordinates, constituents, and peers. This list goes to the system, and a random sample is selected each year for participation in an online survey, the results of which are given the administrator at the time of his or her annual evaluation. Administrators also do goal-setting and self-assessment.

DISCUSSION OF THE DISTANCE EDUCATION STRATEGIC PLAN AND RESPONSE TO RECOMMENDATION 3
DE Coordinator Ross Egloria opened the discussion with a reference to the statement made by the visiting team with specific reference to the need to develop a DE Strategic Plan. The College looked at a number of different models, and adopted several aspects of the DE Plan developed at sister campus Leeward Community College.

Ross took those in attendance through the plan section by section: Mission statement, Core Values, Four Strategic Goals, and Strategic Actions.

The Goals section was discussed in some detail and it was noted that these goals are tied to three of the UH system goals for DE. The goals are:

1. Increase student participation/enrollment (2 specific activities)
   The Chancellor noted that this was an important goal, but that the College also had to ensure that we could also provide sufficient support services to a growing DE population. It was noted that the process of DE certification already requires us to address this issue at the time new courses are created.
2. Provide on-going support for faculty and students (6 specific activities)
3. Deliver and maintain high quality distance ed courses (5 specific activities)
4. Increase number of qualified faculty who can teach DE (4 specific activities)

**FEEDBACK ON RECOMMENDATION 3 AND THE DE STRATEGIC PLAN:**

Q: Should we say at “at least” two new courses will be created each year?

A: Two is about right, though this has fluctuated. It is also important to ensure rigor in older courses as they are recerified.

Q: What about the issue of demand? How do we know what would be a good new course to create?

A: This is a tricky issue; we need to look across the system (though most people don’t) when thinking about developing new DE courses. We also need to consider the issue of how students enroll; i.e., will they stay with their home campus offerings?

There are only three options for DE: we can shrink, sustain the level of current offerings, or grow. It is clear that we need to grow if we want to build enrollment.

Although we do not have to demonstrate need to justify new course creation, the Distance Education Advisory Committee (DEAC) should develop an enrollment management plan—set it as a goal for this year.

Q: We are supposed to compare face-to-face and online versions of courses to ensure comparability, but a number of faculty members who teach in both modalities feel that they are totally different courses. So how do we deal with the comparability issue? And how do we address the disparity of completion rates?
A: There should not be a disparity, so we have to assess how to close the gap manifested in the current data. We should also look at other factors, such as general preparation, skill levels with technology, overall “fitness” for Distance Education. (Some instructors use a questionnaire that looks at how ready students are for DE learning.) Another thing to note is that with institutions that are primarily online, they are much more uniform in terms of how course materials are presented and engaged, so students have more consistent expectations, modes of interaction and DE experiences overall.

Q: Where is the assessment, “closing the loop” piece of this plan? What is the penalty if we don’t meet the goals?

A: We have been doing assessment and this is documented in a table that is being finalized that looks at all DE courses, how they are handling assessment, and, where appropriate, how DE and F2F versions of the course compare.

We can set a goal of dealing with attrition and have DEAC develop a mandatory orientation for students by Spring 2014. This means we should get benchmark data now. We should also discuss what cycle of assessment we want to maintain—every semester? Every year?

______________________________________________________________

The Town Hall was attended by forty members of the College community, representing all units of the campus, including all instructional divisions, administration, student services, administrative services, academic support, ITS, and student government.