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Honolulu Community College has, since its comprehensive Self-Evaluation Report and campus visit in 2012, prepared two Follow-Up Reports (2013 and 2014) in response to recommendations from the visiting team and determinations made by the Accrediting Commission for Community and Junior Colleges (ACCJC). This Midterm Report consolidates portions of those Follow-Up Reports, and provides updates to actions taken in response to recommendations, providing evidence that the College has fully addressed all recommendations and has, in addition, been committed to other initiatives in support of continued student success and institutional effectiveness.

The process of preparing our 2013 Follow-Up Report followed a plan developed by the Chancellor in response to the Commission’s letter placing the College on Warning; the plan was sent to members of her executive team on April 1, 2013. The Follow-up report was prepared by members of the Chancellor’s executive team, with multiple opportunities provided to members of the college community for broad-based campus review of working drafts. Campus review culminated in a special Town Hall meeting on September 20, 2013, which also provided an opportunity for discussion of the newly developed Distance Education Strategic Plan. The team also decided to add an additional concluding section highlighting the various “closing the loop” actions that had been taken in response to assessment in various contexts. The Follow-Up report included the responses to recommendations directed specifically to the College, as well as responses to recommendations directed to the UHCC and UH systems as a whole. The latter were prepared by the Office of the Vice President for Community Colleges. [2013 Follow-Up Report]

Members of the Chancellor’s team involved in report preparation included the following: Chancellor Erika Lacro; Interim Vice Chancellor for Administrative Services, Brian Furuto; Interim Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs, Russell Uyeno; Dean of Student Services, Katy Ho; Interim Dean, Tech I, Mike Barros; Interim Dean, Tech II, Keala Chock; Dean, University College, Marcia Roberts-Deutsch; Dean of Academic Support, Wayne Sunahara; Interim Director of the Pacific Center for Advanced Technology Training and Continuing Education and Lifelong Learning, Rose Sumajit; Executive Assistant to the Chancellor and Director of Communications and External Affairs, Billie Takaki Lueder.

The process of preparing the 2014 Follow-Up Report in response to the further recommendations of the team, which visited the campus on November 12, 2013, began shortly after receiving the letter of February 7, 2014, from ACCJC. The College was extremely gratified to learn that it had been removed from Warning status, with a reaffirmation of accreditation. The College’s 2014 Follow-Up Report was prepared by members of the Chancellor’s executive team, with multiple opportunities again provided to members of the college community for broad-based campus review. [2014 Follow-Up Report]
Members of the Chancellor’s team involved in report preparation included the following: Chancellor Erika Lacro; Interim Vice Chancellor for Administrative Services, Ken Kato; Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs, Katy Ho; Dean, Tech I, Keala Chock; Dean, Tech II, Russell Uyeno; Dean, University College, Marcia Roberts-Deutsch; Dean of Academic Support, Wayne Sunahara; Director of Secondary Programs, Mike Barros; and Executive Assistant to the Chancellor and Director of Communications and External Affairs, Billie Takaki Lueder.

Planning for the 2015 Midterm Report was a major focus during the 2014-2015 Academic Year, extending into Summer and Fall 2015. The College approved a new committee structure during the previous year that provided better coordination of the closely aligned processes of Accreditation and Assessment, and the Accreditation Task Force in particular focused on two key tasks: 1) updating the Actionable Improvement Plan (AIP), and 2) Conducting a comprehensive campus-wide survey in Spring 2015 to get current feedback on issues related to the 2012 Recommendations. [AIP; Midterm Survey.] In late Spring 2015, the members of the Chancellor’s team were provided with a report indicating where updated information would be needed. Updates were received throughout the summer and a comprehensive working draft was shared with the campus at the beginning of the Fall semester. The 2015 Midterm report includes the responses to recommendations directed specifically to the College, as well as responses to recommendations directed to the UHCC and UH systems as a whole. The latter have been prepared by the Office of the Vice President for Community Colleges.

Members of the Chancellor’s team involved in report preparation included the following: Chancellor Erika Lacro; Vice Chancellor for Administrative Services, Derek Inafuku; Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs, Katy Ho; Director of the Pacific Center for Advanced Technology Training and the Office of Continuing Education and Lifelong Learning (PCATT/CELL), Steven Auerbach; Dean, Tech I, Keala Chock; Dean, Tech II, Russell Uyeno; Dean, University College, Marcia Roberts-Deutsch; Interim Dean of Student Services Lara Sugimoto; Dean of Academic Support, Wayne Sunahara; Director of Secondary Programs, Mike Barros; and Executive Assistant to the Chancellor and Director of Communications and External Affairs, Billie Takaki Lueder.

EVIDENCE FOR REPORT PREPARATION:
2013 Follow-Up Report
2014 Follow-Up Report
Actionable Improvement Plan (AIP)
Midterm Survey
CERTIFICATION OF CONTINUED INSTITUTIONAL COMPLIANCE
WITH ELIGIBILITY REQUIREMENTS

1. Authority

The University of Hawai`i Board of regents, under the authority of State of Hawai`i Law, Chapter 305, Hawai`i Revised Statutes, is authorized to develop and administer a system of community colleges. In 1966, the Board authorized the College to operate and to award degrees.

2. Mission

The College’s mission is clearly defined, adopted and published. The College’s mission is consistent with the purposes set forth in State law for the UH community college system, and is in alignment with the University of Hawai`i Community College’s Mission Statement (approved by the Board of Regents in 1997). The College’s Mission Statement was reviewed and approved by the Board in 2012.

3. Governing Board

The University of Hawai`i Board of Regents is a fifteen-member body responsible for the quality, integrity and financial stability of all University of Hawaii campuses. The regents are nominated by the Regents Candidate Advisory Councils and are appointed by the governor and confirmed by the legislature. The board formulates policy and exercises control over the university through its executive officer, the university president. The Board has exclusive jurisdiction over the internal structure, management and operation of the university. The number of members and composition of the Board is sufficient for it to fulfill its responsibilities. This ability has been enhanced by the expanded number of members on the Board. Based on Hawaii law, the Board has the final responsibility for ensuring that the financial resources of the institution are used to provide sound educational programs.

In accordance with Hawai`i State law, a 2000 constitutional amendment granting greater autonomy to the University of Hawai`i, and as articulated under Board by-laws, the governing board is an independent policy-making body. Its primary duty is to serve the public interest and UH constituent needs, and this purpose directs its activities and decisions. An overview of the background and professional affiliations of the Board members verifies that a majority of the Board members do not have employment, family, ownership or personal financial interest in the institution. Board by-laws, Article X, articulate a clear conflict of interest policy, including disclosure requirements. Board members adhere to this policy. Board member interests do not interfere with the impartiality of governing body members and do not outweigh their primary duty to secure and ensure the academic and fiscal integrity of the institution.
4. Chief Executive Officer

The University of Hawai‘i Board of Regents appoints the Chancellor, who is the chief executive officer of the College. The Chancellor’s full-time responsibility is to the College; this officer has the requisite authority to administer Board policies. The Chancellor has the necessary authority to provide leadership to the College in areas of planning, establishing priorities, managing resources and ensuring the institution’s implementation of statutes, regulations, and policies.

5. Administrative Capacity

Based on the findings of the Standard committees, the College has sufficient staff to provide administrative services necessary for the College to fulfill its mission and purpose. Personnel processes ensure that administrative officers are qualified by education, training, and experience to perform administrative responsibilities.

6. Operational Status

The College is fully operational, offering Fall, Spring, and Summer-session classes designed to meet the varied educational needs of degree-seeking students in CTE and Liberal Arts programs. These programs graduate students receiving certificates and degrees. The College offers classes at several sites and in alternative scheduling options, and it supports an active DE program.

7. Degrees

Programs leading to degrees make up the substantial portion of the College’s educational offerings. The College attracts students to its degree programs due to the diversity of instructional programs offered, and the fact that the College is the only institution in the State to offer many of the unique programs located at Honolulu Community College.

8. Educational Programs

The linking of program missions to the College’s mission and goals reflects the fact that all degree programs offered by the College are in alignment with the mission of the institution. The curriculum and requirements of these programs are based on recognized standards of higher education field(s) of study. Programs review and revise as necessary curriculum and program currency based on evaluation of student work, in consultation with advisory committees and in accordance with required program review and annual assessments. Programs are of sufficient content and length and students receive education at the level of quality and rigor appropriate to the degree offered. These fields of study culminate in identified program SLOs. Degree programs are at least two years in length.
9. Academic Credit

As documented in the College’s Catalog, the College awards academic credits based on criteria that reflect generally accepted practices in degree-granting institutions of higher education. The awarding of credit is in compliance with clearly stated criteria and processes also published in the College Catalog.

10. Student Learning Achievement

The College has identified—and has published in its Catalog and on the Web—expected SLOs for all instructional programs. The College has adopted processes and timelines to ensure that regular and systematic assessment of these outcomes takes place. Annual Assessment and periodic Program Review reports require programs to demonstrate that students who complete instructional programs achieve these outcomes, regardless of where or how they are delivered.

This Eligibility Requirement, cited in College Recommendation 2, has been addressed and reaffirmed.

11. General Education

A review of degree-granting program requirements confirms that the College incorporates into all of its degree programs General Education requirements designed to cultivate a breadth of knowledge and encourage intellectual inquiry. The General Education component for all programs includes demonstrated competence in writing and computational skills, and an introduction to some of the major areas of knowledge. General Education courses, as reviewed and certified by the General Education Board, are required to have comprehensive learning outcomes as well as clearly identified assessment strategies. Degree credit in General Education is consistent with levels of quality and rigor appropriate to higher education.

This Eligibility Requirement, cited in College Recommendation 4, has been addressed and reaffirmed.

12. Academic Freedom

The College is committed to creating and maintaining an atmosphere of inquiry and intellectual freedom. Faculty and students are guaranteed the right to examine and test all knowledge appropriate to their discipline or area of study. The College has made this commitment explicit in the form of an Academic Freedom statement included in the College Catalog’s Policies and Procedures.

13. Faculty

The College has a substantial number of qualified faculty members whose full-time responsibility is to the institution. The faculty is sufficient in number and professional
training and experience to ensure achievement of the College’s mission and to support all of the institution’s educational programs. The University of Hawai`i Board of Regents’ Classification Plan of Faculty in the Community Colleges provides a statement of faculty responsibilities as well as the basis on which specific positions are advertised and filled. Expectations of faculty include maintaining currency in their program, and continual professional development in their respective areas of effective instruction. These requirements ensure that faculty are actively involved in the development and review of curriculum, and in the assessment of student learning.

14. Student Services

The College has a strong and multi-faceted Student Services program, which provides appropriate and comprehensive student support services. In addition, the College’s Academic Support units, as well as instruction in developmental English and Mathematics and English as a Second Language, provide necessary and effective support of student learning. The missions of all these instructional and service programs are in alignment with the College’s Mission; their effectiveness is documented with various forms of assessment. The various forms of support for students meet students’ needs and are consistent with the College’s Mission. All of these programs are required to conduct Annual Assessments and complete Program Reviews to ensure continued program effectiveness.

15. Admissions

The College operates based on admission policies that are consistent with its open-door mission. A review of the College Catalog, the information posted on the Internet, and all program specific publications makes clear that admissions policies explicitly and clearly communicate the appropriate qualifications of students for specific programs.

16. Information and Learning Resources

The College has built a robust program of Information Technology services that provides long-term access to information and learning resources necessary to support the College Mission and the missions and SLOs of its programs. This applies to those courses offered in classrooms, as well as courses offered at other sites or via distance education.

17. Financial Resources

The College has the necessary funding base, financial resources, and financial development plans to effectively support student learning programs and services, to improve institutional effectiveness, and to assure financial stability. The College relies primarily on public funding by the State general fund. The College receives additional financial resources through tuition, fees, grants, and contracts. The College adheres to the two-year State budget cycle and budget guidelines and controls of the UH system. In addition to State regulations, in the case of contracts and grants, the College also complies with the rules of the funding organization.
18. Financial Accountability

UH’s consolidated financial statements are prepared in accordance with Government Standards Board principles, which establish standards for external financial reporting for public colleges and universities. The financial audit is part of the A-133 audit required by the federal government (US Department of Education.) Furthermore, the College’s Financial Aid office is audited annually as part of the A-133 audit. The University also reports as a combined balance sheet and income statement for the community colleges as a whole. By virtue of State law, the College is prohibited from accruing, and does not operate under, a deficit.

19. Institutional Planning and Evaluation

The College has created the infrastructure and processes necessary to ensure systematic evaluation of all programs and College functions. Ongoing evaluation and improvement activities have as their focus assessment of SLO’s fulfillment of service outcomes. The College has in place mechanisms for publicizing results of institutional research and assessment. The College has significantly improved methods of integrating assessment, planning and decision-making to increase the effectiveness of institutional structures and processes, promote enhanced student achievement of educational goals, and continually improve student learning. As a result of the integration of assessment activities and governance bodies and processes, the College has in place a system that ensures decisions on resources and strategic activities are based on how best to improve the institution. Evidence for these links are development of a new Strategic Plan, development of the integrated planning and budgeting policy, and minutes of major governance committees.

20. Public Information

The College Catalog is published in hardcopy and on the Web. Review of the College Catalog indicates that the College publishes accurate, current, and necessary information for its constituencies. Information provided includes the College’s address and contact information, the mission and goals statement, and relevant and up-to-date information about course, program, and degree offerings (e.g. program SLOs, program requirements, program length, and other necessary information). The Catalog includes an academic calendar with all crucial deadlines indicated. Under the headings “General Information”, “Student Services”, “Academic Regulations”, “Tuition and Fees”, and “Degree and Certificates”, the Catalog contains all the information outlined in these eligibility criteria. In the case of documents and policies too lengthy for inclusion, the Catalog indicates where this documentation is available.

21. Relations with the Accrediting Commission

The College affirms that the institution strictly and in good faith adheres to the eligibility requirements and accreditation standards and policies of the Commission. The College describes itself in consistent terms; however, at present it does not have any relations with other accrediting agencies for any of its degrees. A review of past correspondence
and ACCJC/WASC actions confirms that the College communicates any changes in its accredited status, and readily and immediately discloses information required by the Commission in carrying out its accrediting responsibilities. The College complies with all Commission requests, directives, decisions, and policies, including complete accurate and honest disclosure.
CERTIFICATION OF CONTINUED INSTITUTIONAL COMPLIANCE WITH COMMISSION POLICIES

Honolulu Community College certifies that it is in compliance with the following specific policies of the accrediting commission, as follows:

**Policy on Distance Education and Correspondence Education:** HCC offers a substantial range of courses delivered online or as cable courses and submitted Substantive Change requests when the FIRE program and the AA degree began to include more than 50% of courses offered through distance education modalities. See Standard IIA, IIB, IIIC.

**Policy on Institutional Compliance with Title IV:** HCC’s Financial Aid office is subject to annual audits as well as other forms of fiscal review that serve to minimize student loan defaults. See Standard IIB (Financial Aid), IIID.

**Policy on Institutional Advertising, Student Recruitment, and Representation of Accredited Status:** HCC continues to monitor and update the information provided to both prospective and enrolled students and to the community about all aspects of its programs, including its accredited status. The College catalog is updated annually in print, and information is also kept current online. See Standard I, IIA, IV.

**Policy on Award of Credit:** HCC adheres to generally accepted norms in higher education in the awarding of credit, understanding that assessment of the meeting of clearly defined SLOs is the primary criterion for determining a student’s eligibility to receive college credit. See Standard IIA.

**Policy on Institutional Integrity and Ethics:** HCC adheres to a high standard of expectations with regard to institutional integrity that governs both internal and external relations, and has policies in place to ensure academic honesty and integrity, as well as clear policies of remediation and resolution. See Standard I, IV.

**Policy on Contractual Relationships with Non-Regionally Accredited Organizations:** HCC currently has no such relationships, but would abide by the stated policy, were it to enter into such agreements. Credit courses offered at remote sites (e.g., through the SOCAD program) are reviewed by the same criteria as are courses offered on-campus, and the same standards would apply to non-credit offerings. See Standard IIA.
Response to College Recommendation 1

To fully meet the standard, the team recommends that the college extend its use of program review to ensure that all administrative units complete a cycle of evaluation that examines their impact on institutional processes that affect student learning. (Standard I.B.1, I.B.2, I.B.3, I.B.4, I.B.6, I.B.7)

Honolulu Community College, like its counterparts in the University of Hawai‘i system, completes annual program assessment linked to Annual Reports of Program Data (ARPD); every five years each program must also complete a comprehensive and cumulative program review. The programs receive data linked to specific indicators, and complete an assessment in narrative form that also addresses SLOs at course and program levels, as well as budgetary implications. Closing the loop on areas of need or deficiency thus documented has resulted in numerous requests linked to the campus integrated annual budget and planning cycle (or applications for extramural grant funding), and in numerous actions for curriculum development and program modification. ARPD and the annual reports based on them ultimately become public on the University’s website; the annual reports as well as the five-year program reviews are posted on the College’s own website. Included in this process are all credit instructional programs (including remedial/developmental Math, Writing and Reading), Student Services, and Academic Support (which includes Library, Technology Resources, Testing Services and Tutoring Services.) The challenge for the campus was to extrapolate from this well-established and structured process to other areas of campus function, creating and utilizing comparable outcomes-based cycles of planning, assessment and change for other units/programs.

Administrative Services Report

Following their October 2012 visit to Honolulu Community College, the visiting team recommended that the College’s Administrative Services division demonstrate progress in developing and integrating appropriate assessment methods impacting student learning. The College has since taken the appropriate steps to ensure that on-going, continuous assessment is integrated into all facets of its operation and has created an appropriate framework needed to support a culture of continuous improvement.

Historically, efforts supporting administrative unit assessment have been focused on common goals and specific measurements unique to each area. Both qualitative and quantitative data are used to provide evidence-rich information that drives decision-making related to student learning. Codified by the College’s Policy on assessment, HCCP #5.202, all programs, including administrative services, participate in ongoing assessment using specific parameters defined to indicate performance in relation to specific service area outcomes related to the campus’ strategic goals.

Previous assessment results and a review of our assessment practices relating to Recommendation #1 have positively impacted the College, both internally (e.g., heightening awareness of how the effective provision of services contributes to a positive experience for students) and in the actual provision of those services. The results, based
on work in all administrative service areas (Human Resources, Business Office, and Operations & Maintenance) include the development of the Service Area Outcomes, Unit Assessment Administrative Resource Guide, and completion of the 2012-2013 Assessment Report.

Part of the College’s ongoing commitment towards creating a culture of assessment included appropriate professional development for all administrative units. In April 2013, members from the divisions of Administrative Services, Academic Support, and Student Services participated alongside instructional faculty in a three-day Outcomes and Assessment Training in order to establish common ground for assessment across all units. The training days included specific work sessions for Administrative Services. These work sessions allowed for more in-depth training on how to create robust and assessable student learning and/or service area outcomes. The assessment resources include the traditional quantitative and qualitative tools (surveys, open-ended questions, and numerical data) as well as new tools that may not traditionally be used in areas like Student Services or Administrative Services (rubrics, checklists, and process checklists.)

By the end of the Spring 2013 semester, each unit had not only created outcomes, but also had in place specific unit goals that tied into the unit’s ultimate mission. For each unit’s goals, activities were identified. Many of these activities were then linked to some kind of assessment or measurement tool. In many cases, these assessments relied on looking at data reports or conducting a survey. As each unit identified outcomes, particular activities or means of assessment were noted that would help measure the intended outcome. All this information was pulled into one Planning Document, which has subsequently been used for tracking. The Planning Document also serves as a way for each unit to report on assessment results and to document any changes made to processes or procedures based on the results. The units within the division continue to use this in an annual cycle of assessment and improvement. Comparable planning and work also took place in Student Services, as described in greater detail in the response to Recommendation 2.

One additional area critical to the ongoing support of the assessment practices was the development of the Unit Assessment Administrative Resource Guide. This comprehensive training guide provides a framework for understanding assessment, development of appropriate service area outcomes, and the time-frame for assessing each administrative unit. Specific checklists and benchmarks have been developed to guide units to conduct appropriate assessment moving forward.

**Executive Leadership Report**

Honolulu Community College’s commitment to assessment also includes evaluation of the Chancellor’s executive leadership team, which includes Vice Chancellors of Academic Affairs and Administrative Services, as well as Deans of instructional units, Academic Support, and Student Services. Executive assessment occurs on both an individual as well as a collective level. Each unit head is responsible for the development and evaluation of appropriate goals relating to the mission and strategic plan of the
College. Unit heads meet with the Chancellor to discuss specific performance objectives, and are provided with recommendations for improvement and development of strategic goals for the following school year. In addition, the University of Hawai‘i’s 360 Performance Evaluations capture similar executive assessments, and are included as part of the executive assessment report.

**EVIDENCE FOR RECOMMENDATION 1:**

[2013 Follow-Up Report](#) (Evidence for Recommendation 1)
Response to College Recommendation 2

As was recommended by the 2006 evaluation team, “In order to meet the standards, focus on ensuring student success and the quality of programs and services, the team recommends the college...develop and refine its program review process and to identify student learning outcomes at the course, program and institutional levels. The college should also systematically assess these student learning outcomes and use the results of these assessments for the improvement of institutional effectiveness.” In addition, the college should ensure that assessment of program quality occurs for all student support, academic and administrative programs. (2006 Recommendation 2, Eligibility Requirement 10, Standards I.B.1, I.B.4, I.B.7, II.A, II.A.1.b, II.A.1.c, II.A.2.a, II.A.2.b, II.A.2.c, II.A.2.f, II.A.2.g, II.A.2.h, II.A.2.i, II.A.3, II.A.6, II.A.6.a, II.B.1, II.B.4, II.C.1.a, II.C.2, III.A, III.A.6, IV.A.1, IV.A.2.b, IV.A.5, IV.B.1.b)

The Commission’s cover letter accompanying the visiting team’s report also noted that:

With regard to Recommendation 2 above, the Commission notes the College has taken significant steps to address the recommendations from the 2006 evaluation team. There remain, however, some portions of the 2006 recommendations that need to be addressed in order to fully meet the Eligibility Requirements and Accreditation Standards.

Honolulu Community College understood, based on the findings in the Follow-Up Visit Report of November 12, 2013, that it had substantially addressed, in the instructional context, several of the issues identified in this Recommendation, including

- refinement of the program review process,
- identification of student learning outcomes at the course, program and institutional levels, and
- use of assessment results to improve institutional effectiveness.

The College’s remaining task, then, was to ensure that comparable progress was made in the non-instructional areas of the campus—student services, academic support, administrative services.

As noted in the college’s response to Recommendation 1, members from the divisions of Administrative Services, Student Services and Academic Support, participated alongside instructional faculty in a three-day Outcomes and Assessment Training in April 2013. The training days included specific work sessions for both Administrative Services and Student Services.

Administrative Services:

Prior to this training, the Administrative Services Division, under the leadership of the Vice Chancellor for Administrative Services, had worked on creating Service Unit Outcomes (another term used could be Service Area Outcomes.) In several staff meetings over the course of the Spring 2013 Semester, lead personnel within the division spent time at each staff meeting to learn about outcomes and assessment, and to develop unit
mission statements, goals, and outcomes. Prior to this, the units within this division had not been asked to create outcomes. It became necessary to make sure staff were trained in assessment before outcomes could be developed. Using a common framework, each area worked on developing and refining their mission, goals, and outcomes. The three-day training session helped by offering more training and opportunities for refinement of outcomes. (See also Response to College Recommendation 1 above.)

By the end of the semester, each unit (including Human Resources, Business Office, and Operations and Maintenance) had not only created outcomes, but also had in place specific unit goals that tied into the unit’s ultimate mission. For each unit’s goals, relevant activities were identified. Many of these activities were then linked to some kind of assessment or measurement tool. In many cases, these assessments relied on looking at data reports or conducting a survey. As each unit identified outcomes, particular activities or assessments were noted that would help measure the intended outcome. All this information was pulled into one final Planning Document, which is now used for tracking. The Planning Document also serves as a way for each unit to report on assessment results, and to document any changes made to processes or procedures due to the results. The units within the division now use this in an annual cycle of assessment and improvement.

For particular unit outcomes, the units spent the Fall 2013 semester developing assessment tools. Data points for each outcome or goal were also pulled. The units that comprise Administrative Services then implemented their assessment process at the end of the Fall semester. The Planning Document, and related activities linked to assessment of outcomes and goals, are used to help complete the division’s internal Program Review.

In Spring 2014, Administrative Services units worked in conjunction with the divisions of Academic Support and Student Services to create and deploy a campus-wide survey. The survey results were shared with the individual units and also compiled into an executive summary. Themes were identified and if needed, action items were created. Many of the action items are either complete or underway. The Administrative Services Executive Summary document was recently updated to reflect status of current action items. [Administrative Services Executive Summary 2014]

Through the process of the assessment, the unit leads in Administrative Services (Human Resources, Business Office, Security, Operations & Maintenance) also discovered that their original Service Area Outcomes (SAOs) statements needed some refinement in order to make them more applicable and measureable. In preparation for the next cycle of assessment, which took place over Academic Year 2014–2015, the units tightened and modified their outcomes language. As an example, Human Resources originally had this outcome: *Attract, recruit, hire and retain exceptional qualified employees to meet the educational needs of students and provide a successful learning experience.* After looking at survey results and reflecting upon the original intent of this outcome, the unit has updated the outcome with this language: *As a result of being on a hiring committee, faculty, staff, and/or students will be able to describe the hiring process and use basic principles of employment policies and laws to fairly recommend qualified candidates.*
After tightening up outcomes language, unit leads then reviewed the original goals attached to outcomes and if needed, modified those goals. Both of these things were done in preparation for the next cycle of assessment. Looking ahead to the coming year, each unit has selected outcomes to assess, and will be taking the approach of individual unit assessments based on their own outcomes. The units came together to develop an Administrative Service Assessment Plan for 2014–2015. [Administrative Service Assessment Plan 2014-2015]

As of June 2015, Administrative Services had completed the following assessment initiatives:

- Creation of spreadsheets to track recruitments—i.e., analyzing timeframes, making adjustments to recruitment processes to streamline hiring process, ensure consistent communications to screening committee participants and applicants, and created standardized communications forms/templates;
- Creation and implementation of new employee orientations, in part in response to assessment feedback from current employees. Orientations continue to be assessed and appropriate adjustments made based on feedback;
- Provision of opportunities (some mandatory) for continuous training on financial management systems (Kuali) for all employees;
- Successful increase in use of PCards and reduction in use of Purchase Orders;
- Implementation of annual mandatory training for Security personnel;
- Standardized routing and collection of incident reports; and
- Improvement in timely responses to requests for information.

**Student Services:**

In the Student Services Division, several of the offices and programs had some outcomes already developed but had not fully addressed them for assessment. Prior to the Outcomes and Assessment Training workshop, the Dean of Student Services (DOSS) held a division meeting specifically centered on outcomes. The intent of this meeting was to pre-train the members of division in the philosophy and terminology of outcomes development in order to have a shared understanding of the work ahead. Lead personnel in each of the Student Services areas were asked to attend the three-day training. After attending the April 2013 training, each office or program worked with the DOSS to either revise their Student Learning Outcomes (SLOs) or develop new outcomes. In areas where appropriate, Service Area Outcomes (SAOs) were developed. This work was done over a period of several months using the techniques and practices learned in the training. After the outcomes were set, attention turned toward choosing which two or three outcomes each program or department would measure during the upcoming academic year (AY 2013-2014.) Selection of particular outcomes dictated what kind of assessment tools would need to be used or developed. In several cases, the assessment tools did not exist, and work began over the last half of Summer 2013 to create these tools. Many of the new assessment tools being created (rubrics and checklists) also ended up being part of a program or department’s every-day work. Certain parts of the checklists were also used for assessment. These types of embedded assessments helped reinforce concepts or issues related to the outcomes. Each program or department has an established Assessment Plan
that includes which outcomes are up for assessment each year, and how they will be assessed. This information will be used for the following: (a) program/department improvement, (b) division prioritization for funding and advocacy, and (c) program review data and documentation. The division of Student Services has now fully implemented its use of the Annual Assessment Report Template, utilized by each unit—Admissions and Records, Academic Counseling, Financial Aid, Health Office, Wellness Center, Outreach, and Student Life and Development.

The work done around outcomes and assessment, including assessment results and findings, is also used in the Student Services Annual Report of Program Data (ARPD), or program review. As with instruction, Student Services is required to submit the ARPD each fall semester. Traditionally, the data metrics used to respond to the ARPD sections are generated through the University of Hawaii’s Office of the Vice-President for Community Colleges. These metrics are pre-defined and use a combination of data set by Achieving the Dream and the University of Hawai‘i System. The sections of the ARPD report mirror those of instruction. Each college may also request additional items from their offices of Institutional Research (IR). Currently, the default ARPD measures and data are not specific or related enough to the areas or mission of student services, and as a result it is often hard to describe fully what areas within student services do, what the impact is on students, and how areas can improve. The additional request for data from IR is helpful, and the results of individual program/department assessment of SLOs also aid in helping to show areas of accomplishment and areas of needed improvement. However, the ARPD measures and metrics should be reviewed at system level with input from student services administrators, as our key mission and goals are often different from those of our instructional counterparts. By reporting on measures and asking for data more meaningful to the mission and goals of student services, the ARPD will then become a more meaningful report for planning and improvement.

In addition to the work done specifically around outcomes and assessment, Student Services also engaged in two related activities in Spring 2013. First, an Accreditation Action Plan for the division overall, as well as one for each program or department within the division, was created. In conjunction with the members of the division, the DOSS worked to pull out specific items in Standard IIB: Student Support Services that needed to be addressed. The creation of the action plan was shared at a division meeting. In addition to outcomes and assessment work, the action plan also includes changes and improvements that need to be made in order to serve the college’s Distance Education students, as well as other issues identified by the visiting team.

The second assessment-related activity in Student Services was the creation and implementation of a Student Satisfaction Survey. The purpose of the survey was to take a baseline reading of how programs and departments within Student Services and related areas were doing in terms of serving the student population. The survey was deployed over the span of several weeks prior to summer registration, and was offered in both online and paper formats. Over 300 students responded to the survey. Results were analyzed by individual program/departments, and as a whole. Results of the survey were used to loop back to the Accreditation Action Plan for each area, as well as used to make
changes in order to improve access to services and customer service. Overall, the results showed that students are satisfied with the level of service that they are receiving from programs and departments. Students also feel that the types of services and programs offered are valuable to their success. However, when students had trouble accessing services or felt unwelcomed, they were very unsatisfied with their experiences. The results helped the group consider how to address this issue. The college periodically uses this survey, with small changes made to the survey to improve completion rates; it remains accessible both online and in-person. Results from the survey can also be used in specific programs or departments to help measure specific SLOs.

By the end of Spring 2014 all department/program areas of the Student Services Division completed a round of outcomes assessment. Each area had refined and honed Student Learning and/or Service Area Outcomes by the start of Fall 2013. Each area then selected all or certain outcomes to assess, and developed a range of assessment tools—rubrics, checklists, surveys—to assess appropriate outcomes. Assessments within individual departments took place in Spring 2014, during which time another Student Satisfaction Survey was deployed for the entire division. Each unit then submitted an end-of-year Assessment Report. The reports detail the assessment results, and outline proposed changes and action items. The Dean of Student Services met with the leads from each unit for a roundtable discussion about the reports and the implementation of any actionable items. In preparation for a new cycle, units once again selected outcomes to assess to report on in Spring 2015. [SAO Support Units - Student Survey; Student Services Annual Assessment Reports]

Each year, the Dean of Student Services coordinates and completes an Annual Review of Program Data (ARPD.) For the current cycle, due in December 2015, Student Services will be able to combine assessment data from the internal annual reports with system-generated data points. The addition of departmental level assessment and action items will add richness to the ARPD. In addition, the Assessment Reports will help to support any budget requests that are developed in the college’s budget cycle. The Dean of Student Services will assist in leading these efforts.

Highlights from Student Services Assessment Reports:
As a result of completing assessments and doing a second year of a satisfaction survey, the departments within the Student Services Division have come up with several actionable items, which are documented in the Assessment Report. Many of the actionable items are now complete or underway. Some highlights include:

- **Website Changes:** In an effort to streamline information and provide better customer service, many areas (Financial Aid, Counseling, Admissions, Records, e.g.) made significant changes to website content. By adding additional or clearer information on websites, departments are hoping to decrease foot-traffic, and empower students to use online tools to answer questions or perform basic actions. [Services for Students]

- **Changes to New Student Registration:** Work is underway to keep improving the orientation process, which includes New Student Registration. Based on
assessments, new video is being considered as well as modifying content at in-person sessions. The goal is to also tie it in better with the orientation process.

- **Customer Service:** The results from department assessments as well as the Student Satisfaction Survey once again showed customer services as an area that could be improved. The Admissions and Records Department will work in conjunction with other interested areas to offer workshops to address this issue.

- **Rubrics in Action:** The Health Office will be creating a Project Management Rubric to assist student leaders when planning and leading events and projects for the department. This action item came directly from assessment of outcomes and shows how rubrics can be used as a teaching tool.

- **Recruitment Plan:** The Outreach & Orientation Office is well underway in deploying the first stages of the college’s comprehensive recruitment plan. Specific, measureable outcome are built into the plan, and assessment and refinement will be ongoing throughout the current academic year. [Honolulu CC Recruitment Plan]

**Academic Support Services:**
During the Spring 2013 Semester the hiring process was underway for a permanent Dean of Academic Support Services, a process that has now been completed. This division is new in the college’s organizational chart, and includes a combination of instructional and support services.

Outcome creation and refinement for programs within this unit took place during Spring and Summer 2013. Members of each department or program met with the Vice Chancellor of Academic Affairs to make sure outcomes were measureable and robust. By the middle of summer 2013, a permanent Dean of Academic Support Services was hired. Programs and departments under this division continued to work on refinement of outcomes. A few programs and departments were also able to move forward with identifying what types of assessments could take place to measure specific outcomes.

Each program or department under Academic Support now has finalized SLOs or SAOs, and worked in Fall 2013 to either finish identifying assessment tools, or to begin to create the assessment tools. Results from the assessments helped to inform the ARPD annual report, and have been used for program and department improvements and planning. In Spring 2015, the Academic Support division completed its five-year comprehensive program review.

Currently, Academic Support Services has successfully developed and implemented a standardized approach in assessing the effectiveness of each program. The majority of departments have participated consistently with annual reporting in a variety of ways. However, standardizing the process will help ensure that we are all assessing and utilizing the results consistently across the Division. Though there are only a few Departments/Programs in our Division that are required to comply to a UHCC system-wide ARPD at this time, the division has instituted an annual report requirement for all Departments, and has collectively developed a template that is largely based on a model from the Council for the Advancement of Standards in Higher Education. The annual
reports will allow each program to stay on track and effectively assess each of our programs and services, and to provide a road map for continuous improvement. These annual reports will also provide a framework for each program to clearly state, with supporting data, its individual program needs as they relate to both human and financial resources.

The following is a timeline of events as it relates to the Division’s assessment activities:

- **Summer 2013**: Finalized Service Area Outcomes in all Departments of Academic Support
- **Spring 2014**: Completion of comprehensive survey of all non-instructional units (employees and students)
- **Spring 2014**: Distributed all results to applicable units
- **End of Spring 2014**: Individual Departments running targeted surveys
- **Summer 2014**: Completion of Executive Summaries for all Academic Support Units (that were involved in the Campus-wide employee and or student survey – Library did not participate as they ran their own survey for their annual report separately)
- **July 2014**: Annual reports submitted to Deans Office for FY 2013-2014 for review.
- **February 2015**: Completion of the Five-Year Comprehensive Program Review.
- **Annual reports will be done yearly** (completed each summer based on data provided by the UHCC system) that will be used for assessment, evaluation, resource needs justification, and plans for improvement.

**Career Services** (formerly the Career Employment Center) is in the process of being moved formally within the College’s organizational chart to the Academic Support Division, under the umbrella of the Student Success Center. There are several success centers that include career- and job-oriented services within this initiative/structure. Some of the reasons for this organizational change include:

- enable the students to make a firm connection between college and the world of work (purpose to their educational journey),
- enable students to access student employment (to provide incentives and engage our students to our college),
- facilitate access for students (both new incoming and those who may need support services) to resources for direction/redirection to alternative/new careers and or programs (working hand in hand with our retention office and testing center--now located next to each other), and
- teach students life-long self-assessment tools and job-seeking skills.

Additionally, the Career Counselor will be tasked with coordinating the student success workshop series (iKEA workshops) and to develop a student success course (an experimental course to run during Spring 2015). Career Services will also be working more closely with our developmental education classes to engage the students to our campus quickly in making the connection between college and the world of work. Having Career Services in the Student Success Center, directly next to our Retention Services, has assisted students tremendously, as it enables some of our most fragile
students to a) keep focused on the ultimate goal of education – employment; and b) help re-direct students into alternative degree and or career paths.

The Computer Lab is also in the process of moving under the aegis of Academic Support from ITS. The primary concept of the lab is to provide another space for the students to engage with one another and with our campus. The vision was to create a space that purposefully fit between two existing resources, the library and the student lounge—a place where students can not only access computers, but also use their "inside voices" and hang out, study, collaborate, engage, and connect. In renovating the lab, staff made efforts to create a more collaborative environment for our students (a topic that was identified through our IKEA workshop assessments and focus groups). Though there continue to be areas that need improvement, this is a very positive first step in taking the Lab to the next level. As part of the transition of the Lab to Academic Support, the office of Distance Education Coordinator was relocated to the Lab. This allows the DE Coordinator to provide technical support for the Lab while also supporting the technology-dependent DE program, faculty and students. Moving to the Lab also provides him with a venue to offer DE training and workshops in support of our DE faculty. He will also be conducting regularly scheduled computer-related training and workshops for interested students. Through this transition, an assistant will be assigned from ITS to the Academic Support Division to provide basic technical support to the Lab and to our students while assisting our DE Coordinator in supporting the overall functions of the Lab This transition will be completed by the end of Fall 2014. We continue to build comparable resources for DE students with the help of both instructional faculty and the various student support services. The campus has bought into Brainfuse, an online 24 hour accessible tutoring service to enable all students (both in class and DE students) additional supports. Further, our Academic Alert system also includes supporting DE students in their classes through chosen media.

To provide further support, a vacant civil service clerk position is being re-described to an Assessment Educational Specialist. This individual will work out of our Policy Planning and Institutional Research office, hand in hand with all of academic, non-instructional, and institutional support services in assisting in coordinating our assessment initiatives. This position will also work closely with our newly organized Campus Council on Institutional Effectiveness, Assessment Taskforce, and Accreditation Task force committees to help ensure the College’s commitment to assessment as an ongoing driver of institutional improvement. To continuously meet the changing needs of our students, we have also re-described two vacant positions – one to coordinate our off campus employment placement efforts and to reach out to employers in Career Services and other to facilitate and organize our academic coaching program (we have successfully institutionalized a successfully initiative learned through our C3T grant program) in our Retention program.

Each Department in the Academic Support Division has successfully assessed their programs and services through the campus-wide survey (student and employee surveys) conducted in April 2014, and/or via a targeted survey conducted within the Department (surveying primary customers, who could be students, employees, or a combination of
Many of our Departments, including Educational Technology, Career Services, Library, College Achievement and Retention Experience (CARE), Student ACCESS, and Testing and Tutoring, have utilized both HCC campus-wide surveys and individual Department surveys to secure a broad range of information to help develop their annual reports, and to guide the development and improvement of programs and services. The following is a snapshot of Department initiatives and improvements now underway, many of which are driven in part by program assessments and annual reports.

**Education Technology**
- Improve overall visibility of program and services by detailing what services are available to support our employees—currently we are working on a comprehensive menu of services and recreating the Ed Tech website to highlight points learned through the comprehensive survey of our campus.
- In the process of merging Distance Education into the Education Technology Department—currently working on a unified mission, objectives, service area outcomes, and assessments that reflect the entire Department.

**Educational Tech Mission:**
- To provide instructional media support and assist the faculty in the design, development, and delivery of courses (distance, flipped, and face to face).
- To provide relevant and timely distance education training (faculty, staff, and students), consultation, and coordination.
- To be a resource to HonCC – to assist in keeping the campus abreast of innovative educational technologies to assist in meeting the changing needs of the 21st century learner

**The Education Technology Center SAOs**
- Support 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
- Support curriculum innovation by introducing alternative means of instructional delivery in the classroom
- Train faculty, staff, and students in use instructional media and distant education tools and resources.
- Participate in system-wide distance education planning and coordination with other University units
- Coordinate DE programs and classes. Facilitates communication and compliance to UHCC system and campus DE policies, procedures, and guidelines among campus constituents (DEAC, DERB)

**Career Services**
- Improve outreach efforts to reach a range of students, including our most vulnerable students (developmental education, early alert students, new students) and to our faculty. Survey information suggested improvement was needed in reaching out to the campus. Additionally, Career Services was moved to the Student Success Center to foster a connection to the students (in the same location as the entrance testing center, C.A.R.E. [early alert], and tutoring services).
academic year 2015 this unit successfully reached out to all developmental education classes and faculty as recommended by campus-wide survey.

- Coordinate and run iKEA student success workshops.
  - Launch Fall job fair aimed at supporting our large part time student population. Fair will be targeting employers around our campus to enable students to both work and come to school. Reached out to support students who are looking for work by running resume and interview workshops in addition to drop-in resume doctor session on the campus mall.
- Improve integrating provision of services for our DE students.
- Continue to implement, market and utilize Job Center online, the off-campus employer data-base for students and employers to access.

**Policy Planning and Institutional Research**

- In the past, a data request form was discussed internally within PPIR, but it was decided that it or some other formal mechanism would have an adverse impact on timeliness in responding to inquiries. To address survey concerns about accessibility, a set of guidelines is being developed to assist those requesting information on how to focus and explain their inquiries. This should help direct requests to the proper party, and help improve response time and appropriateness of information received.
- To increase awareness of what PPIR can do support programs, periodic announcements will be made through email and other avenues of communication (committee meetings, administrative meetings) to the campus to direct people to the PPIR web site for College data, available services, and contact information on PPIR office and employees.

**Design Center**

- The Design Center is in the process of moving from the Academic Support Division to the Office of the Executive Assistant to the Chancellor. The Design Center will work under the direction of the Executive Assistant in executing its program goals and objectives while meeting system/campus design protocols and standards. The Campus-wide survey indicated that this particular service should be more easily accessible and less constrained by bureaucracy; this move will help in meeting this goal. Additionally, a menu of services, including service charges, will be created to increase the transparency of this program.

**College Achievement and Retention Experience (CARE)**

- Reassess the student survey questions to properly reflect the program’s Service Area Outcomes (SAOs.)
- Work closely with faculty in supporting and connecting students to resources on campus through the MySuccess academic alert referral system.
- Disseminate and collect academic alert student and faculty evaluations to determine the effectiveness of the referral process and identify areas for improvement.
• Create a follow-up system for students (case management system) who were referred to the CARE program from the MySuccess Academic Alerts. A screening process is underway to hire an individual to serve as coordinator for this initiative.
• Develop a Peer Coaching program for students who participated in the College Experience Workshops. This was successfully rolled out in AY 2015. It will continue with Perkins funding secured to expand the program.
• Continue to expand the academic alert referral system through MySuccess. This will include training faculty on the new system.

Testing and Tutoring
• With Student Success Center staff, plan and improve space utilization of assigned facilities to increase student engagement.
• Secure an Educational Specialist designation on the College’s organizational chart to reflect a second position in testing.
• Implement and evaluate study groups and a scheduled tutoring program. This will allow the College to offset the significant cost of running a drop-in tutoring program.
• Promote and improve utilization of Brainfuse, the online tutor system. Interface with DE Coordinator to help promote to our DE classes.
• Reorganize the testing space to accommodate more test-takers and reduce wait time.

Student ACCESS
• Continuing education and training for Student ACCESS staff: Student ACCESS staff will continue to improve their knowledge and skills through on-line and live workshops, presentations and training, including, but not limited to: continuing education credits through the Commission for Certified Counselor Certification, the Pacific Rim Conference on Disabilities, and other organizations.
• Professional development for campus faculty, staff and students: Student ACCESS will develop and provide educational and training opportunities for campus faculty, staff and students on various disabilities, disability rights and academic accommodations. If feasible, Student ACCESS will collaborate with other departments (e.g., Mental Health Counseling and Student Health) to provide information holistically and from a diversity—rather than a disability—framework.
• Signage: Student ACCESS will work with the Design Center on creating new signage that provides enough information for those who are seeking services while also being discreet, so that students will not feel their disability status is disclosed upon entering the office.
• Access to buildings during ongoing renovation: Student ACCESS will continue to address access needs for buildings, structures, and pathways as campus renovation continues. Interdepartmental collaboration will include, but is not limited to: Campus Security, Student Health, and Operations and Maintenance.
• Communication access (videophone for Deaf): Student ACCESS is exploring having one or two video-relay phones on campus for deaf students. This will enable the Deaf to communicate directly using American Sign language (similar
to Skype or Facetime). The relay service also allows a deaf person to communicate with a hearing person by signing to a relay interpreter, who will speak to the hearing person.

- Reworking of the Student ACCESS website: Student ACCESS will collaborate with the campus ADA/504 Coordinator on updating the language and relevant disability rights legislation and law. Student ACCESS will also revise the website for ease of use while still maintaining a format that is accessible to all users.
- Test proctoring for distance education: Student ACCESS is working with the Distance Education Advisory Committee and the Testing Center on feasible and appropriate methods of proctoring students who are enrolled in distance-education courses. One of the major issues to be explored is finding accommodation for students who are physically unable to come to an approved testing center (e.g., a homebound student). The DEAC and the Distance Education Coordinator has addressed this issue by researching and introducing an online proctoring tool called ProctorU. The ProctorU services offers live, online proctors who administers the student’s online exam. The ProctorU services also serves the needs of out of state students who require proctoring services for DE courses they enroll in. This service is fee for service however in cases where the student due to a disability (documented with Student ACCESS) is unable to access a proctoring site – Student ACCESS may pay for the service as a disability related academic accommodation.

Library
Based on the library survey, daily interactions and observations with students and faculty, staff self-assessments, and in order to to create a better environment for our students, the library’s plans include:
- Research and secure grant opportunities to fund library materials and equipment,
- Improve campus awareness of library services, and
- Purchase new computers for students and staff.

Intermediate and Long-Term Goals include:
- Redesign the first floor space to be flexible and multipurpose i.e. for collaboration, hosting events, study space, laptop bar. Currently in process of redesign the first floor space to be flexible and multipurpose i.e. for collaboration, hosting events, study space, laptop station. Received two grants to drive this initiative.
- Plan /Design a separate library instruction area,
- Evaluate collection (discard worn books, purchase replacements, update collection); this is an ongoing initiative.
- Work with campus to have security cameras installed in the library,
- Work with campus on installing a permanent PA system, and
- Acquire art work from the State Foundation on Culture and the Arts; completed in AY 15.
**PCATT/Continuing Education:**
Under new leadership, PCATT/Continuing Education and Lifelong Learning (CELL) has also engaged in continuing and robust assessment of its operations in order to ensure improved quality of service.

*Consolidation of non-credit activities:* The campus previously organized its non-credit activities under each academic unit. This resulted in inefficiencies and lost productivity. All non-credit activities are now the responsibility of the Director of the Pacific Center for Advanced Technology Training and Continuing Education and Lifelong Learning.

*Continuing Education (non-credit customers):* For several years the limitations of the Non-Credit registration system at Honolulu Community College (HCC) have been evident, including the inability to handle online registrations and having limited access to data reports. The College had already moved to a University-wide online registration system for our customers taking credit classes. Through a lengthy Request for Proposal (RFP) process, the Destiny One registration system, provided by Destiny Solutions, was selected as the new University of Hawaii Community Colleges (UHCC) non-credit registration system that went live on November 25, 2013. Destiny One provides a rich online experience that improves student self-service while maximizing staff efficiency. It includes an online shopping cart and multiple registration and payment options that streamline registration processes and improve customer satisfaction. Up-to-the-minute data allows staff to quickly respond to inquiries, saving valuable time and work effort. Honolulu Community College has closed the loop for our customers expecting web-based equivalents for in-person transactions and student self-service by supporting the acquisition of a UHCC-wide registration system.

As a division, PCATT has completed its 2015 – 2021 strategic plan incorporating key elements from our campus plan along with UHCC and UH plans. We are in the process of rolling out our strategic plan and in parallel developing individual performance and objective plans. This cascading plan establishes the key objectives and measures for our department. We have implemented weekly one-on-one’s between Director and Chancellor to report on progress, milestones and course corrections. We have also implemented weekly one-on-one’s between the Director and staff members to review progress against goals and make any course corrections.

We have re-instated our annual reporting. Our annual reporting process is a key enabler to ensure that we are consistently and effectively assessing and utilizing the results to drive forward planning and improvements. The annual reports will allow us to stay on track or make course corrections and effectively assess our programs and services, and to provide a road map for continuous improvement.

Other methods of assessing the quality of our programs and courses come from course surveys, program surveys, and business and industry engagement/feedback. We are also in the process of re-instating our advisory membership board comprised of business, industry and government participants.
Our mission is to provide leadership and expert training solutions, for the State of Hawai`i and the Pacific Rim, to meet personal and professional development needs. For AY15-AY 16 we are developing our PCATT and Continuing Education Annual Plan. This plan is intended to incorporate our strategic plan, which is grounded on these key principles:

- The UHCC’s are an integral component of workforce development in the State and a leader in identifying workforce needs and developing and delivering training programs to enable student participants to gain employment.
- Our primary focus is to support noncredit participants in their journey to enhance their skills and professional development.
- Being conveniently located near Downtown Honolulu positions the campus to be the center for business and industry professional development and ongoing training.
- Intense focus on our customers, which includes participants, business, industry, government and our community.
- Listening, identifying and delivering relevant new courses, programs, seminars and other educational activities to meet the unique and diverse workforce needs of the State.
- Continuing to build our training capacity by engaging and working closely with industry stakeholders.

The following is a summary of our strategic plan initiatives. The full plan can be referenced online.

**Training and Workforce Development**

We will establish strategic partnerships with the workforce and anticipate and align programs and curricula with community and workforce needs. In developing continuing education programs, HonCC must design these programs to support and link the outcomes of existing and emerging jobs within Hawai`i’s economy and ensure that student participants have the necessary technical and soft skills to be successful.

- Increase enrollment in non-credit and short-term training in areas where there is demonstrated State of Hawai`i shortages of qualified workers, where the average wage is at or above the U.S. average.
- Collaborate with members of Business, Industry and Government agencies to conduct market needs assessment/validation to inform program offerings and curricula that contribute to workforce and economic development.

**Hawai`i Innovation Initiative**

Our plan includes focusing on creating more high-quality jobs and diversifying Hawai`i’s economy by leading the development of innovation, education and training that address the challenges and opportunities faced by Hawai`i. In order to advance innovation and entrepreneurial development HonCC will:
• Integrate entrepreneurial development and innovation throughout PCATT Consortium and develop educational experience for students and participants that lead to funnel for XLR8UH program.
• Strengthen existing partnerships and form new ones to enhance high quality job creation in Hawai‘i.

High Performance Mission Driven System (HPMS)
Through cost-effective, transparent and accountable practices, ensure financial viability and sustainability of HonCC/PCATT/CELL. We will employ business basics and best practices in management, administration and operations.
• Create business plan and annual report.
• Administer tracking, data collection, formulation of insights from data, reporting and take action based on insights gathered.

The following is a snapshot of Department initiatives and improvements now underway, many of which are driven in part by program assessments, business and industry input, campus strategic directions and personnel skills and experiences.

PCATT Consortium Engagement: Improve overall visibility of program and services by detailing what services are available to support our sister campuses. Developed PCATT Consortium funds request process and rolled this process out to all OCET offices. Target one award per campus annually.

PCATT/CELL Branding and Marketing Campaign: We are working on a comprehensive marketing plan to include campaign to enhance visibility and to promote services and solutions. This includes updating all of our touchpoints (Web Site, Print Catalogue, Social Media, Banners, etc).

PCATT/CELL Business, Industry, and Government outreach: We have begun regular engagement with business, industry and government to listen and identify to current and future workforce development needs. Taking input and developing structured training and development opportunities for incumbent workers, displaced workers, new hires, along with new skill development. We have established strong connections with the Tech community and are active members of the Chief Information Officers Council of Hawai‘i.

PCATT/CELL Classroom, Facilities and Infrastructure Enhancements: Leveraging feedback from participant surveys along with optimizing facilities we are developing a comprehensive plan to replace, upgrade equipment and improve space utilization. This includes upgrading our equipment to expand capacity and incorporate on-line offerings along with moving equipment to improve noise and centralize servers. We have identified a current staff member to assume the role of leading all of our IT activities.

PCATT/CELL Revenue and Expenses: Establish baseline and process for capturing quarterly cadence of revenue and expenses. We plan to roll out this new process and reporting cycle in October 2015.

Office of Communication and External Affairs:
The Office of Communication and External Affairs also participated in the outcome and assessment training workshop. As a result of this, outcomes were developed specifically for the work of that office. Due to the extensive collaboration between this office and that
of the Design Center (housed under Academic Support), outcomes were compared and aligned where necessary. In determining how to measure the established outcomes, the Office of Communication and External Affairs draws upon the University of Hawaii Community College System’s data derived from in-depth media preference surveys that are completed every two years. Additionally, more campus-specific surveys will be developed and deployed through the college’s social media channels over the upcoming academic year. Results from the assessments will be used in the annual reports that are coordinated by this office.

**Instruction:**

Program review for Instruction, the most fully developed domain of the college’s engagement in assessment of student learning outcomes, has continued to evolve, with a multi-faceted focus on curriculum review, course development and program modification. All courses offered at the College have clearly identified Student Learning Outcomes (SLOs); all programs also have clearly identified SLOs. All Career and Technical Education (CTE) programs have mapped course to program SLOs; the Liberal Arts program began the process of this course-to-program mapping in Spring 2013, and will revisit that work in the current academic year, with the understanding that the fact that students may take multiple pathways toward the completion of the Associate in Arts (A.A.) makes charting the degree structure more complex. Alignment of PLOs with the updated Institutional Learning Outcomes (ILOs) is also in process.

As participants in the assessment and outcomes training workshop of April 2013, instructional faculty also engaged in program-level discussions. All faculty members were provided with an SLO Assessment Inventory template and asked to complete the form for each active course offering, which asks, among other things, how each course-level SLO aligns with one or more program SLOs. While faculty have become proficient at utilizing various forms of assessment, these inventories serve to engage in assessment in a more focused and mindful way, and to consider other or additional forms of assessment of student learning. Academic Deans have continued to work with program faculty to complete these course inventories, and peer mentoring has also been made available. Focused assessment efforts in the areas of distance education and general education are addressed in the College’s responses to Recommendations 3 and 4.

The College also developed three institutional-level outcomes that were approved by the Planning Council (PC) in October 2012, and were published in the college catalog for the 2013-2014 Academic Year. An initial discussion of assessment measures took place in Spring 2013. A group of PC members created an assessment survey that would measure the success of the first ILO, related to the General Education component of all degree programs. This was administered to a sample of students prior to the graduation ceremony in May 2013. Results of this indirect assessment were positive, and the PC continued to investigate other methods of assessment. A re-evaluation of the initial ILOs led to an expansion and revision of ILOs in AY 2013-2014, creating ILOs that were more closely related to key General Education concepts. Programs have now done an initial mapping of their PLOs to the new ILOs in order to identify and resolve any significant programmatic gaps.
The College has also provided support for the participation of the Accreditation Liaison Officer (ALO) in the 2013-2014 WASC Assessment Leadership Academy. This has brought additional resources to the College in support of a more broad-based approach to assessment in multiple contexts at multiple levels.

Administration:
Administration worked alongside all other divisions of the college in 2013 to establish or re-evaluate the department’s service area outcomes (SAOs.) At that time the department created six service area outcomes. An assessment of the outcomes was included in the campus-wide survey that was conducted in academic year 2013-2014. [SAO Support Units-Faculty/Staff Survey] The assessment of the campus feedback indicated that one of the service area outcomes was rated low; SAO 3 (“Evaluate and analyze personnel and financial resources to responsibly manage programs and service”) was identified as needing improvement. In an effort to be more transparent and allow everyone to understand the budget, several campus presentations were conducted. Over the course of the Spring 2014 semester and into the Fall 2014 semester, these presentations were developed to discuss the financial standing of the college. At the general college meeting at the beginning of the Fall 2014 semester, a section of the presentation was dedicated to discussing the campus budget. In addition, the College’s Planning Council was also focused on a discussion of the campus budget. Work continued in the 2014-2015 Academic Year to improve this outcome, as well as strengthening the other five service area outcomes. [Fall 2014 General College Meeting]

EVIDENCE FOR RECOMMENDATION 2:

2.1. 2013 Follow-Up Report (Evidence for Recommendation 2)
2.2 2014 Follow-Up Report (Evidence for Recommendation 2)
2.3 Administrative Services Executive Summary 2014
2.4 Administrative Services Assessment Plan 2014-2015
2.5 SAO Support Units-Student Survey
2.6 Student Services Annual Assessment Reports
2.7 Services for Students
2.8 Honolulu CC Recruitment Plan
2.9 SAO Support Units-Faculty/Staff Survey
2.10 Fall 2014 General College Meeting
2.11 PCATT/Continuing Education Course Surveys
2.12 PCATT Consortium Funding Process
2.13 PCATT CELL Annual Report
2.14 PCATT/CELL Strategic Plan Narrative
Response to College Recommendation #3

As was recommended by the 2006 evaluation team, in order to meet the Standards, the college must "develop a formal assessment process to evaluate the effectiveness of its Distance Education program in meeting the institutional mission. The process should include a systematic evaluation, analysis, communication, and improvement of the program, including assessment of how well each online course is satisfying its student learning outcomes, support for staff development, and technical assistance for faculty." This review must include a formal evaluation of student support services and learning resources including its design and delivery. The college should compare the instructional quality of face-to-face and distance education courses and develop a strategic plan for distance education. (Standards II.A.2.e, II.A.2.f, II.B, II.C.l.c, III.A.5.a)

HCC has fully addressed this recommendation in the following ways:

HCC has developed and finalized its Distance Education Strategic Plan. The DE Strategic Plan covers all areas specified in Recommendation #3, including assessment and faculty development/technical assistance.

The DE Strategic Plan was developed by the Distance Education Coordinator, the Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs and the Dean of Academic Support Services, with broad input from the campus community, including the Distance Education Advisory Committee (DEAC) and DE faculty, via the following:

a. A survey of all students enrolled in DE courses as of Spring 2013. The results of this survey were used extensively to guide development of the Plan. Prior forms of DE assessment include surveys of DE students and reports compiled from those surveys, documented discussions with DE faculty, as well as research on DE management at other institutions, and a review of the ACCJC manual governing Distance Education.

b. A campus-wide Town Hall meeting was held on May 3, 2013, attended primarily by faculty and IT staff. The results of the student survey were presented, and input on various aspects of DE was obtained. The Town Hall was critical in identifying immediate and longer-term actions that needed attention.

Based on the assessment provided by the Town Hall in Spring 2013, a mandatory orientation providing technical support and course development assistance for all faculty teaching DE courses in Fall 2013 was held on August 21, 2013 and has been conducted every semester since then. A survey conducted at this meeting also provided additional perspective on critical issues. At the Fall 2015 DE Faculty Orientation, the DE Coordinator reviewed in detail what is known about DE students, based on what has been learned from the past two years of survey data. For example, data showed that about 80% of survey responders are also completers of the DE courses in which they were enrolled, suggesting that better means need to be found to get responses from students who drop and/or do not complete a course, as that would provide better insight into the challenges specific to successful completion of DE instruction.
A series of training workshops for faculty teaching DE courses or planning to teach DE courses are being held at the start of every semester. This enables DE faculty to better serve their current DE students, and also to better plan for future instruction. Topics given priority for the workshops were determined based on recent survey results, as well as prior discussions with DE faculty. As part of these orientation sessions, data from student surveys are also analyzed.

A resource page with information and links specifically for DE students has been developed as a tab on the college’s official course management system, Laulima. This tab will automatically appear for all students registered in DE courses and will provide them direct access to information and contacts. A copy of this page can be found on Laulima; guest access to the Laulima group “HCC DE Student Links” can be provided on request.

An updated DE resource page is directly accessible to all students and faculty via the Honolulu Community College main web page. The DE resource page can also be accessed directly.

All faculty who taught DE courses are required to submit their assessment results the following semester to document their SLO assessment, including comparison of results with face-to-face sections of the course, if applicable. For faculty teaching DE courses, this need is emphasized in the mandatory orientation and in the periodically-offered training sessions. Several summary reports are posted of assessment analysis for specific departments or disciplines, and individual inventory reports are available for review upon request.

To address the possible classroom shortage due to the renovation of building 7, one of the primary classroom facilities at the College, the College partnered with Kapiʻolani Community College (KCC) to utilize training materials that KCC had developed in Laulima. KCC’s Director of the Center for Learning, Teaching and Technology, and their Distance Education Coordinator came to HCC to do an in-person presentation on their Laulima training site designed with information on standards and best practices for creating DE courses. (Guest access to the Laulima group “HonCC.OnlineConnection” can be provided on request.) There have also been several workshops and training sessions offered each year on topics like adding audio narrative to PowerPoint presentations and utilizing a computer-based text-messaging application to communicate with students via SMS.

The College continues to support elements of institutional infrastructure for quality assurance of its Distance Education offerings. These include the following:
  a. A Distance Education Coordinator, whose responsibility it is to oversee all aspects of the College’s distance education offerings;
  b. A Distance Education Advisory Committee (DEAC), chaired by the DE Coordinator. The DEAC, with campus-wide membership, has provided important input on Distance Education issues and has contributed to the creation of a number of resources, including a DE Handbook; and
c. A process of regular certification and recertification of all distance education offerings (both online and cable), in which faculty must address issues of delivery, assessment, meaningful interaction between instructor and students, and security questions (e.g., proctoring of exams.)

The College has carried out review and certification of Distance Education courses for several years. The Distance Education Review Board (DERB) was initially created by the campus-wide Committee on Programs and Curricula (CPC) and the process of reviewing and certifying has been assessed and revised a number of times in the past five years. Courses for which faculty are seeking certification/recertification are now reviewed by the Distance Education (DE) Coordinator in conjunction with discipline coordinators, Division Chairs, and other faculty with expertise in DE curriculum and pedagogy. The current process specifies clear standards to be met, and requires revision of those courses that do not meet established standards. The DE Coordinator works one-on-one with the faculty member seeking certification/recertification to ensure that DE standards and best practices are properly incorporated and implemented. In addition to this, the College has been utilizing a peer evaluation form specifically designed for DE to help faculty improve their courses. The recent growth in the number of DE courses and the maturation of the DE program has led to the need to clarify processes and timetables for recertification. The DE Coordinator, along with the DEAC, is working on clarifying these processes and timetables during the 2015-2016 Academic Year.

EVIDENCE FOR RECOMMENDATION 3:

3.1 2013 Follow-Up Report (Evidence for Recommendation 3)
3.2 HCC website (DE Services for Students)
3.3 HCC intranet (Distance Education)
Response to College Recommendation #4

To meet Eligibility Requirement 11, the college must finalize its discussion regarding General Education and ensure General Education courses that are consistent with levels of quality and rigor appropriate to higher education be made part of all programs. (Eligibility Requirement 11, Standard II.A.3.a-c)

With regard to Recommendation 4, please note that degree credit for the general education component of a program must be consistent with levels of quality and rigor appropriate to higher education. A deficiency in this area implicates the College’s compliance with both Eligibility Requirements and Accreditation Standards.

In response to Recommendation #4, the college revised the campus General Education policy (HCCP #5.213) originally approved on April 27, 2012. After a review of the policy and the comments in the accreditation report, it was evident that the College needed to revise and improve specific General Education requirements, specifically those related to the levels of Math and English for the Associate of Applied Science (AAS) degrees, and new policy was approved in Spring 2013. The revised policy raised the level of Math and English to the transfer-level equivalent of Math 100 and English 100, transferable to four-year institutions. Several of the CTE programs also required upgrading of course curriculum in the sciences. Many of these course upgrades took place over the summer of 2013 and were launched in the Fall 2013 semester. Curriculum actions in Fall 2013 ensured that these changes were formally documented.

In addition to revising the General Education policy approved in August 2013, the College reviewed all other General Education options for the Career and Technical (CTE) programs. Courses were evaluated based upon their rigor and transfer equivalencies. The current college catalog reflects the changes to the course offerings designated as appropriate for meeting specific General Education requirements.

A great deal of campus dialogue and debate occurred prior to revisions of the policy. As part of the need for proper approval of CTE General Education options, the college needed to determine the structure within which courses would be reviewed and approved, based on appropriateness, by the CTE and Liberal Arts programs faculty. After more than six months of debate and discussion following the visiting team’s exit presentation in October 2012, the College approved a committee for CTE General Education. The structure calls for balanced representation of Liberal Arts and CTE faculty. The Charter of the committee was approved by the General Education Board (GEB) on April 15, 2013, by the Committee on Programs and Curricula (CPC) on April 26, 2013, and by the Faculty Senate Executive Committee (FSEC) on May 10, 2013. Through discussion at the GEB, CPC, and FSEC, it became clear that it was best to have separate committees (sub-boards) for CTE General Education and for articulation matters. At the same time, there should be coordination and consultation among Liberal Arts and CTE faculty across all of the boards, which called for balanced representation of Liberal Arts and CTE faculty. The committee also created hallmarks, similar to those of the General Education
committee for the Associate of Arts degree, and an approval process to submit courses for review.

Because of the need to reflect the new policy and the correlated guidelines for General Education requirements in the current catalog for 2013-2014, it was agreed that the process for curriculum review would be modified to expedite the process. Changes were reviewed by a special ad hoc committee of faculty and counselors and discussed with the Chancellor in early summer 2013, and curriculum actions formalizing program modifications (e.g., changes to college-level Math requirements) were reviewed and approved through the College’s regular process in Fall 2013.

Subsequent modifications to the General Education Board (and its sub-boards) membership took place in AY 2014-2015, as faculty members worked to streamline the process of review and certification. Given the new requirements for achieving college-level proficiency in English and Math, and the potential impact of those changes on various programs, General Education will remain a major focus for Instruction.

EVIDENCE FOR RECOMMENDATION 4:

4.1 2013 Follow-Up Report (Evidence for Recommendation 4)
Response to College Recommendation 5

To fully meet the standard, the team recommends that the college review personnel procedures for all hiring to ensure consistency, transparency, and confidentiality. (III.A.1.a, III.A.3.a, III.A.3.b)

The College reviewed the hiring procedures to address concerns voiced by many faculty and staff who have served on selection committees. An investigation and survey of the other UHCCs’ hiring procedures, and an interview with the UH system EEO/AA coordinator, were conducted by the College’s Chancellor. Based upon that comparison of procedures and actual EEO requirements, a number of valid issues surfaced. It has become apparent that the College’s hiring procedures were far too restrictive, thus causing great frustration for those participating in hiring committees as well as at the level of administrative review.

Based upon the review of other campus procedures, and the interview with the system EEO/AA officer, the following specific issues were identified, and the executive team created solutions to address those issues.

1. When creating selection committees, a balance of diversity is needed to reflect the University’s EEO / Affirmative Action policies, but not to the point that every underserved ethnic group must be represented. In response to the findings, the committee appointments will be approved by the appropriate Dean or Director, and not the Personnel Director.

2. The process of the Personnel Director approving committee minutes is not required nor recommended. The committees will continue to produce minutes to reflect the discussion and recommendations made as an outcome of the search process.

3. Specific directions will be provided to the search committees regarding the types of interview questions available and appropriate for use in the interview process. The college will begin to create a bank of interview questions that can be easily updated or adjusted to fit the specific needs of each search. These questions will be provided to each search committee to assist them in preparing for consistent and fair interviews. The Personnel Director will approve the final set of questions to ensure that all EEO and affirmative action regulations are met.

4. The process of allowing search committees to only meet in one building on campus is restrictive and unnecessary. The new standard operating procedures identify the expectation of keeping the meetings and meeting outcomes confidential, but also allow for the flexibility and professional judgment of those serving on the committees to meet in an appropriate venue and ensure the security of all documents.

5. The process of allowing minutes and interview questions to be kept on only one
computer is also restrictive and unnecessary. The new standard operating procedures allow for interview questions to be shared amongst the committee members in writing or electronically.

6. Timely notification to applicants not selected for the position will occur once the candidate selected for the position accepts.

In order to address the recommendation regarding **consistency** and **transparency**, the Chancellor’s office created new standard operating procedures. These procedures will guide each search committee in a clear and consistent manner. Each search will be held accountable to follow the procedures. These procedures will also allow for transparency of the process, as there will be a clear and accessible set of procedures. Currently, the perception of employees serving on screening committees is that each committee has been treated in a different manner. The new procedures will create a transparent and consistent process managed by the administrator of the relevant division.

In order to address the recommendation of **confidentiality**, the process of convening search committees has changed. In the past, the Personnel Director convened each search committee and required they sign a confidentiality agreement. In order to hold each committee accountable, the confidentiality agreement has been updated to include other expectations of those serving on the search committees. In addition, in order to elevate the importance of a confidential process, each search committee is convened by the Dean or Director responsible for the unit/division, where a discussion of these responsibilities occurs. Questions that occur throughout the search process will be directed to the Dean or Director of the unit, and not the Personnel Officer. In AY 2014-2015, the College hired a new Personnel Officer, who had previously helped to develop the new standard operating procedures, and continues to assist in streamlining the hiring process, including the employment of casual hires.

**EVIDENCE FOR RECOMMENDATION 5:**

5.1 [2013 Follow-Up Report](Evidence for Recommendation 5)
Response to College Recommendation 6

To fully meet the standard the team recommends that the college reviews its evaluation process for all positions and ensure all staff and faculty (including post-tenure faculty) are evaluated in all operational units on a regular basis. (Standard III.A.1.b)

and

Response to Commission Requirement

The Commission also requires Honolulu Community College to demonstrate that it has adopted, implemented, and is adhering to the UH Policy on faculty (full- and part-time) evaluations to include, as a component, effectiveness in producing learning outcomes (Standard III.A.1.c).

The college has four classifications of employees. These include 1) Executives, 2) Faculty (instructional and non-instructional), 3) Administrative, Professional and Technical (APT), and 4) Civil Service employees. With the exception of the executive level employees, each group has an individual collective bargaining agreement with the University of Hawai`i. Through union negotiations, a regulated evaluation schedule is established.

For members of the University of Hawai`i Professional Assembly (UHPA), the faculty bargaining unit, an evaluation schedule is established by tenure-track, non tenure-track and post-tenure categories. Tenure-track employees are granted two-year contracts and go through a contract renewal process every two years until they are eligible to apply for tenure. Non-tenure track faculty members are on annual contracts and are required to apply for renewal every year. This review process includes several levels of evaluation. The evaluation is based upon the candidate’s teaching ability, his or her review of student learning in the classroom, professional development, and service to the college and the community. Faculty members are reviewed at several levels: by a department personnel committee made up of peers, by the division chair, by the dean of the division, and by the Chancellor. When applying for tenure and/or promotion, candidates are also reviewed by tenure and promotion review committees (TPRC, comprised of peers from their home campus as well as other UHCC campuses.) As dictated by Board policy 9-15 regarding post-tenure review, every faculty member will be evaluated through a post-tenure review process at least once every five years. This review requires, at a minimum, an assessment of teaching ability, student learning, and service activities.

Administrative, Professional and Technical personnel (APT) belong to the Hawaii Government Employees Association (HGEA) bargaining unit. HGEA employees undergo an annual performance review every November. This review includes an assessment of their performance, and a review of their accomplishments based upon their previous year’s goals. At that time, employees also set goals for the upcoming year in consultation with their supervisor. Supervisors are notified electronically of the schedule for review, which occurs October through November each year.
Civil service employees are also State of Hawaii employees and belong to the United Public Workers (UPW) bargaining union. All civil service employees are also evaluated on an annual basis, depending on their anniversary date with the University of Hawai`i. At this evaluation they review the previous year’s performance, and set performance goals for the following year.

When the ACCJC visiting team conducted their accreditation visit in Oct 2012, the college was in the middle of the evaluation cycle for APTs. Data at that time indicated that not all employees were regularly evaluated. In response to this recommendation, the college has developed a policy to hold supervisors accountable for completing all subordinates’ evaluations within the specific timeframe. The policy was brought to the four governance committees for comment and approval in Fall 2013. In addition to this policy, a standard operating procedure was developed to ensure that the Chief Personnel Director performs routine checks on the evaluation status of all APT and Civil Service employees and reminds them of the pending review. The operating procedures indicate the repercussions for not completing the performance reviews. Deans and Directors will be responsible for ensuring all employees within their division are evaluated. The 2013-2014 academic year was the first year this procedure was in place, and it was reviewed for possible improvement for Fall 2014.

As noted in the 2013 response to the College’s required Follow-Up Report, the college put into place several key policies related to required employee evaluations for all employees on a regular cycle. Several UH Community College System as well as Honolulu Community College Policies address the evaluation process for performance evaluations of civil service, APT, faculty, and executive/management evaluations. For clarification, the College has prepared a summary of employment categories and the documents that govern their evaluation.

These new policies outline the process for employee evaluations and identify the responsibility of supervisors for completing employee evaluations in a timely manner, consistent with timelines outlined in the respective negotiated agreements or administrative procedures. These policies were put in place during the 2013-2014 Academic Year, and will re-occur on an established cycle.

An evaluation of the impact of those policies on employee and supervisor performance review processes has truly changed the importance given to the overall personnel evaluation process on campus. One hundred percent of probationary faculty completed the performance evaluation process. The five-year post-tenure review process was put into policy in AY2013-2014. In only one case out of ten, the College discovered that the five-year post-tenure review requirement had not been completed; that case has now been resolved. One hundred percent of all executives completed the performance evaluation process. One hundred percent of all eligible APT employees completed the evaluation process. Those ineligible employees in this category included those that separated from the college in the AY2013-2014 academic year, or separated from their assigned duties during that year. In the civil service category, annual performance reviews of employees rose from 57% in the previous year to 100% in AY 2013-2014.
The tracking and notification to the supervisors to ensure that the evaluations are done within the proper timeframe is currently somewhat tedious. However, the change in culture at the campus is already having a positive impact on the management of the assessment of personnel in all employment categories.

The College was fully compliant with the requirement to complete the five-year reviews of post-tenure faculty in AY 2014-2015. (See also UHCC system recommendation #3.)

EVIDENCE FOR RECOMMENDATION 6:

6.1 2013 Follow-Up Report (Evidence for Recommendation 6)
6.2 2014 Follow-Up Report (Evidence for Recommendation 6)
Closing the Loop—improvement-oriented planning and action in response to careful assessment—has increasingly framed the College’s efforts to embody its vision of being a student-centered, student-focused institution of post-secondary education. The College understands this process as a dynamic one—not a closed circle, but a spiral of meaningful growth and continuing improvement of the quality of student learning. In addition to addressing the recommendations received as a result of the College’s Self-Evaluation Report and accreditation visit in 2012, the College feels it is important to highlight the ways in which this paradigm of assessment and responsive action is increasingly embedded in the structure and the functions of the College.

Closing the Loop: Student Success Pathway and Strategic Plan
In the 2014-2015 academic year, the College began a process to update its Strategic Plan. As a way to organize the work needed to reach strategic plan goals and to continue to keep the work of the College focused on student success, A Student Success Working Group was created and tasked with the responsibility to develop a more focused and integrated plan. The result of that work was the Student Success Pathway. The pathway serves as a roadmap for the college community and an organizing tool for planning actionable items to help meet strategic plan goals and advance student success and completion. The five phases of the Pathway are: Prepare, Engage, Commit, Complete, and Thrive. In AY 2015-2016, the College will focus efforts around the first phase—Prepare. The outcomes for this phase include the following: 1) Entering students are holistically assessed for college readiness, and will be prepared for success on the first day of classes; 2) Students will successfully complete pre-college work within their first semester or first year. Specific actionable items in this phase include: 1) Establishing an Enrollment Management committee; 2) revamping the college’s Outreach and Early College High School plan; 3) redesigning Developmental Education in conjunction with system initiatives; and 4) a series of projects related to the establishment of academic pathways and proactive student registration.

Closing the Loop: Remedial/Developmental Education
The Community Colleges collectively joined the Achieving the Dream initiative in 2008. That required colleges to begin building a process of evaluating student success within a culture of evidence. As part of that initiative, the College began to closely evaluate the success of remedial and developmental education. At the outset, the lowest level of completion for developmental education was 20%. The involvement of the English faculty resulted in a complete redesign of the curriculum by focusing on reading and writing as parts of an essential skills base for underprepared students. Included in the redesign is the incorporation of technology resources as learning and assessment tools. Similarly, the Math faculty also overhauled the remedial math curriculum in line with successful college models. The incorporation of technology into this curriculum has also been essential to assessment and evaluation of student learning. Assessment of both the English and Math is now in the process of being refined, and becoming integrated into the campus dialogue around student success. Part of the change linked to assessing student performance was the creation of HCCP #5.101, Policy on Student Placement
Testing and Developmental Education Class Assignments. The purpose of the policy is to identify those incoming students who are required to participate in the college placement testing process and to determine, if necessary, their appropriate placement in the established developmental reading, writing, and mathematics curricula. As a result of these changes, the college was able to close the loop and celebrate success for the College, as we are tied for the highest success level in the system for developmental writing, and now have the highest success rates for Native Hawaiian students in college level math. Currently, campus representatives are included in a system-wide effort to substantially transform the CCs approach to Developmental Education that will, if successful, shorten the time students need to spend in below-college level instruction in English and Math. This has implications for both better use of financial aid and shorter time to completion of degree programs.

Closing the Loop: Organizational Structure
As a result of an assessment of college operations, a major reorganization occurred for the College in Fall 2012. Prior to the approval of the reorganization plan, a year was spent meeting with each department and academic unit to determine structural barriers as well as areas of improvement that could be implemented to ensure organizational effectiveness.

Over time, and unintentionally, some areas of the College had created an environment that was not fully responsive to the needs of today’s students, and an organizational structure that did not allow the campus to work at a high level of efficiency. Reorganization was experienced in two key ways: structural changes that meant the College would be better prepared to serve students; and an attitudinal commitment to creating a student-centered, student-focused culture. The implementation of various aspects of reorganization have slowly taken place over the last academic year (2012-2013), resulting in these changes:

Creation of a Retention Office: Four positions were reallocated from other areas to focus on student success initiatives not currently underway in a unit entitled the Retention Office. Also included in this structure is the assignment of a Student Success Coordinator to function like a division chair and work campus-wide around the discussion of student success. Closing the loop activities and indicators of success include, for example, reaching out to students. During the summer of 2013, retention personnel called all the students who completed Spring 2013 but did not re-enroll for Fall 2013; outreach calls and emails were made to 995 students, and the Retention Office was successful in getting 383 of them to reenroll for Fall 2013.

Dean of Academic Support Office: Two other positions were reallocated and used to support an administrative office entitled Academic Support. This new administrative dean will assist in coordinating all aspects of academic support, including assessment, program review, and student success initiatives.

Consolidation of non-credit activities: The campus previously organized its non-credit activities under each academic unit. This resulted in inefficiencies and lost productivity.
All non-credit activities are now the responsibility of the Director of the Pacific Center for Advanced Technology Training and Continuing Education and Lifelong Learning.

Creation of the Admission and Records office: Prior to the reorganization, records and admissions reported separately to two different administrators. This consolidation also allows for better control, productivity, and flow of student information.

Creation of an academic division of Hawaiian Programs: The re-organization clustered all of the Hawaiian studies, Hawaiian language and Native Hawaiian Center services under one academic unit, within University College, the campus’ liberal arts program. This illustrates the importance of the campus’ efforts to build more enrollment and graduates of these programs.

Redevelopment of Financial Aid: Not a formal part of the re-organization, but important to the campus, it had become apparent that our Financial Aid office was dealing with major procedural issues. Over the past few years the University of Hawai‘i Community Colleges have undergone a significant transition in the area of Financial Aid. In order to boost the amount of aid awarded a systemized approach was used. This approach has meant that several key functions of the awarding process have moved from the campus to the system level. Although the system had begun to utilize more automated practices related to the awarding of aid, the College was not actively adopting those practices. In an effort to improve our students’ chances for success, the College began to rebuild the office with the help of UH system financial aid experts. The result has allowed the college to award aid in a matter of days, rather than 3-4 months. As evidence of success, the college had disbursed $543,175 by the beginning of Fall 2012. After making the necessary changes, the college had disbursed $2,018,919 by the beginning of Fall 2013—a 272% increase in disbursement. The college will continue to monitor this progress, and will continue to work in collaboration with the system staff to further improve processes and communication to students.

Closing the Loop: Outreach and Orientation
In response to declining enrollments from specific groups such as high school students, an Outreach Office was created in the summer of 2012. Changes in leadership have occurred, and new initiatives have been implemented which address overarching recruitment goals. The purpose of this office was to refocus efforts in creating relationships with the surrounding community and high schools, and in recruiting new students to the college. In November 2012, the then-new Dean of Student Services added the function of new student orientation to the office functions, thus creating an Outreach & Orientation Office. Prior to this, orientation had been housed with a committee that had a rotating chair. By adding this function into the outreach area, the college has provided a consistency of leadership and a strong tie with incoming students. The Outreach & Orientation Office will continue to improve services by focusing on two things. First is a revamp of the orientation process, which aims to make the process easier for students and bring more of the orientation components to the local high schools. Second, the office will work in conjunction with the Dean of Students to update and
refocus the college’s recruitment plan. This plan will focus on high schools, and have built-in goals and assessments in order to increase our high school-aged population. Orientation is completed online and development and modification of delivery is ongoing. The college’s recruitment plan is also continually modified to address changing needs of prospective students. Goals and assessments are still being addressed for Outreach and Orientation. Focus has been on high schools, and the Outreach Office has made significant headway with regard to recruitment efforts at feeder campuses. These efforts are addressed in the High School Transition section.

Closing the Loop: Academic Support
Another component of the College’s reorganization was the creation of a new administrative position, the Dean of Academic Support; this position was filled on a permanent basis in early August, 2013. Prior to this, faculty and staff in the various units that comprise Academic Support participated in campus-wide workshops on the development and assessment of Service Area Outcomes (SAOs.) This will facilitate both Annual Review and Comprehensive Program Review; all units are modifying survey instruments and other assessment tools to reflect changes made to SAOs.

Of particular importance is the newly developed Student Success Department—tasked with rolling out services related to retention, engagement, and persistence. Programs included in this department are: Retention, Testing and Tutoring, and TRIO-SSS, overseen by a Student Success Coordinator. The goals of the Department are to (1) increase student retention through direct and intrusive services aimed that are both proactive and supportive; (2) actively collaborate with all departments/divisions across our campus to increase student engagement through cross-divisional programing and support (development of workshops, classes, student engagement events); (3) promotion of placement testing brush-up; (4) expanding tutoring services (including peer mentor tutoring); and (5) having TRIO-SSS and the Retention Department work closely together to coordinate service needs, thus expanding services to students.

As noted in the response to Recommendation No. 3, we have successfully completed the development of the Distance Education Strategic Plan, and will continue to work on formalizing the process and procedures as stated in the Plan. Support provided by various elements of Academic Support is integral to the success of Distance Education at the College. At this point in time, Distance Education office has: (1) conducted two Town Hall meetings (one to give the campus an update on DE, and the second to provide an opportunity for comment and feedback on the new Distance Education Strategic Plan); (2) developed and conducted a mandatory workshop for faculty who are teaching Distance Education Classes; (3) modification of the Distance Education website to make it more student- and faculty-friendly; and (4) created a “services to students” tab/page in Laulima (UH’s course management platform) for students to have easy access to services. The Distance Education Coordinator will continue to work directly with the Deans, Division Chairs, and faculty teaching DE courses regarding assessment of those courses. The Deans who oversee the divisions/departments of each DE course will need to ensure faculty members are complying with assessment procedures. Additionally, the Education Technology Department (which manages Distance Education) will be working
on reaching out to faculty to support classroom-related activities with technology as a means to expand Distance Education offerings.

Other Departments in the Academic Support Division (Disability Services, Policy Planning and Institutional Research, Library, Design Center) have been relatively stable, with only minor changes to programs, operations and outcomes.

**Closing the Loop: Assessment Training and Follow-Up**
While the College has functioned effectively in the context of instructional assessment, it was important to extend that understanding and embrace of assessment in the context of non-instructional units of the campus. To address that need, the Chancellor engaged the services of an external consultant in Spring 2013 to provide guidance to the campus at large and to develop a common language and understanding for outcomes-based assessment. The College selected a provider that utilized assessment practices based on those developed by Ruth Stiehl. The three-day workshop in April 2013 provided a transformative experience for the campus, as faculty, staff and administrators worked side by side to address issues of assessment, from developing robust SLOs (or SAOs) to considering the best means to assess those outcomes and plan for improvement.

As a follow-up to the workshop, all faculty were asked to complete a form that would allow them to identify course-level SLOs, alignment with program learning outcomes (PLOs), methods of assessment, and data gathered that would contribute to “closing the loop” in terms of continuous improvement. A summary of course-level actions made in early Fall 2013 indicated that almost all faculty had completed the SLO inventory forms for active courses and are in the process of gathering data that will aid them in completing assessment activities. Follow-up activities include Deans working with programs in their division, as well as individual peer-mentoring activities with faculty members.

The campus-wide effort to look at assessment activities, applied to both instructional and non-instructional areas, has resulted in a common focus and shared concern with improving services to students linked to specific and measurable outcomes. The College has moved from a climate where some areas were doing assessment well to an institutional focus on assessment as part of the general culture of the College. As one of the manifestations of that shift in focus, the College has developed a multi-year Assessment and Planning Calendar so that various assessment-related activities are more readily identified and given priority. Activities now include an Assessment Showcase in late Spring (a “summative” event to review work done during the current year), and another focus on assessment projects in Fall (a “formative” event to determine what data-gathering and analysis will take place in the coming academic year.)

**Closing the Loop: Campus Communication**
In early 2012, through small- and large-group discussions, it was determined that communication in the Administrative Services division needed improvement. The campus community asked that the communication sent from Administrative Services to students and employees regarding campus operations (i.e., construction, traffic, closures,
etc.) occur more frequently. As a result, a portion of the college intranet was designated for construction and operations updates. In addition, weekly, sometimes daily, emails are sent to the campus to keep everyone abreast of various facilities-related issues that may impact building and campus users. Another area of communication that required improvement was the internal communication between Administrative Services employees. Several people voiced concern that communication between Administrative Services units was non-existent. To address this issue Administrative Services supervisor’s meetings were scheduled once a month, and during certain portions of the year increase to every other week. Both changes came as a result of employee and student feedback, and have helped to improve coordination.

Closing the Loop: Safety and Security
In 2012 the campus instituted a new incident reporting software system. Prior to its implementation, all incident reports were recorded by hand on paper, and a paper filing system was maintained. Although the campus is required to keep certain documents in hard copy form for seven years, the vast majority of paperwork is now done electronically in the web-based Report Exec software system.

Closing the Loop: High School Transition
As part of the Community Colleges Strategic Plan, the community college system has been tracking the high school “going rate.” This is defined as recent high school graduates entering fall semester at the community college following their spring graduation from high school. The overall community college system has been able to meet the annual goals. While Honolulu Community College has experienced an overall decline in high school going rates over the past four years beginning in 2009 and has not met the established goal, increased activities with the high school campuses has helped to address some of these needs.

Honolulu Community College has established and implemented three summer high school programs. The Automotive Academy is a six-week program from public high schools throughout the island of Oahu. Students receive college credit through instruction at the College and through an internship at a local dealership. This program could not be successful without our partnerships with the local First Hawaiian Bank and local Cutter Dealerships.

Honolulu Community College received a P-20 grant for the past two summers to implement a Summer Engineering Academy. This past summer over fifty high school students attended a 6-week program on campus. Students rotated between three modules designed to explore mechanical, electrical, and civil engineering. The program also hosted thirty middle school students for a one-day hands-on field trip.

Construction Academy’s 2012 Summer Program afforded 63 high school students from various public, charter school, and private high schools on O’ahu the opportunity to learn about the construction industry. Of these students, 30 (47.6%) were 2012 high school graduates; 9 students (14.3%) were female; 21 students (33.3%) were Native Hawaiian. Eighty-three percent (25 students) of the program participants who recently graduated in
2012 were admitted into the University of Hawai`i System during the Fall 2012 semester; of the students who matriculated into the University of Hawai`i System, 67% (20 students) were admitted to Honolulu Community College.

**Closing the Loop: Redefining General Education for Career-Technical Programs**

In response to ACCJC’s recommendation regarding Honolulu Community College’s general education requirements for all associate degree programs, the College moved immediately to address this concern. Through on-going campus-wide dialogue and unified work efforts with major governing bodies, HCC’s policy on general education was modified and approved in April 2013 (HCCP #5.213.) Specific language was included to clarify that the general education components for all associate degrees must be at the “college level.” College level has been defined as 100-level and transferable. In addition, the College has established a Career and Technical General Education Board to establish parameters and a thorough review process to certify general education courses specific to each associate degree program. Most importantly, faculty from both CTE and Liberal Arts received funding from the Carl D. Perkins Career and Technical Education Act to develop and implement appropriate curriculum that meet the new requirements.

As noted above, many associate degrees have been impacted and have positively responded to making the necessary curricular changes. To ensure the College continues to strengthen students’ general education skill sets, five courses are in the process of being developed, funded through the Carl D. Perkins Career and Technical Education Act. These include courses in Math, Science, English, and Philosophy. Throughout the process, CTE and Liberal Arts faculty met to discuss specific program needs and have taken appropriate action to develop program-specific general education curriculum. Subsequent implementation and related curriculum action will continue throughout the 2013-2014 academic year. Faculty will also work with college counselors and CTE program leaders to inform them of these course options for general education.

**Closing the Loop: Student Success in Distance Education**

Preliminary data from the college’s institutional research office indicated lower success and higher withdrawal rates for students in DE courses versus face-to-face courses. To address these disparities, the Distance Education Coordinator and other staff members implemented the following:

1. Administered a survey to DE students to better ascertain the obstacles to their success in DE courses;
2. Planned and directed a formal campus-wide dialogue (via Town Hall) that presented faculty and staff with these data, and solicited ideas for college assistance and intervention to assist students, change processes;
3. Directed the College’s Retention Office to pay particular attention to DE students in their outreach efforts during the summer (Retention Office contacted students who had not re-registered for Fall 2013 courses and assisted them as appropriate. This effort was highly successful and resulted in about 400 re-registrations);
4. Developed new ways to better build greater community and “buy-in” in DE courses with respect to student identification with, and sense of belonging to, the college campus. Efforts have focused on social media and web resources.
Further areas of research and assessment include a look at other characteristics that might separate successful from unsuccessful DE students in terms of place of residence, year in program, and other courses being taken concurrently. PPIR can do further analysis of data to see if there are patterns that indicate possible college follow-up to improve likelihood of student success. Such information would be helpful to counselors, instructors, and students by indicating potentially difficult combinations of courses, or time/format challenges.

Closing the Loop: Support for Distance Education Faculty
General feedback and Town Hall discussion indicated greater need for flexible faculty development and training opportunities for technical aspects of distance education and course development, particularly in light of impending unavailability of classrooms in Spring 2014 due to Building 7 renovation. To address these concerns, the Distance Education Coordinator

1. Negotiated a special arrangement with DE support resources at Kapiʻolani Community College to offer: (1) large group presentation on DE support resources and instruction available; (2) free participation in an online course that is designed to take instructors through entire process of DE course development, offered in summer 2013 in preparation for upcoming semesters;
2. Organized a mandatory orientation held on August 21, 2013, for all faculty teaching DE courses in Fall 2013. Orientation covered key technical and resource issues, and also encouraged intra-faculty dialogue on best practices and tips. Similar sessions—the most recent was in August 2015—have been held at the beginning of each semester since then;
3. Organized DE faculty training sessions planned for September 2013, responding to faculty request for more flexible scheduling of DE training to accommodate class schedules.

Closing the Loop: Resources for Distance Education Students
Campus Town Hall discussion indicated a greater need for clearly identifiable, consolidated, and easily accessible online resources for DE students. To address that need, the College is supporting the following:

1. Student Services is taking the lead in ensuring that DE support services are accessible and “packaged” in a convenient way for DE students. The Dean of Academic Support has already taken a leadership role in consolidating and improving DE support services, including information access on the web to both HCC and UH system DE resources;
2. A Laulima (official UH course management system) page has been designed and implemented, which automatically appears for all DE students. This page includes information and links that are helpful to DE students.

Closing the Loop: HCConnect
HCConnect, a social networking site for the campus community, addresses both retention/course engagement issues as well as technical issues (e.g., how to upload video to share with others). Expansion of HCConnect was discussed as a good way to improve students’ DE experience (and all students’ experience) and create a greater sense of
HCC’s online community. This discussion began in Spring 2012, and will continue in the current academic year.

Closing the Loop: Use of Social Media
For the always “connected” generation, hand-held devices and constant communications are normal. The Millennial generation will most likely have a smart phone or handheld device with which to communicate, and send/receive upwards of 50 text messages a day (according to recent Nielsen Report.) They will have a Facebook, Twitter, YouTube or other social media networking account in which to stay connected to their friends and favorites. To promote the good work of the college, Honolulu Community College has built a social media strategy using the following social media outlets: Facebook, Twitter, Instagram, Word Press blog (The Water Blog), NING (HCConnect), and a campus mobile app. In Spring 2012, a Social Media Strategic Plan was created to differentiate goals, reach, content and audience to best leverage social media as open and free communication between the campus and its stakeholders.

Closing the Loop: Continuing Education (non-credit customers)
For several years the limitations of the Non-Credit registration system at Honolulu Community College (HCC) have been evident, including the inability to handle on-line registrations and having limited access to data reports. The college had already moved to a University-wide on-line registration system for our customers taking credit classes. Through a lengthy Request for Proposal (RFP) process, the Destiny One registration system, provided by Destiny Solutions, was selected as the new University of Hawaii Community Colleges (UHCC) non-credit registration system with a Go-Live date of November 25, 2013. Destiny One provides a rich online experience that improves student self-service while maximizing staff efficiency. It includes an on-line shopping cart and multiple registration and payment options that streamline registration processes and improve customer satisfaction. Up-to-the-minute data allows staff to quickly respond to inquiries, saving valuable time and work effort. HCC has closed the loop for our customers expecting web-based equivalents for in-person transactions by supporting the acquisition of a UHCC-wide registration system.

Closing the Loop: Managing Assessment
In connection with its self-evaluation report and site visit in Fall 2012, the College engaged in an extended review of the way it managed all aspects of the processes of assessment. It became evident that a more comprehensive, coordinated, and coherent approach to the multiple tasks related to assessment of all aspects of institutional function would be of benefit to the College. A draft of a Comprehensive Assessment Planning Calendar was initially developed in Spring 2013 as a means of identifying the various strands of assessment activity and the frequencies with which they occurred. The Calendar was also able to allow the campus to focus on any given academic year in order to set its priorities for action. With input from various constituencies, a final iteration of the Calendar was shared more broadly with the campus, with the understanding that this was a dynamic tool that could be refined with implementation and use.
Linked to the creation of the Calendar was the assessment of existing committees charged with managing the activities centered on Assessment and Accreditation, understood to be closely linked and in some cases overlapping areas of concern. A proposal to create a new committee structure was developed and circulated to the campus and in particular the faculty and staff governance committees with supervision of the existing committees for Assessment and Accreditation. The new structure included the creation of the Campus Council on Institutional Effectiveness (CCIE), which would serve as a coordinating body. The campus took the Academic Year 2013-2014 to review this structure and approve the Charters of the CCIE as well as those of the newly reformulated Task Forces on Assessment and Accreditation.

The Assessment Task Force is continuing in its three-pronged mission to educate College faculty and staff about assessment techniques and procedures, consolidate all assessment activity conducted on campus and archive that activity, and publicize relevant assessment processes and results to relevant stakeholders including the community, ACCJC, and other interested parties. In line with this work, the Task Force has begun building a rubric to help programs understand and better conduct their 5-year comprehensive reviews through which we hope to improve the effectiveness of program assessments and their use in closing the loop. The Task Force also planned and sponsored Assessment Showcase events in Spring of 2013 and Fall of 2015, and is planning an Assessment Showcase for Spring of 2016 in order to publicize to the campus the results of assessment activities, and encourage ongoing improvement in assessment and assessment reporting. The committee is also revisiting its own activities through self-reviews, annual reports to the Faculty Senate, and College-wide surveys to determine effectiveness, and College needs.

A third significant addition to the College’s focus on Assessment was the creation of activities that would serve to frame assessment activities as an ongoing, essential part of College function, beginning with an event at the start of the academic year that would allow for discussion and planning of activities to come, and ending with an event that would allow for a sharing of assessment-related accomplishments Thus the first Assessment Showcase took place in May 2014, and the first Assessment Town Hall took place in August 2014; these will each become annual events that continue to revalidate the College’s commitment to assessment as a continual process that contributes to its overall effectiveness as an institution of higher learning. The most recent Assessment Showcase took place in August 2015, with a focus on the array of different assessment methods used by various units in different contexts.

The most recent evidence of the College’s commitment to comprehensive management of assessment is the hiring of a dedicated Assessment Coordinator, a full-time APT staff member who will report to the Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs. That hiring process will be completed in Fall 2015.

**Closing the Loop: Assessment of Instruction**
As noted above, the College previously provided evidence of its substantial engagement in various forms of assessment in the context of instruction, with identification and evaluation of learning outcomes at course, program and institutional levels, the last being finalized in Academic year 2013-2014, following an extended period of research, dialogue and discussion in a process managed by a subcommittee of the College’s Planning Council. Programs had completed work on aligning course to program SLOs; they are currently working on the alignment between program and institutional learning outcomes. The updates that follow document the continuing work that faculty are doing related to SLO assessment at multiple levels and utilizing various tools and methods of assessment as appropriate in order to focus on the continuing improvement of student learning.

Tech I: Transportation & Trades
Tech I, The Transportation and Trades division, has continued to support and strengthen overall program and course assessment efforts. These collective initiatives have established a supportive foundation embracing appropriate evaluation and action-oriented improvements. Some programs have currently focused areas of improvement at the course level, while others have been more active at the program level.

The Transportation & Trades division continues to engage in meaningful, comprehensive assessment efforts aimed at improving student success at Honolulu Community College. Targeted strategies to continue activity related to the evaluation of student learning outcomes, program learning outcomes, and industry driven alignments efforts have resulted in moderate to substantial changes over the past year. The division faculty continue to work closely with the division chair to ensure all assessment efforts and any changes as a result, are appropriate and integrated into the larger campus strategic planning efforts.

During the 2015 accreditation mid-term report, the following areas were highlighted as part of our work towards continuous self-improvement or closing the loop: a) Program Level Assessment Efforts, b) Course Student Learning Outcome Assessment, and c) External Program Accreditation. While each program utilizes a variety of assessment techniques, all areas continue to evaluate the results of program and course specific assessment.

Annual Report on Program Data (ARPD)
During the 2013-2014 and 2014-2015 academic years, all programs completed the University of Hawai‘i Community College System wide Annual Report on Program Data (ARPD.) One major highlight relating to the ARPD process has been the strengthening of dialogue among program faculty, division chair and dean, with the sole purpose of reviewing changes and improvements indicated by the results of the program review. Program faculty members have continued to refine assessment strategies and develop action plans addressing areas of improvement.

Programs such as Welding Technology identified both major equipment deficiencies and opportunities to expand curriculum to meet emerging workforce needs. Through the newly established communication loops within the Division, the program participated in
a series of discussions at the division and college level. These discussions resulted in the program developing a grant proposal, which was successfully funded through the Carl D. Perkins Career and Technical Education Act. Perkins funding enabled the program to work on acquiring specific tools, which will also be complemented by the introduction of new curricular units and modules for both credit and non-credit instruction. Additionally, through previously established industry advisory groups, the program worked directly with the Ship Repair Association of Hawai‘i (SRAH), and State of Hawai‘i Department of Labor; through this partnership, Welding Technology successfully implemented a non-credit workforce stabilization program in Marine Ship Repair welding. Program faculty members continue to work with SRAH to develop relevant workforce training modules.

During the Spring 2014 semester, the College administration met with the Commercial Aviation program to discuss a number of concerns related to the program’s overall effectiveness and efficiency. Historically, the program has struggled to maintain sufficient student demand due to a number of reasons related to costs associated with flight training. Overall costs for the program to the students—who pay upwards of $60,000 per year—are not sustainable. Since 1998, there have been fewer than twenty-five degrees awarded. The low number of program completers prompted a comprehensive evaluation and review of the overall program, and in Spring 2014, the College initiated a stop-out for the program. The College and program will continue to work with current students to assist them with completing any remaining requirements by Spring 2016.

All programs continue to complete annual program level assessments through the UHCC’s Annual Report on Program Data (ARPD). These reports will contain specific discussions around various programmatic assessment efforts and any changes as a result. As evidenced in the ARPD reports, these evaluations have served as a basis for small to substantial changes. In a previous report, the College initiated the formal shut down of the Commercial Aviation program. Additional efforts to work with all students will continue during the final year of the program.

Course Student Learning Outcome Inventory
Program faculty members have continued to refine their use of the Course Student Learning Outcome Inventory forms to better understand assessment efforts related to student learning outcomes and to formulate changes to improve student learning as a direct result of assessment. Faculty are currently in the process of completing assessment activity for Spring 2015, which will be incorporated into the upcoming Annual Report on Program Data (ARPD) for the 2014-2015 academic year. Further analysis will be forthcoming.

Similar to other instructional areas, course level assessment efforts continue to reflect the division’s awareness to systematically evaluate, discuss, and disseminate overall assessment efforts. Course student learning outcome inventory forms serve as the basis for appropriate changes and in conjunction with the Division Chair, included as part of the large campus planning process. Moving forward, the division will work with the Assessment Committee to post on the College’s SharePoint systems.
Program Accreditations, Spring 2014

The Transportation and Trades division has two programs accredited by an external governing body—the National Automotive Technicians Education Foundation (NATEF). The Automotive Technology (AMT) program participated in a full program recertification, and the Auto Body Repair and Painting (ABRP) program completed a mid-cycle compliance review. Both programs developed an extensive self-evaluation performed by faculty members and local industry advisory committee members. Each standard was thoroughly reviewed and actionable improvement items were identified.

The College’s AMT program successful met all major recommendations, in an evaluation conducted by an on-site NATEF Evaluation Team Leader, and is currently working towards integrating academic skills in English, Mathematics and Science. The optional skills recognition by NATEF further demonstrates the program’s strong commitment towards creating a culture of continuous improvement through action-oriented activity. The ABRP program is currently working to organize and address recommendations from the mid-cycle compliance review, and will have an actionable improvement plan developed by the completion of the Fall 2014 semester.

During the Fall 2015, the College’s Diesel Technology program is preparing to submit for NATEF accreditation under the Medium/Heavy Duty Truck compliance category. Current NATEF approved programs will continue to work on maintaining various program standards.

General Education Requirements

The establishment of the General Education sub-board for CTE programs has allowed faculty an opportunity to identify and contextualize specific general education course requirements for a number of CTE programs. These courses were introduced during the 2013-2014 academic year as part of the new general education requirements that were established to meet previous accreditation recommendations. In some instances, newly introduced courses like the accelerated ENG 60/100, have further integrated CTE content into the course while introducing more rigor in composition and reading. The course condenses a traditional two-semester sequence to one semester, and has been well received by students. Demand for the course continues to remain high. CTE and English faculty continue to collaborate in an effort to better understand student and program feedback.

Similar strides have been made in the areas of Science and Math, but additional work is needed to better identify appropriate strategies to support CTE students’ general education needs. Moving forward, the Tech I division chair will continue to actively work with program faculty and industry advisory councils to better understand specific workforce needs associated with each trade. These ongoing discussions will assist the College by better understanding and preparing for the ways in which Tech I programs and general education requirements are aligning with and supporting current and emerging industry requirements.
Alignment of Learning Outcomes
As the College works towards refining Institution Learning Outcomes (ILO), program faculty will focus efforts to align these outcomes to current program learning outcomes. During the Spring 2014 semester, the Division participated in the College’s inaugural Assessment Showcase. Program faculty participated in an alignment exercise focused on understanding how the College’s ILOs currently align with existing program learning outcomes. Results of this exercise will be reviewed moving forward and will serve as a basis for related discussions. Additional assessment training opportunities are planned for the current year and will be available to all division faculty members. Program and course student learning outcomes will remain a vibrant aspect for each program. The Division will continue to work with the newly established Assessment Task Force, Division Chair and Dean to better organize and manage related assessment activity.

Tech II: Communication and Services
Like the other divisions, all course-level SLOs for programs in this division have been completed and inventoried. In keeping with the general College timeline for curriculum modifications, appropriate course modifications, linked to SLO assessment, are developed during the Fall semester, for implementation in the following Fall semester. Early each Fall (generally, late August-early September), data from the previous academic year’s performance are released to the College (the ARPD results.) These data sets then serve as the basis for each program’s annual self-assessment, a crucial part of which includes consideration of SLOs. SLO modifications, if any, are included in the narrative for each program review: what prompted them, and how they are expected to improve the program. SLO review will be important in AY 2014-2015, as the division will be looking at expanding its certificate offerings for students. SLOs will therefore be central to the development of PLOs that are appropriate for the proposed certificates. The division chair works closely with each program to ensure that the campus repository of course SLOs is accurate and up-to-date, and that their assessment provides an appropriate basis on which to base program improvement efforts, including budget requests that are incorporated into the College’s annual budget and planning cycle, in which the Planning Council and the four major governance bodies participate.

University College
University College, the Liberal Arts unit of the College, includes four divisions, each of which has completed and continues to use the SLO inventories and engage in different forms of assessment selected by faculty as particularly appropriate to their specific disciplines.

Humanities and Social Sciences
The division of Humanities and Social Sciences continues to update SLO inventories, which are completed and collated each semester. The division has effectively met some specific challenges, including assessment of courses that are offered in multiple modalities (e.g., face-to-face, hybrid, online) in order to ensure parity of student experience and performance. Disciplines in which multiple sections are taught by multiple instructors, including part-time faculty members (lecturers), have also worked to ensure that SLOs are consistent across sections, and that common embedded means of
assessment (e.g., questions in common on all iterations of exams) provide a basis for appropriate aggregation of data.

Language Arts
The division of Language Arts includes instruction in multiple levels of English (from developmental reading and writing to advance literature courses.) Courses up through college-level composition are also offered in multiple sections taught by multiple instructors. The division has thus also utilized the direct assessment method of embedded items to focus on SLOs, a process that allows faculty members to track student performance on both individual section and aggregate course levels. This division has also implemented some assessment-based changes in curriculum, developing accelerated sequences that allow students to move more quickly and effectively to college-level writing, and also provides CTE students with content perceived as more pertinent to their respective programs of study.

Math and Natural Sciences
In the Math department, faculty members have been individually assigned to create embedded questions for all Math courses, a process that was completed in October 2014 for implementation in Spring 2015. As a means of closing the loop, the department collectively analyzes data on student performance, determines whether changes are needed in how material is presented, and subsequently studies whether changes, when implemented, result in improvement. Faculty are currently engaged in discussing the updating of SLOs with their colleagues on other campuses, so that there is consistency among courses offered through the UH system. In the sciences, the use of embedded questions is also an effective means of assessing student performance, and faculty are attuned to the need to continually monitor fluctuations, so that modifications in content, modes of presentation, and tools of assessment can be made at any point.

Hawaiian Programs
The division of Hawaiian Programs offers instruction in both Hawaiian language and Hawaiian Studies with courses that support the Associate of Arts degree in Hawaiian Studies. Faculty members in this division, like their colleagues in other divisions of University College, have also completed SLO Inventories for AY 2013-2014 and 2014-2015.

Closing the Loop: Campus Communication of Data Analysis
There are several online sources of descriptive data for the College; the primary ones are the UHCC’s Annual Report of Program Data (ARPD), the UHCC Office of the Vice President for Academic Affairs, and the UH System Institutional Research and Analysis Office (IRAO). Together, the data and tables available on these sites provide the campus with a comprehensive source of raw data, ratios, and indicators on a range of different measures.

In an effort to use the wealth of data available to the College (from both internal and external sources) and provide the campus with a greater understanding of what the data may be indicating with respect to important issues like student completion and success,
retention, etc., the Chancellor initiated a “White Paper” series beginning Fall 2014. This series consists of concise analyses of these issues, based on data specific to the College. The purpose of this series will be to engage the campus community in a user-friendly, ongoing dialog about the usefulness of data in understanding and addressing campus issues and, thus, its role in ongoing campus assessment and improvement. The goal is to have the campus understand data and analysis as driven by what it does, how it does it, and how it moves towards its goals, rather than as a retrospective tool/weapon to identify shortcomings and weaknesses. In short, the campus should develop an active and constructive perspective on data and analysis.

The tools and methods of predictive analytics will be the topic of the first set of white papers. Predictive analytics has begun to make significant inroads into educational assessment and improvement, and a broader campus understanding of what it is and how it can (and cannot) be helpful will be an important step in changing the campus attitude towards data. The topic of the first such paper focuses on the predictors of Fall-to-Fall retention for Honolulu CC students, focusing on certain demographic characteristics.

The groundwork for this initiative was laid in AY 2013-14, during which the Chancellor directed the College’s institutional research office to introduce analytics to the administrative team at its weekly meetings. This effort generated two formal presentations: 1) *Predictive Analytics* provided a broader look at predictive analytics, and included two applications focused on retention and based on UH data. This presentation was delivered at the annual Hawaii Strategy Institute statewide conference for the UH Community Colleges on March 7, 2014. 2) *PPIR Executive Talks* was presented to the College’s administration team on March 25, 2014, and was more closely focused on key findings from retention analyses of Honolulu Community College students.

**Closing the Loop: Recruitment**

Over the 2013-2014 academic year Honolulu Community College created a comprehensive recruitment plan that integrates marketing, branding, and specific outreach strategies. The plan has specific and measureable outcomes that aim to improve the going rate of high school students and Native Hawaiians. Communication about the plan began in late Spring 2014. At the start of the 2014-15 academic year, the plan was presented to all instructional divisions of the college. Recruitment will be approached in a holistic manner under the coordination of the Outreach & Orientation Office. This office will also have the responsibility to gather assessment data and share back with the campus. The recruitment plan, as a work in progress, must adapt to suit the needs of prospective student populations, and is being revised based on new system goals in the 2015-2021 Strategic Plan.

**Closing the Loop: Reverse Transfer and Automatic Conferral of Certificates**

In Fall 2013, the college began to implement Reverse Transfer and Automatic Conferral of Certificates. Upon review and development of campus policies and internal procedures, the campus has shown increased yields in conferrals via STAR. Efforts led by Academic Counseling and the Records Office have proven beneficial and progressive
efforts have led to efficient practices surrounding Reverse Transfer and Auto Conferral. The efforts of these departments have directly contributed to assisting the college with meeting and exceeding its system completion goals.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CATEGORY</th>
<th>2013-14</th>
<th>2014-15**</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>DEGREES/CERTIFICATES AWARDED</td>
<td>683</td>
<td>720*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AC</td>
<td>214 (Fall 0, Spring 214)</td>
<td>153 (Fall 48, Spring 105)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RT</td>
<td>97 (Fall 49, Spring 48)</td>
<td>69 (Fall 47, Spring 22)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>299-LIST FALL 2014 RT</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>19 (Summer Project)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Of the 720, awaiting Banner Codes for 41 potential graduates
**Goal for 2014-15 was 717
^Information taken from STAR Academic Logic DB

Goals for 2014-15
- Increase the number of degrees/certificates awarded
- Increase the number of degrees/certificates awarded to Native Hawaiians
- Increase dollar amount dispersed in Pell grants
- Increase the number of STEM degrees awarded

Additionally, the campus will be involved in piloting support initiatives with AdAstra, PAR Framework, and Registration via STAR. These combined technologies will support and increase the number of degrees and certificates awarded and RT/AC efforts have proven successful yields for the college.

**Closing the Loop: Website Redesign**

The University of Hawaii Community Colleges have been working towards a more unified website look among the seven campuses. Each College was to each maintain a look that is unique to each campus that includes common elements to unify the UHCC system. For example, the primary navigation menu will include action-oriented tabs: How to Apply, Paying for College, Programs of Study, and Services for Students. The purpose was to help students while navigating through the various campus websites as many of our students attend classes at another campus in addition to their home campus.

Honolulu CC was the first to pilot the selected Drupal 7.0 website theme that is supported and housed at ITS Manoa. Honolulu CC and the system's office are the first to go live with the new theme.

Based on student feedback the new design addresses their feedback of wanting more white space, less clutter, simple and clean lines to make information easier to digest, and more visuals, such as quality photos and videos. Other common elements to be adapted by the CCs are: a header and footer of the website, usage of campus color, and the UHCC seal, as well as having the information categorized in accordion tabs.
This is a responsive website that will provide an optimal viewing experience for users making it easy to read and to navigate across a range of devices (desktop, laptop, tablet, mobile).

A campus email explaining the redesign of the website was sent out to all employees. A campus-wide town hall was held to walk individuals through and navigate the new website. Website training was incorporated into the new employee orientation at the beginning of the academic year and training was done with the Outreach Office student ambassadors so that they could be best equip to teach current and potential students during outreach opportunities. A one page reference guide on how to navigate the website was also created and is used during new student orientation.

Overall, the feedback the College has received of the new look has been very positive. Students and employees from the college and other college campuses have commented that they liked the look and feel of the website and the ease of navigation and organization of the web content.
University of Hawai‘i Community Colleges (UHCC)
System Recommendations

In conjunction with the 2012 comprehensive visits to the individual campuses, a System Evaluation Team (SET) was formed to examine University of Hawaii Community Colleges (UHCC) system level standards. The SET consisted of a chair, one additional member who was not part of campus teams, and one member each from the six campus teams.

The SET commended the UHCC for:

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

The SET also made five recommendations, all to meet standards, as follows:

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

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

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

**UHCC Recommendation 2: Student Learning Programs and Services**
In order to meet the Standards, degrees offered by the colleges must be consistent with the general education philosophy as outlined in the college catalog and the rigor of the English and math courses needed to fulfill the degree requirements must be appropriate to higher education (ER 11, Standards II.A.3, II.A.3.b).

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

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

**UH Recommendation 4: Resources**

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

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

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

While not all of the recommendations applied to all colleges, the system team charged the UHCC System office with ensuring full compliance with the issues associated with these recommendations.

Over the next two years, as documented in follow-up reports and visits, all of the recommendations were implemented and the UHCC was determined to be in compliance with the standards and eligibility criteria cited in the recommendations. This mid-term report summarizes the actions that were taken to come into compliance, the further efforts to sustain compliance, and any future plans for enhancement.
**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).

**Summary of Previously Reported Activities and Actions**

**UHCC Strategic Planning Process**

The University of Hawaiʻi Community Colleges (UHCC) strategic planning process is codified in UHCC Policy #4.101 Strategic Academic Planning.

The process is characterized by:

- Defined metrics and targets over the planning period for key strategic directions;
- Strong alignment in both strategic direction and metrics with the University of Hawaiʻi System strategic directions;
- The use of selected key metrics in system budget allocation, performance funding, managerial evaluation, and targeted use of innovation funding; and
- Regular monitoring and reporting of the progress toward the strategic goals with the broader college and general community.

Per UHCC Policy #4.101 Strategic Academic Planning, the Vice President for Community Colleges (VPCC) convenes the full UHCC Strategic Planning Council (SPC) in the spring and fall of each year. The membership of the SPC consists of the chancellor, faculty senate chair, and student government chair from each college, and the vice president and associate vice presidents for community colleges. Meeting notes and materials are posted to the public website.
The annual spring meeting is used to review UHCC strategic outcomes and performance measures. The SPC monitors and advises on progress toward the UHCC strategic planning goals. The VPCC uses the meeting to gather impressions and reactions to progress to date and to emphasize and maintain the focus on the things UHCC has identified as important. The VPCC follows this meeting with visits to each college to present college-level detailed data. During the open meetings for the college community at each campus, the VPCC leads discussions on progress and encourages feedback, e.g., new ideas, process improvement, and college innovations.

The annual fall meeting is used to look at the strategic planning process and to introduce and/or review UH systemwide strategic planning initiatives. The VPCC follows the fall meeting with visits to each college for UHCC Systemwide engagement and dialogue.

The strategic plan in effect during the comprehensive visit covered the period 2008-2014. In fall 2012, the SPC established a process to begin the revision of the plan for the period 2015-2021. In the spring 2013 meeting, working groups, chaired by a chancellor with faculty senate chair (not of the same college), and a student leader supplemented by members knowledgeable and appropriate for the work, were formed. The organization and process for updating the plan beyond 2015 was part of the VPCC’s spring visit to each of the institutions. The working group goals or focus from UHCC Strategic Plan were:

Goal A (part 1): Educational Effectiveness and Student Success.
   Special Emphasis on Part-Time Student Access and Success
   and Adult Learners

Goal A (part 2): Native Hawaiian educational Attainment.
   Including review of other underserved populations.

Goal B: Functioning as a Seamless State System.
   Transfers and Articulation

Goal C: Promote Workforce and Economic Development
   Special emphasis on STEM, Workforce – Energizing Areas,
   and
   Reviving the global curriculum

Goal D: Hawai‘i’s Educational Capital/Resources and Stewardship
   What it means to be a Native Hawaiian Serving Institution
   Government/non-profit partnerships
   Entrepreneurship, commercialization, resource base

Goal E: Develop Sustainable Infrastructure for Student Learning
   Clean Energy, Sustainability

Focus Area 1: Distance Education
   Infrastructure for Student Learning, ADA Delivery, Rigor,
   Student Success

The working groups were charged with reviewing current performance measures, identify which should stay and/or be revised, and identify potential new metrics
during spring and summer 2013 meetings. The full SPC discussed and compiled measures at its October 2013 meeting followed by visits by the VPCC to each college for open, systemwide dialogue. Based on the results of those meetings, the measures were refined and work continued to finalize outcomes and performance measures for the 2015 and beyond update.

The BOR Standing Committee on Community Colleges met on August 30, 2013. The VPCC gave an update relating to the progress in meeting the goals in the current strategic plan and reviewed the process for updating the plan including the seven working group areas of focus. The presentation and the direction of the plan were well-received by the BOR CC Committee and the Committee was informed it would be kept apprised of progress in the development of the plan.

Following the meeting of the BOR CC, the VPCC, associate vice presidents for academic and administrative affairs and the chancellors held an executive level meeting, which addressed accreditation, strategic planning process, and budget allocation. Chancellors reported on the status of the goals/focus areas of their strategic planning working groups.

In addition to the UHCC Strategic Planning process with its strategic outcomes and performance measures, the UHCC System uses the following tools to support ongoing improvement and effectiveness:

- **Community College Inventory: Focus on Student Persistence, Learning, and Attainment**;
- **UHCC Performance Funding**; and
- **Annual Reports Program Data (ARPD)**

1. **Community College Inventory: Focus on Student Persistence, Learning, and Attainment**

The UHCC System uses the Community College Inventory: Focus on Student Persistence, Learning, and Attainment – a research based tool developed by the Community College Leadership Program, University of Texas Austin to evaluate UHCC System effectiveness. The inventory assesses 11 institutional characteristics that are strongly focused on student success. The Office of the Vice President for Community Colleges (OVPCC) administers the inventory online in odd-numbered years (complementing the Community College Survey Student Engagement (CCSSE) that is administered in even-numbered years--benchmark measurements included in Strategic Plan). The SPC affirmed that the 11 institutional characteristics are important to the system and incorporating selected outcomes in the UHCC Strategic Plan supports the regular assessment and review for on-going improvement and effectiveness of planning. As required in the policy, and evidenced in proceedings of the SPC, the inventory results are reviewed and discussed by the full Council.
The chancellors reviewed the results of the 2013 survey at their August 30, 2013 executive meeting. “The UHCC System has a strategic plan that clearly and succinctly states its goals for future development” continues to receive the highest ranking within the category while “The UHCC System demonstrates its ability to stop doing things that are off mission, low-priority, and/or ineffective in promoting student persistence, learning, and attainment” continues to be scored the lowest.

2. Performance (Outcomes) Funding

The outcomes funding model is directly linked to the University's established strategic outcomes. The measures adopted are directly from the strategic plan and the targets are the specific targets identified in the strategic outcomes adopted by the University in 2008.

The outcomes incorporated into the formula include the following:

a. degrees and certificates awarded;

b. degrees and certificates awarded to Native Hawaiian students;

c. degrees and certificates awarded to students in Science, Technology, Engineering, and Math (STEM) fields;

d. number of low-income students participating the Federal Pell program; and

e. number of transfers from the community colleges to the baccalaureate campuses.

The outcomes funding model has the following characteristics:

a. For each outcome, the baseline is the value set by the strategic outcomes for FY 2010 and the target is the value set for FY 2011 (for FY 2012 funding).

b. The outcomes are independent of each other. Campuses can only achieve their full outcomes funding if they meet or exceed the targeted outcomes for each of the measures.

c. If a campus does not meet the targeted outcome, then any unused funds would be used for other UHCC initiatives.

At the spring 2013 Instructional Program Review Council (I-PRC), it was decided to include program-level performance funding in the Annual Reports of Program Data (ARPD) to be released in August 2013.

3. Annual Reports of Program Data (ARPD) and Comprehensive Program Reviews

UHCC Program Review and Annual Reports of Program Data (ARPD) are codified in UHCCP 5.202 Review of Established Programs. The policy, developed by broad systemwide dialogue by chancellors, administrators, faculty, and staff defines programs subject to review, frequency of program reviews, content of the program
review, dissemination of program reviews, and assessment of the program review process. Each college has established and operates its own college-level program review process within the framework of the UHCC System policy and the UH Board of Regents (BOR) policies.

The system-level process is managed by the OVPCC through the UHCC I-PRC. The I-PRC is comprised of key data users from across the seven community colleges with functional representation of chancellors, vice chancellors for academic affairs, division/department chairs (with further representation from general education faculty and Career Technical Education faculty), assessment coordinators, and institutional research (IR). The I-PRC meets once in the fall and once in the spring semester. The fall meeting is used to discuss the current ARPD reports, college process/progress and mid-term data definition and data calculations (i.e., in the 2012 ARPDs the calculation of persistence was modified to exclude from the denominator those students who had received associate degrees and would not be expected to persist in the program). The spring meeting is used to assess the effectiveness of the UHCC System program review process (including ARPDs), review the measures and content, and ensure that the review provides the information necessary for program assessment and improvement. The Comprehensive Program Reviews, Annual Reports of Program Data, and Records of Proceedings for the I-PRC meetings are posted and made public on the UHCC website.

The OVPCC provides the data for ARPD by August 15 of each year. The data are from the immediate prior program year (July 1 - June 30). This standardization of data and timing allow colleges to compare against similar programs and employ “best practices” in program improvement. Data are publicly released by August 15. Access to the analysis section of the ARPD is controlled by userid limited to those administrators, faculty, and staff who have an analysis and input role as determined by the institution. At the end of the review cycle (generally the end of the fall semester), analysis and program planning, along with an executive summary of all annual reports within the area (Instruction, Academic Support, Student Support Services) are finalized and the full ARPD is made public. ARPD data and analysis serve as the foundation of the Comprehensive Program Review (CPR). Colleges have set CPR schedules within the BOR requirement of review at least every five years. CPRs are publicly available through the college websites and a link to the most recent CPR is included in the ARPD.

Following the comprehensive visits of fall 2012, the OVPCC surveyed all key data users (vice chancellors for academic affairs, deans and assistant deans department and division chairs, program directors, and IR). The online survey asked users to evaluate the usefulness/importance of the current ARPD data elements and to suggest data they wish they had. The OVPCC Academic Planning, Assessment, and Policy Analysis (APAPA) Office compiled the results of the survey and conducted focus group discussions with the various constituents including additional training and professional development needed. The process identified a gap in data
information provided at new faculty, staff, and administrator orientation. Current college practices do not include data training. The UHCC IR Cadre is developing key data information to be included in orientation as well as website “cheat sheets” to direct inquiries to available tools and data. Additional outcomes from focus group discussions was reviewed by the UHCC I-PRC in fall 2013 including how to meet identified training and professional development needs.

At the August 30, 2013 executive level meeting, the VPCC, associate vice presidents for academic and administrative affairs, and chancellors approved the basic design of an assessment tool for program review that will provide additional information on student flow, progress, and achievement at the program level. The conceptual model is broadly based on the principles identified in the Gates-funded Completion by Design on the student loss and momentum pathways.

Following discussion at the chancellors’ August 2013 executive meeting, the VPCC issued a UHCC policy codifying the UHCC System’s commitment to a culture of evidence. The UHCCP #4.202 Culture of Evidence requires that at least every three years starting in 2013, the OVPCC will survey stakeholders and users of major UHCC analytical tools (e.g., UHCC Strategic Planning Outcomes and Performance Measures, Comprehensive Program Reviews, Annual Reports of Program Data). This survey will measure the effectiveness of the planning process and importance and usefulness of the data and for training and/or professional development needed to maximize use of these tools for planning and resource allocation that supports institutional effectiveness in meeting college and system mission. The results will be made public by posting to the system website Culture of Evidence.

UHCC Budget Allocation Process

Since 2009, the UHCC budgets have gone through a period of great flux including reductions in State of Hawai‘i general funding, negotiated pay reductions for all employees and subsequent restorations of pay, state imposed restrictions, and tuition increases. Responding to these external forces has created some confusion around budget allocations. The confusion has been compounded since many of the budget reductions occurred outside the normal budget cycles.

Despite the budget flux and the enrollment increases, the UHCC System and campuses were able to manage the finances and still maintain healthy cash positions. However, in order to make the budget allocation process more transparent, the budget allocation model was put into a formal policy, UHCCP #8.000 General Fund and Tuition and Fees Special Fund Allocation, that was promulgated in September 2013. Key elements of the budget allocation policy include:

- In accordance with state budget policy, state general funds are allocated based on a current service base with enhancements based on specific program change requests as approved by the State Legislature.
• Approximately 5 percent of the operating budget is allocated based on five performance metrics – student graduation, Native Hawaiian student graduation, STEM graduation, Pell financial aid recipients, and UH transfers to baccalaureate institutions. In order to receive the outcomes funding portion of the budget allocation, campuses must meet numeric targets for each of these metrics.
• An additional pool of funds is allocated to campuses to meet enrollment growth and to fund need-based financial aid.
• Campuses retain tuition and fee income.
• Campuses retain and manage non-credit and auxiliary services income.

Campuses are expected to allocate funds within their campus in accordance with planning and program review priorities.

The budget allocation policy is posted on the UHCC System website. In addition, the actual allocations for the year as well as historic trends in revenue, expenditures, allocations, and reserves are distributed to each campus and also published on the system website Budget, Planning and Finance.

The associate vice president for administrative affairs also meets with campus leadership to discuss the allocations, trends, and financial projections for each campus. The broad information on the budget allocation is also shared by the VPCC during his regular campus presentations.

The budget allocation model will undergo a continuous review, including an assessment of efficiency metrics, to determine whether further adjustments to the current service base will need to be made.

Sustained Compliance Activity Since the Last Report

Strategic Planning

The major focus during the past two years has been the completion of the UHCC Strategic Plan for the period 2015-2021. The process outlined above continued with active engagement by the Strategic Planning Council (SPC), working groups, public meetings, and Board of Regents briefings. At the same time, the University system was engaged in an update of its strategic directions and concerted efforts were made to align the University plan with the UHCC plan.

The SPC adopted the new plan at its spring 2015 meeting. Notable features of the plan include:

• Graduation targets consistent with the State of Hawai‘i policy goal of having 55 percent of the working adult population having a college degree by 2025;
- A change in metric for transfer students to include all transfers rather than just within UH transfers, a change based on data suggesting that as many of 35-40 percent of the students are transferring to non-UH baccalaureate institutions;
- A change in metric for STEM graduates to include both community college graduates and baccalaureate STEM graduates who have community college background, a change intending to capture the total community college contribution to the STEM workforce;
- Targets to eliminate all access and success gaps for the following targeted populations:
  - Native Hawaiian,
  - Filipino,
  - Pacific Islander, and
  - Low income (Pell recipients).

Eliminating the access gap is defined as enrollment at or in excess of population percentages. Eliminating the success gap is defined as having graduation, transfer, and STEM graduation at or in excess of enrollment percentages; and
- Restructuring the developmental education program in both math and English to move from sequentially-based courses to co-requisite models of remediation.

The plan also continues a commitment to the use of performance funding for successful attainment of the targets in five metrics:

- Graduation,
- Native Hawaiian Student Graduation,
- Pell Student Graduation,
- STEM Graduation, and
- Baccalaureate Transfer.

The planning process also identified a structural weakness in the previous strategic plan efforts. The innovation efforts undertaken with the system’s innovation fund were perceived to be disconnected from the more traditional academic decision making processes on campuses. While faculty were engaged in piloting positive changes in curriculum and practice, those changes were not impacting practice on a broader scale within the institution. To address this “scaling” problem, a new Student Success Council was added to the strategic planning process. The new committee draws on academic administration (both instructional and student support), institutional researchers, and faculty leadership. While the Strategic Planning Council remains responsible for the overall goals and directions within the
plan, the new committee and working groups that it may form is charged with the detailed implementation of the different components of the plan.

Performance Funding

As noted, the UHCC continued its use of performance funding as one of the tools to assure alignment of strategic goals with budget decisions. In spring 2015, the State Legislature included in the University’s appropriation an amount of $6,000,000 intended for the University to implement performance funding across the University system. The legislative appropriation charges the University to develop a methodology for the implementation of the performance funding during the 2015-16 academic year with the intention of basing the allocation of the $6,000,000 using that methodology in FY 2017. These funds would add to the pool of performance funding already in place within the UHCC.

Future Plans

Two projects growing out of the strategic planning process are being developed to further enhance the planning and assessment of college programs.

Workforce Sector Modeling Tool

Based on similar work in Colorado, the UHCC’s are developing a planning model and tool that examines the key workforce sectors within the State of Hawai‘i to better focus workforce development and training efforts. Within each sector, positions are identified and mapped along the following dimensions:

- Employment demand. Demand data will be collected at both state and local levels and be based on historical employment patterns as well as real time job search data. The employment demand will be vetted through industry and government panels to account for anticipated future changes that might not be reflected in historical or even current employment data;
- Wage data for each of the positions;
- Educational attainment required for the position at both the certificates and degree level and the mapping of these credentials to the institutions offering the credential;
- Career ladders within the sector; and
- Student placement into the various positions and sectors.

The intention is to have a tool that can serve multiple purposes:

- Student – Provide the student with accurate and current information about job opportunities, wage potential, advancement potential, and educational opportunity;
• Academic program managers – Provide the program managers with more accurate information for use in program review and in managing both the curriculum and student experience;
• Academic planners – Provide planners with more timely information about significant gaps between available programs and emerging new areas of employment or surging demand. Alternatively, provide better information about employment declines that may require restructuring or elimination of programs; and
• Business and industry leaders – Provide a mechanism for the business community to provide valuable information on trends within the industries that impact program offerings of the colleges.

Plans are to complete the new tool by July 2016.

Academic Program Manager Tool

In assessing the UHCC integrated planning and assessment system, the sense was there was a gap between the student success goals and targets which were being captured and monitored at the institutional level and the data being used by and for program managers of individual academic programs. While the program managers had a rich set of data provided through the annual review of program data and through the program review process, there was not a consistent alignment of that data with the strategic targets nor was the data focused on the dynamic flow of students through the programs and beyond to either transfer or employment.

To address this deficiency, a new academic program manager tool is being developed that would provide program coordinators with a single location to manage students within their programs and to provide analytic data that aligns with the student success metrics. The tool is being designed to adapt the Completion by Design construct so that information is provided to program managers on several stages of student movement into and through the programs, including:

• Student engagement and recruitment,
• Student enrollment,
• Student progress,
• Student graduation or transfer, and
• Student job placement.

For each of these stages of student progress toward success, program managers would have available information about students, communication tools to reach students, data metrics to monitor both individual student progress and overall retention, completion, and placement data for students. The data would be
differentiated by selected characteristics of students to allow analysis by sub-population.

In addition, program managers would be provided planning tools using the UHCC guided pathway registration system to identify the demand for courses within the program so that sufficient sections can be scheduled to assure student progress toward degrees.

By designing the system to be both a practical transaction management tool and a focused analytic tool, the academic program managers will be both more likely and more capable of making program decisions to foster student success.

The goal is to have the academic program planning tool completed by Fall 2016.

**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).

**Summary of Previously Reported Activities and Actions**

At the time of the comprehensive visit in October 2012, the UHCC was aware that four colleges (Hawai‘i Community College, Honolulu Community College, Kaua‘i Community College, and Leeward Community College) were out of compliance with granting the Associate of Applied Science degree (AAS). The level of English and math courses required for completion of the AAS degree was at or below the developmental education level and should have been higher.

In May 2012, the system policy was revised to comply with the recommendation and was codified in UHCCP #5.200 General Education in All Degree Programs. The four colleges then modified their degree program requirements for math and English to comply with the new policy, generally by adopting the common expository writing class and the general quantitative mathematics class for all AAS degrees. The follow-up reports and/or visits conducted in 2013 verified that all colleges were in compliance and the standards and eligibility criteria cited were met.

**Sustained Compliance Activity Since the Last Report**

Once the degree modifications were completed in 2013, no further curricular or policy actions have been required or implemented. All degree programs remain in full compliance with the recommendation.

**Future Plans**
As part of the planned restructuring of developmental math and English to move toward a co-requisite remediation model, work has begun on defining the student college level math and English courses and the nature of the co-requisite remedial support needed by the students. A task force of faculty in math and English, along with student support personnel and academic administration leadership, met several times during summer 2015 to develop preliminary plans for sharing with the broader college communities in the 2015-2016 academic year.

Preliminary discussion for math have focused on three distinct pathways – general quantitative reasoning and/or statistics for students in liberal arts fields not requiring calculus; pre-calculus for students seeking degree programs in STEM, business, economics, or other disciplines requiring calculus; and technical math for career and technical education with the technical math class incorporating both general education quantitative reasoning student learning outcomes and program specific math student learning outcomes to ensure students are competent in the mathematics used in their technical program. The resulting remedial co-requisites would likely be different for these different student pathways.

Similar discussions have begun within the English working group about the possibility of having a technical writing course that would be an alternative to the traditional composition course now required of all students. No decision has yet been made on whether to adopt this added alternative.

The agreed upon target for full implementation of the co-requisite remediation support is fall 2016. The 2015-2016 academic year will be used to reach consensus on the design of both English and math pathways, the nature of the co-requisite support (e.g. class, laboratory, tutorial, coaching, etc.), placement or diagnostic tools to support the co-requisite design, and the student support and communication to students to fully implement the program. Any new courses developed as part of this effort would be required to meet all general education student learning outcomes for quantitative reasoning or communication and to be of a level of rigor consistent with the standards associated with this recommendation.

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

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

**Summary of Previously Reported Activities and Actions**

Within the University of Hawai‘i Community Colleges (UHCC), the faculty classification system and collective bargaining definition include regular
instructional faculty, counselors and advisors, librarians and other academic support personnel, and other professionals who are responsible for student learning.

The evaluation system for faculty is based on peer review and merit linked to a faculty classification system with ranks of instructor, assistant professor, associate professor, and professor. The classification document defines the expectations for faculty at the various ranks and forms the fundamental basis for the evaluation system. As noted in our 2012 self evaluation report, this classification system does include achievement of student outcomes as one of the responsibilities of faculty and a factor in the subsequent evaluation of the faculty performance.

As defined by the collective bargaining agreement and UH Board of Regents (BOR) policies, faculty are currently evaluated using different processes at different periods in the faculty member’s professional progress at the institution. During the first five years of employment, faculty members are probationary and undergo comprehensive evaluations at least three times during the five-year period. These evaluations include the submittal of a dossier documenting the faculty member’s work, including contributions toward the defining and achieving of student outcomes, peer evaluations, student evaluations, professional development, curriculum development, and contributions to the college and community. As a faculty member moves through the probationary period, the evaluation may also include responses or progress toward meeting areas of weakness or concern from prior evaluations. The dossier is evaluated by a committee of department peers (Department Personnel Committee), department chair, academic vice chancellors/deans, and ultimately a decision on contract renewal is made by the chancellor.

At the end of the probationary period, a faculty member applies for tenure. The tenure process includes a similar comprehensive review against the classification requirement but is more summative than formative. The successful applicant is granted tenure and the unsuccessful applicant is granted a terminal year contract. In addition to the department-based peer review, department chair review, and administrative review, the tenure application is also reviewed by a faculty committee composed of faculty members from outside the department and faculty members outside the college in the same discipline. The BOR is the final decision maker on granting tenure.

Once tenured, a faculty member may, after a period of four years in rank, apply for promotion to a higher rank. The evaluation process for the promotion application is the same as for tenure except that the criteria are based on the higher expectations as reflected in the faculty classification policy. An unsuccessful promotion applicant is eligible to re-apply in future years.

In 1990, the BOR adopted a policy to address the on-going evaluation of faculty members who did not apply for promotion after achieving tenure or who had
reached the rank of professor and were no longer eligible for promotion and therefore, not subject to evaluation. The BOR wanted to ensure that all faculty members were evaluated on a regular basis.

The team evaluation report correctly noted that this evaluation policy had not been updated since 1990 and did not reflect the current expectations as defined in Standard III.A.1.c. Accordingly, the OVPCC, working with the director of human resources and campus academic administrators, modified the policy to reflect the accreditation standard.

In accordance with the collective bargaining law, this collective bargaining organization was required to be formally consulted on the policy change. That consultation was conducted and the updated policy was adopted in September 2013.

The revised policy makes clear that the basis for the evaluation of faculty in the five-year review process is the same classification system and expectations, including assessing student learning outcomes, as for tenure and promotion.

As a part of the revised policy, campuses are also required to maintain and submit records certifying that all faculty members subject to the five-year evaluation have actually completed the evaluation process. See UHCCP_#9.203-Faculty_Five-Year_Review.

Lecturers are faculty members employed to teach individual classes to meet demand that cannot be met by regular faculty or because of special expertise that the lecturer may bring to a class. The lecturer appointment is for the duration of the class only.

Lecturers must meet the same academic qualifications as regular faculty. The job responsibility for lecturers is limited to the class they are teaching and provides for a limited amount of student contact through office hours or other communication means. The lecturer appointment does not include curriculum development, development of student learning outcomes, college service, or other professional duties expected of regular faculty members. The lecturer is expected to follow the student learning outcomes and assessment methodologies as adopted by the regular faculty for the courses he or she is teaching.

Lecturers advance through a series of pay bands (A, B, C) with the compensation rate per credit hour dependent on the pay band. Unlike regular faculty members whose tenure and promotion is merit based, the lecturer pay band advancement is currently solely based on the historic number of credits the lecturer has taught.

As noted by the team evaluation report, there was no system evaluation policy for lecturers and there were inconsistencies from campus to campus in the form of evaluation, frequency of evaluation, and monitoring of evaluation. Previously,
lecturer evaluations were at the department level and involve review of student evaluations and the insights of the department chair and/or discipline coordinator within the department.

Because the lecturer’s status and rank are the same across all community colleges, there is a compelling reason to maintain consistency in the evaluation process for lecturers. Accordingly, the OVPCC, working with the campus academic administrators, developed a new system policy UHCCP #9.104-Lecture Evaluation. The policy leaves the responsibility for the evaluation on the campus and largely within the department but does define the requirement for evaluation, frequency of evaluation, and criteria to be used in the evaluation.

In accordance with the collective bargaining law, lecturers who are half-time or more are included in the faculty collective bargaining unit and the collective bargaining organization must be formally consulted on the new policy. The consultation was conducted and the new system policy on lecturer evaluation was adopted and promulgated in December 2013.

**Sustained Compliance Activity Since the Last Report**

An online monitoring system has been developed and implemented to track compliance with the faculty evaluation systems. The information in the system includes the last evaluation (whether contract renewal, tenure, promotion, or five-year evaluation) and the next expected evaluation date. The information is available to individual faculty so they can anticipate their next evaluation date and also available for department chairs and academic administrators who are responsible for compliance with the evaluation policies.

A non-substantive change to the faculty evaluation policy was made in December 2014 to adjust the submittal date for faculty members subject to the five-year evaluation but who were candidates for promotion. Since a successful promotion application would negate the need for an additional five-year review, the submittal date for the five-year review was moved to allow the decision on the promotion to occur first.

**Future Plans**

A joint task force of academic administrators and faculty union representatives has begun the development of an online, ePortfolio based system for creating the evaluation and assessment documents for faculty. The goals of the task force are to create a system that:

1. Creates a template for faculty that includes all required information and a structure to submit the information for evaluation,
2. Automatically loads to the ePortfolio information from the student information system, student evaluation system, and other sources of data for use by the faculty member,

3. Allows the faculty member to add documents and artifacts to the ePortfolio for consideration in the evaluation process in real time rather than waiting until an application is prepared,

4. Continues to grow over time as the faculty member proceeds through his or her professional career, and

5. Allows for secure and confidential sharing of the information to the various faculty review and administrative committees.

A recommendation has been made on a possible technology solution for the ePortfolio. Once it has been determined that the system meets all usability, security, and technical requirements, design of the templates and processes will begin.

While the ePortfolio system is intended to provide faculty with a more convenient means to document their work and prepare their applications, the use of common frameworks will also ensure that key criteria, such as those referenced in this recommendation, will be addressed in the application. Additionally, the digital submittal and processing of the evaluation documents will also improve the monitoring and timeliness of the periodic evaluations.

The full deployment of a system is not expected until 2017.

**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).

**Summary of Previously Reported Activities and Actions**

As noted in the prior follow-up reports and visits, the development of the UH’s System technology planning has involved four separate but related activities:

1) **UH System Information Technology Planning Website**

   The UH System Office of Information and Technology Services (ITS) has responsibility for inter-campus technology infrastructure including Internet access, all enterprise applications, and University wide academic applications and tools.

   Under the leadership of the Vice President for Information Technology and Chief Information Officer, ITS developed an online site that includes the UH
system ITS strategic plan. The site will be continually updated to reflect IT strategies, changes in the technology environment, application development, and timelines of any projects in active development. Colleges will use this site to inform their own technology planning.

The site is available at [UH System ITS Strategic Plan 2015](#).

2) Modification to the UH System Strategic Directions

The UH system strategic plan covering the period 2008 – 2015 underwent revision to address the planning period 2015 – 2021. The broad strategic directions include a goal of becoming a high performing system of higher education and includes the following action items related to distance education:

*University of Hawai‘i Strategic Directions Report*

**Action Strategy 2:**

*UH increases opportunity and success for students through leveraging system resources and capabilities. Integrated academic planning across disciplines, levels and campuses, and collaborative/shared student services prevent unnecessary duplication and efficiently provide students throughout the State with access to educational opportunity and the support they need to succeed.*

**Tactics**

- Employ best practices in student-centered distance and online learning using technology and by leveraging University Centers
- Develop degrees and certificates as part of integrated pathways for students enrolled throughout the UH system
- Ensure that transfer and articulation policies are student-centered, transparent, and well communicated in order to support student mobility and success throughout the System.
- Review academic offerings for unnecessary duplication and opportunities for improved collaboration
- Standardize and collaborate to increase consistency for students and improve operating efficiency in student support areas such as (but not limited to) transcript evaluation, financial aid processing, admissions, and monitoring of student progress, early alerts and intervention strategies
- Reduce cost of textbooks and ancillary needs
- Modify financial aid policies and practices to maximize access and success of underserved and underrepresented populations in cost-effective ways.

The UH strategic directions for 2015-2021 can be viewed under the System Priorities and Initiatives section of the System Academic Affairs web site at [UH System Strategic Directions](#).
3) The UH Community College System is also updating its strategic directions for the period 2015 – 2021. One of the major components of that update is the identification of and creation of a strategic use of distance education.

Distance Education has been a significant component of community college delivery of instruction with 1,626 completely online classes offered in AY 2013-2014 with 28,015 registrations. An additional 481 Distance Education mixed media classes with 4,974 registrations were offered in the same time period. However, the planning group has recognized that much of the current distance education is driven by individual faculty initiative and not as a strategic component of addressing student access to programs and degrees across the state. Given that the geography of Hawai‘i does not permit easy access to campuses other than on the home island of students, the use of distance technology is essential to ensuring student access.

As part of the planning effort, the community colleges are approaching the development of distance education in several areas.

a) Identifying which courses not currently offered through distance education should be offered to ensure that students on small campuses or in remote sites are able to remain on a degree pathway in a timely fashion. All UH’s baccalaureate programs have been mapped to create four-year sequential courses of study. Using these maps, the community colleges have developed an overlay project that examines which courses within the first two years of these pathways are available to students on each of the seven campuses. The mapping project revealed that courses may not be available because upper division courses not offered by the community colleges are identified as being in the first two years, major courses may not be available to students on a particular campus, or student demand for courses may be too small to justify an in-person class. The identification and monitoring of these degree pathways is now automated within the system.

Based on the pathway mapping project, the highest demand courses are being identified for development in a distance delivery format. While this planning is ongoing, the preliminary list of courses to be considered for development includes:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course Code</th>
<th>Course Title</th>
<th>Requirement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ICS 215</td>
<td>Introduction to Scripting</td>
<td>Required for BS degree in ICS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CEE 271</td>
<td>Applied Mechanics</td>
<td>Required for BS degree in Engineering</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Psy 230</td>
<td>Introduction to Psychobiology</td>
<td>Required for BA, BS in Psychology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Biol 265</td>
<td>Ecology and</td>
<td>Required for BS in Biology</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The plan will establish the resources, training, and support necessary to assure the student that the pathway is available to the student on a consistent basis.

b) Identifying which degree or certificate programs should be offered, in whole or in part, through distance education and what resources, training, and support systems would be necessary to ensure that programs can be delivered with quality and with student success comparable to on-campus programs.

Since populations and employment opportunities on the neighbor islands are often small but critical, the development of a strategy that uses shared resources and distance technology across the seven colleges is essential to meeting the workforce needs. The specific programs to be developed have not yet been identified, but as with the distance education course development, the plan will identify the resources, training, and support to assure the student access to and success in these programs on a consistent basis.

c) Developing and providing a systemwide program of professional development and certification for faculty teaching online or hybrid classes. Review of the seven colleges revealed that all colleges offered, and in some instances, required faculty to participate in training prior to teaching online. One college also required regular continuing education for its distance education faculty.

The professional development programs being offered by the colleges varied considerably in length, content, and method of delivery. Some focused on the technical aspects of teaching online while others included more content on pedagogy and student learning.

As part of the strategic planning effort, a group of instructional developers and experienced online faculty will be creating a professional development program that may include:

i. Minimum set of content that a faculty member must master before teaching online courses;

ii. Additional content focusing on pedagogy and student success in online instruction;

iii. Structured program of continuing education for online instructors;

iv. The development of multiple formats for delivery of the content including online and face-to-face modalities; and
v. Certification for faculty completing the training.

The design of the professional development program is planned to be completed by summer 2015.

4) Adoption of Open Education Resources

The University of Hawai‘i is planning to move to open educational resources (OER) for as many courses as possible in an effort to reduce textbook costs for students. Textbook costs are a significant part of the student cost of attendance. Eliminating this expenditure could significantly lower the out-of-pocket expenses for students and avoid the negative consequences of students opting not to purchase costly textbooks. Distance education students would especially benefit from OER materials that could be easily delivered via digital technologies.

The OER effort is in the early stages of development with the identification of open education librarians and repositories and the identification of a mechanism to match interested early adopter faculty with available content.

Sustained Compliance Activity Since the Last Report

In the past year since the last reporting on this recommendation, several actions have occurred that reflect continued compliance with the recommendation and the standards.

1. Major update of the UH System ITS Strategic Plan

   The System IT strategic plan underwent expansion and revision under the leadership of the new CIO. The site now includes expanded information.

2. Adoption of the UH System Strategic Directions

   The revisions to the strategic directions for the period 2015-2021 were adopted by the Board of Regents and are now guiding the overall University system directions. The adopted directions include the previously reported emphasis on distance education are an important mechanism for delivery of courses and programs across the ten-campus UH System.

   To help implement the UH System distance education efforts, the BOR included a request to the State Legislature for financial support to coordinate programming across the ten campuses and to provide seed money to develop needed courses. Unfortunately, the Legislature elected not to fund the request. Consideration is still being given to using other funds granted by the Legislature to the University for this purpose.
3. Adoption of the UHCC Strategic Directions

The UHCC Strategic Directions 2015-2021, including a complimentary emphasis on distance education to that included in the UH System Strategic Directions, was adopted as planned in spring 2015. [UHCC Strategic Directions 2015-2021]

4. Adoption of Open Educational Resources (OER)

A task force of faculty and librarians have begun implementation of OER by identifying sources of available OER texts and instructional materials, developing a repository mechanism for faculty and students to access the OER materials, and conducting two workshops for faculty interested in being early adopters.

Planned Future Actions

With the approval of the UHCC Strategic Directions, implementation activities include:

1. An agenda item at the fall 2015 executive retreat to discuss priorities for the use of innovation funds in support of the distance education efforts; strategy discussions on the staged development of OER materials, and organizational discussions on shared projects and staffing across the seven campuses related to faculty professional development, course development, and increased use of digital technologies in teaching;
2. Development of common training and certification for faculty teaching distance education;
3. Expanded staffing and faculty development resources for the identification and development of OER materials; and
4. Consideration of creation of a lead system distance education coordinator within the OVPCC.

**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).

Summary of Previously Reported Activities and Actions

During the period 2012-2014, the BOR was been engaged in an intense period of self-assessment of itself and University governance and business practices. The
The impetus for this self-assessment was driven by an investigation into a failed concert meant to benefit the UH Mānoa athletics department that resulted in a $200,000 loss to the University. The Hawaiʻi State Senate established a Special Committee on Accountability and broadened the investigation to include other aspects of University governance, accountability, and transparency. After a series of investigative hearings, the Senate issued a series of recommendations to the BOR.

Parallel to this external review, the BOR initiated its own review of the circumstances surrounding the failed concert and the broader issues of BOR and administrative structure and accountability and an examination of BOR policies and practices related to these governance issues.

At its September 5, 2012 meeting, the BOR established an Advisory Task Group (ATG) consisting of both UH Board members and community members to address these operational and governance issues. Phase 1 of the ATG’s work focused on the specific circumstances of the failed concert and the adequacy of management and fiscal controls related to the event. The ATG Phase 1 effort was further refined at a September 8, 2012 meeting and the resulting report from the ATG was accepted by the BOR at its meeting on November 15, 2012. November 15, 2012 BOR Minutes [pages 8-11] ATG Report Phase 1

To address the issues of Board governance and self evaluation, the BOR engaged Dr. Terrence MacTaggart of the Association of Governing Boards to conduct an assessment workshop with BOR members as part of the meeting on October 18, 2012. October 18, 2012 BOR Minutes [pages 1-5]. The workshop covered a wide range of governance issues. On January 24, 2013, the BOR authorized the ATG to begin Phase 2 of its work focusing on UH Board governance and practice. The scope of Phase 2 was further defined at a February 21, 2013 meeting of the BOR to include both BOR operational matters and the high level organization structure of the University. The BOR received a status report on the ATG Phase 2 work at its April 18, 2013 meeting. The ATG presented its findings to the BOR in four reports:

Report 1 included the results of interviews with the BOR members on the individual regents’ views on the operational and governance. This report was presented to the BOR Audit Committee on May 16, 2013 and to the full BOR at its May 16, 2013 meeting.

Report 2 included an assessment of then pending legislation on University governance and whether such legislation reflected best practices in higher education governance.

Both Reports 1 and 2 were presented to the BOR Audit committee on May 16, 2013 and to the full Board at its May 16, 2013 meeting. May 16, 2013 BOR Minutes [pages 9-10].

Report 3 made several recommendations for BOR governance, including:
1. The BOR work with the executive administrator and secretary of the BOR to develop a process for tracking unfinished business and ensuring that such unfinished business be placed on the appropriate BOR standing committee (e.g., Committee on Community Colleges) agenda for follow-up and completion.

2. The BOR approve the University's general counsel as direct report to the University president and delegate the authority necessary to the president to oversee this position. The general counsel should have a dotted line reporting responsibility to the BOR to be able to provide it with advice and bring matters to its attention.

3. The BOR adopt an administrative procedure that members may follow to request that items be placed on the BOR agenda. The procedure should also include a section for feedback to members on disposition of the requests.

4. The BOR amend its bylaws to require appropriate action items be first referred to standing committees for review and recommendations. Each standing committee should maintain an annual calendar and compliance checklist to ensure all critical tasks are completed and specific duties and responsibilities are accomplished as outlined in the respective standing committee charters.

5. The BOR determine the nature and extent of staffing needed to support the additional workload of the standing committees and evaluate its current staff resources and assignments to determine changes needed to support the standing committees' workload.

6. The BOR work with UH System administration to ensure the strategic plan be regularly reviewed and updated with BOR involvement. The BOR, at the direction and leadership of the BOR chair, establish a “Board Goals & Accomplishments” annual or two-year plan.

7. The BOR orientation content should be reviewed and updated and that annual training updates be made part of its annual schedule. The BOR should also ensure that its members annually sign a statement affirming their responsibilities and commitment to meeting the expectations placed upon them as regents.

8. The BOR improve its accountability and financial oversight of University operations by additional involvement by the BOR Committee on Budget and Finance and improved periodic financial reporting mechanisms (the exact nature of the financial reports should be developed collaboratively by the Committee on Budget and Finance and University Administration.
but should also include reports comparing budgeted expenditures against actual expenditures).

9. The BOR take steps to improve the effectiveness of its scheduled meetings such as:
   a. Referring informational items to standing committees, requiring less frequent reports of a recurring nature, or the use of a consent agenda.
   b. Scheduling certain meetings as “informational only” meetings with no action items.
   c. Expanding the use of standardized reports to enable quicker comprehension and understandability.
   d. Establishing a prescribed total amount of time for public input at each meeting, after considering compliance with all appropriate legal guidance.

Report 3 was presented to the Audit Committee on July, 2013 and to the full BOR at its July 18, 2013 meeting. [July 18, 2013 BOR Minutes] (pages 5-7)

Report 4 of the ATG dealt with issues of University high level governance and made several recommendations related to the reporting lines to the University president and to the BOR. The ATG reviewed applicable statutes, rules and regulations governing the University's system level operations, Executive Policies, roles and responsibilities and delegations of authority. In addition, the ATG conducted interviews with system level management and others and reviewed published materials on leading practices from organizations. Report 4 is the final part of the ATG’s Operational Assessment of the University's system level operations.

The BOR continued to use the ATG Phase 2 reports in its assessment of the University structure and its policies. Some policies were changed as a result, including:

1. Changes to the policy on professional improvement leaves for executives (adopted February 21, 2013)

2. Changes to the BOR policies on intercollegiate athletics (adopted May 16, 2012). Note: While the community colleges do not have intercollegiate athletics programs, the policy change is reflective of the action of the BOR in reviewing and modifying, as appropriate, its policies.

In addition to the self-assessment and related actions outlined above and on the recommendation of the ATG, the UH System was developing an online policy management system that allows for development and approval of policies, distribution of policies, and tracks the policy history for UH policies, including BOR policies. The system will include a tracking mechanism to ensure that all policies are reviewed periodically and replaces a manual system kept in the BOR and other system offices.
Sustained Compliance Activity Since the Last Report

The Policy Management System has been fully implemented. All BOR policies are publicly available in a format that includes a header showing the last review date and scheduled next review date. A sample header follows:

---

**BOR Policy System**

**Viewing Policy RP 5.201**

**Title**

Instructional Programs

**Header**

Regents Policy Chapter 5, Academic Affairs

Regents Policy **RP 5.201**, Instructional Programs

Effective Date: Oct. 18, 2002


Review Date: August 2018

---

During the development of the new Policy Management System, several policies were recodified. While all policies have a required review date, policies also continue to be revised in response to specific policy issues that emerge before the review date.

The Policy Management System has also been extended to the UH Executive Policies and Administrative Procedures that are derivative of the BOR policies. The same software interface and information, including the header with the scheduled next review, is used for the Executive Policies.

The BOR conducted its annual self-evaluation. Among the more notable actions taken as a result of the evaluation was a reconfiguration of the Board committees. The evaluation revealed some concern that the committee structure was not aligned with the UH Strategic Directions and that the Board could better provide oversight on the strategic directions if the committees were more closely focused on the major strategic directions. Specifically, the Board felt that having a committee on academic affairs, a committee on student affairs, and a committee on community colleges did not allow an integrated discussion or understanding of the overall University efforts to reach the student success targets described as the Hawai‘i Graduation Initiative. The Board agreed to combine these three committees so that one Board committee could provide oversight on student success. Similarly, the University’s research agenda was previously included with academic affairs which did not lend itself to oversight of the major Hawai‘i Innovation research agenda in
the strategic plan and so research was moved to a separate committee. These changes are effective with the Academic Year 2015-16.

**Future Plans**

Other than monitoring continued compliance with the policy management system timelines for policy review and modification and continued engagement by the BOR in regular evaluation as defined by Board policy, no further actions are planned.