Standard IV  Leadership and Governance

The institution recognizes and utilizes the contributions of leadership throughout the organization for continuous improvement of the institution. Governance roles are designed to facilitate decisions that support student learning programs and services and improve institutional effectiveness, while acknowledging the designated responsibilities of the governing board and the chief administrator.

Introduction:

Campus governance at Honolulu Community College is primarily carried out by several committees. The membership of those committees consists of members of the faculty, the staff, the administration and the student body.

Since these committees will be referred to several times in the report that follows, this section describes their organization and function.

All members of the faculty at Honolulu Community College are members of the Faculty Senate. The Faculty Senate Executive Committee (FSEC) acts as the voice of the Faculty Senate. The members of the FSEC are elected from the various divisions on campus [Purpose and Composition of the FSEC]. The FSEC has two co-Chairs: a “Campus Chair” and a “System Chair.” The Campus Chair sits on the Campus Leadership Team (see below). The System Chair is a member of the system-wide committee of Faculty Senate chairs and is involved with University of Hawai`i System-wide issues. The Chancellor of the College is an ex-officio member of the FSEC and is the only non-faculty member. Traditionally the FSEC plays a proactive role and is concerned with the “larger issues” that confront the College rather than the day-to-day issues. The FSEC has a number of active subcommittees, all of which play important roles on campus. There are two campus-wide subcommittees that play major roles in campus governance: the Committee on Programs and Curricula (CPC) and the Committee on Student Affairs (COSA). The other subcommittees are not primarily involved with governance issues. The CPC is where all matters that involve the curricula of the College are discussed. The COSA is where matters that affect students are discussed.

The Staff Senate Executive Committee (SSEC) is an advisory committee for the members of the staff at Honolulu Community College [Purpose and Composition of the SSEC]. This committee used to be called the Staff Advisory Council. The aim of the SSEC is to serve as an advisory body to the College Chancellor and administration. The SSEC solicits and considers suggestions and inquiries from staff members and then makes recommendations to the Chancellor.

The Campus Leadership Team (CLT) is comprised of members of the faculty, staff and administration [Purpose and Composition of the CLT]. The CLT meets regularly and is primarily concerned with the day-to-day matters that affect the College, and is more reactive than the FSEC.
The Planning Council (PC) is a new committee, formed only recently as the direct result of a concern by the ACCJC visiting team and their suggestion that such a committee be formed [April 2005 ACCJC Progress Team Report]. The “Statement of Purpose” of the Planning Council indicates that “The Planning Council is the major planning body. Its work focuses on strategic planning, enhancing the effectiveness of the College, and linking the work of existing governance bodies.” The membership of the PC includes several members of the administration, three Division Chairs, and a few members of the faculty and staff [Purpose and Composition of the PC]. As this committee has only just been formed, it's not possible at this time to report on its effectiveness, but the pages that follow will indicate what the PC is expected to accomplish.

Information Gathering:

The Standard IV team created a faculty/staff survey [Faculty/Staff Survey] in the Spring semester of 2005 and distributed hard copies to all members of the faculty, staff and part-time lecturers (via their mailboxes) in March, 2005. 101 of the 135 full-time faculty (75%) completed and returned the survey. 77 of the 123 members of the staff (63%) completed and returned the survey. And 21 of the 105 lecturers (20%) returned their surveys. The responses to the survey are discussed and analyzed in the following pages. The raw data [Faculty/Staff Survey Data] showing all responses to the survey is available for review. References to the survey and to the data will be made throughout the reminder of this section. It should be noted that in the survey, the term “Dean of Instruction” was used to refer to the Vice-Chancellor for Academic Affairs. That title has been changed quite recently and the team felt that the people being surveyed would be more familiar with the old title. Similarly, the survey refers to “Assistant Dean.” Those titles have recently been changed to “Dean.”

Over the past several months the Standard IV team met with various groups and individuals involved with governance at Honolulu Community College.

On April 25, 2005 the team met with some past and present Division Chairs, including Jerry Saviano, Marcia Roberts-Deutsch, Cynthia Smith, Diane Caulfield, and Muriel Fuji [Div Chairs meeting minutes]. On May 5, 2005 the team met with Jim Poole, David Cleveland, Jerry Saviano and Gaynel Buxton all of whom served in the past as Chair or Vice-Chair of the FSEC [FSEC/SSEC meeting minutes]. The team also received responses to a list of question regarding the SSEC from Sheryl Legaspi and Kyle Higa who served as Chairs of the SSEC.

On (date) the team met with (list the names), members of the PC [PC meeting minutes].

On September 19, 2005 the team met with Ramsey Pedersen, Chancellor of the College [Chancellor meeting minutes]. And on October 10, 2005 the team met with Sharon Ota, Vice-Chancellor for Academic Affairs [VCAA meeting minutes].
Several past assistant deans were sent an e-mail message [Message to ex-deans] asking them to comment on the reasons they are no longer serving as assistant dean. Those responses [Responses from ex-deans] have been collected but the anonymity of the respondents is being preserved.

The two current deans (the Dean of Tech II and the Dean of Student Services) were asked to comment [Responses of current deans] on their roles as they pertain to leadership and governance of the College.

Those meetings and other communications, and what was learned from them will be referred to in the pages that follow. The team tried to schedule a meeting with the Board of Regents but was not successful in scheduling such a meeting.

It should be noted that members of the Standard IV team have been Division Chairs, FSEC Chairs, FSEC Vice-Chairs, and SSEC Chairs in the past. One member of the team is currently a Division Chair, one member is currently SSEC Chair, and two members of the team are currently on the PC. This experience has been drawn on in writing this report.

---

**IV.A** The institution recognizes that ethical and effective leadership throughout the organization enables the institution to identify institutional values, set and achieve goals, learn, and improve.

**IV.A.1** Institutional leaders create an environment for empowerment, innovation, and institutional excellence. They encourage staff, faculty, administrators, and students, no matter what their official titles, to take initiative in improving the practices, programs, and services in which they are involved. When ideas for improvement have policy or significant institution-wide implications, systematic participative processes are used to assure effective discussion, planning, and implementation.

---

**Descriptive Summary:**

Governance at Honolulu Community College is a joint responsibility of administration, faculty, and staff who serve on many committees across the campus and are represented by different governing bodies. These groups and individuals meet to discuss, plan, and implement changes for the college.

The Standard IV Team has identified and evaluated the following individuals and committees:

- Chancellor
- Vice Chancellor of Academic Affairs
Governance at Honolulu Community College requires the involvement of representatives of all major campus constituencies in the campus decision making and prioritization process.

Self Evaluation:

The Faculty and Staff survey [Faculty/Staff Survey] found that 133 out of 146 of the respondents (77%) strongly agreed or agreed that the Chancellor is effective in handling his responsibilities with comments such as “he seems to be on top of things and knows what is going on at different parts of the campus than before.”

However, on the same question, the Team noted with concern that of the 76 members of the staff who responded, 27 (36%) had “no opinion.” Since the Chancellor is the leader of the entire campus, this appears to be a problem. Of the 21 lecturers – who may teach only one course on campus – 12 (57%) had “no opinion.” The Chancellor appears to be more in touch with the faculty with only 12 out of 100 (12%) having “no opinion.”

The Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs – formerly the Dean of Instruction – received an approval rating from 106 out of 133 (80%) faculty respondents for effectiveness in handling her responsibilities. One respondent commented that “it is amazing that she accomplishes as much as she does, given the circumstances.”

The Assistant Dean positions have been filled with temporary deans or interim deans many times recently. Even so, of the 121 faculty respondents, 100 (83%) agreed or strongly agreed that their assistant dean was effective in handling his or her responsibilities. There was a slightly higher rate of “no opinion” among all of the groups combined than among just the faculty. The Team noted with concern that University College has never had a permanent Assistant Dean since the inception of the current division structure in 199? [when was this??].

Of the 107 full-time faculty who responded, an overwhelming 96 (90%) agreed or strongly agreed that their Division Chair was effective as a faculty advocate. It was the top rated item on the survey. A large number of staff members, 54 out of 76 (71%) – who are not directly affected by the Division Chairs – had “no opinion.” Comments included “the division chair is very conscientious and professional in performing her duties in all respects.”

Based on the job description and the meetings with the current and some past Division Chairs, they appear to be meeting their responsibilities. During the April 25, 2005
meeting with the Standard IV Team, several Division Chairs [Div Chairs meeting minutes] did raise some concerns and noted that the job continues to evolve based on critical college needs. According to these current and past Division Chairs, they have no real authority or role in decision making. They described the job as being “more operational.” The Team noted with concern that the Aeronautics and the Pacific Aerospace Training Center faculty have no Division Chair representation at CLT meetings; this has left their faculty uninformed about important issues.

About three-quarters of the faculty and staff who responded strongly agreed or agreed that the FSEC and the CLT “play significant roles in determining campus priorities.” About one-quarter of the respondents disagreed or strongly disagreed. During the May 5th meeting with the past chairs of the FSEC [FSEC/SSEC meeting minutes], they explained that the FSEC is responsible for day to day policy, while Division Chairs are responsible for carrying out those policy decisions.

10 of the 21 lecturers (48%) and 34 of the 77 staff members (44%) had “no opinion” about the effectiveness of the Campus Leadership Team. These numbers are not surprising since the Division Chairs are not as involved with these groups. One faculty respondent said, “This is where the real control seems to lie more than any other group.”

Lecturers 11/21 (52%) and staff 44/77 (57%) had “no opinion” about the effectiveness of the Faculty Senate, even though the lecturers are represented on the senate.

The Staff Executive Committee (SSEC) is a relatively new committee with 50/94 (53%) of the respondents strongly agreeing or agreeing that the committee effectively represented them. Nearly one-half (44) disagreed or strongly disagreed to the same question. Over half (52%) had “no opinion” which is probably a result of the group identifying its role.

The Planning Committee held its first meeting on October 7, 2005. Therefore, no evaluation of that group has been made.

Planning Agenda:

The administration will make efforts to reach out to staff and lecturers.

All problems in the recruitment and retention of assistant deans must be addressed. (job responsibilities, power issues on 2nd floor, old boys’ network, pay)

Aeronautics Maintenance Technology and the Pacific Aerospace Training Center must have reliable representation at CLT.

A problem in the recruitment of division chairs needs to be addressed.

Division must have more input in decision making.
The Staff Executive Committee will continue to clarify and re-define its role.

The newly formed Planning Council will coordinate and link the other campus governance bodies.

The campus will encourage wide participation on committees which is necessary for shared governance.

---

**IV.A.2**  The institution establishes and implements a written policy providing for faculty, staff, administrator, and student participation in decision-making processes. The policy specifies the manner in which individuals bring forward ideas from their constituencies and work together on appropriate policy, planning, and special-purpose bodies.

---

**IV.A.2.a**  Faculty and administrators have a substantive and clearly defined role in institutional governance and exercise a substantial voice in institutional policies, planning, and budget that relate to their areas of responsibility and expertise. Students and staff also have established mechanisms or organizations for providing input into institutional decisions.

---

**Descriptive Summary:**

The College Strategic Plan is the basis for institutional planning and budget formulation. While the ultimate decision rests with the Chancellor, the PC is the highest level advisory committee. Each of the other governance groups exercises a voice in specific areas of responsibility and expertise.

The FSEC [Purpose and Composition of the FSEC] represents the interests of the College faculty. The FSEC advises the administration on all issues which pertain to quality education and serves as a forum for discussion on those issues. There are standing committees that address specific policy and planning areas: the Academic Standing Committee, Budget Advisory Committee, Committee on Committees, Committee on Student Affairs, and Committee on Programs and Curricula. All of these committees provide faculty with a voice in campus decision-making.

The SSEC [Purpose and Composition of the SSEC] is the voice of the staff. The SSEC provides input and make recommendations to Administration on matters relating to College operations, budget, and staffing. The SSEC will make every effort to solicit and consider all suggestions and inquiries from staff members and then make appropriate recommendations with the goal of promoting the general welfare of the College.

The role of students in governance is defined in the Board of Regents Bylaws and Policies, Chapter 7 [BOR Bylaws Ch7]. At the campus level, the Associated Students of
the University of Hawai‘i, Honolulu Community College (asuh-hcc), is the Student Senate, composed of sixteen voting senators. The Executive Board is composed of a president, a vice president, a comptroller, a human resource manager, an ambassador, and a business manager.

The PC [PC purpose and function can link once website is created] is the primary advisory body to the Chancellor. The responsibilities include reviewing and analyzing Program Review Reports as well as Annual Assessment Reports (required of instructional programs). Program needs gleaned from these reports will be prioritized and integrated into Honolulu Community College’s Strategic Plan, which will be the primary document used to prioritize budget proposals for the College. The PC includes constituents from the Administration, Faculty, and Staff.

The CLT [Purpose and Composition of the CLT] is the body responsible for the day-to-day operations of the College. The purpose of the Campus Leadership Team is to serve as facilitator and liaison to deal with campus issues and policies. The role and duties of the CLT are based on a 1987 document establishing the duties of Division Chairs; there is a section discussing the role and duties of the “Team” of Division Chairs and Deans.

Self Evaluation:

Over three-quarters (79%) of respondents to the Faculty/Staff survey strongly agree or agree that they have sufficient opportunity to participate in campus governance. However, a fifth of respondents disagree that they have such opportunities. Full-time faculty respondents are more likely to report that they have sufficient opportunity to participate in governance than are lecturers or staff respondents (this is not surprising given the greater role that full-time faculty have traditionally had in major governance bodies on the campus). Note in the table below that 85% of Faculty strongly agree or agree that they have sufficient opportunity to participate in campus governance as compared to only 73% of Lecturers and 72% of Staff.

A shared governance model requires the involvement of representatives of all major campus constituencies in the campus decision-making and prioritization processes. Besides the Honolulu Community College administration, three major bodies are involved in campus governance: the Faculty Senate (via the FSEC and standing committees like the Committee on Programs and Curricula), the Staff Senate Executive Committee, the Student Senate, and the Campus Leadership Team. The role of the Student Senate in governance was not included in this study. About three-quarters of respondents strongly agreed or agreed that the FSEC and the CLT play significant roles in determining campus priorities - leaving about a quarter of respondents disagreeing or strongly disagreeing that these bodies are significantly involved in campus prioritizing. While Chancellor Pedersen has said that the CLT is a decision-making body, it is at most for day-to-day operations and not at the strategic level. FSEC members feel that Ramsey comes to FSEC with a done deal and distributes information. Many members of the College community feel that there are too many committees and most of them are for the purpose of dissemination of information rather than for decision making.
Planning Agenda:

The campus will strive to improve the level of participation by faculty, staff and students in governance.

IV.A.2.b The institution relies on faculty, its academic senate or other appropriate faculty structures, the curriculum committee, and academic administrators for recommendations about student learning programs and services.

Descriptive Summary:

The FSEC is the formal voice of the faculty. It is responsible for developing and maintaining campus academic policy and providing a means for improved communication among the faculty, administration, students, and community. While it serves in an advisory capacity to the administration, its vigilance over campus affairs is integral to the provision, preservation, and improvement of quality education at the college.

The CPC [Purpose and Composition of the CPC] is responsible for approving all changes in curriculum (which in most cases have been passed up from the individual Division Curriculum Committees). It is one of four (along with FSEC, COSA, and the Faculty Development) campus-wide committees. Since the faculty has primary responsibility for curriculum content, subject matter, and methods of instruction, the CPC represents, to the greatest extent possible, the faculty’s interest in maintaining the quality of curriculum at Honolulu Community College. The CPC recently required that all new course and program proposals would have to have SLO’s in order to be approved.

The Division Curriculum Committees (DCC) [Purpose and Composition of the DDCs] represent the curriculum interests of each division, and review course and program proposals originating within the division prior to those proposals being sent to the CPC.

The General Education Board [GE Board Charter] has the authority to approve the charters of all articulation boards at Honolulu Community College. Further, the General Education Board has the authority to require the articulation boards to assess courses, and to provide both assessment plans, and results of assessment activities for review and approval. The General Education Board sets and enforces policies that concern all of the articulation boards.

The Foundations Board [Foundations Board Charter] will be solely responsible for designation of Honolulu Community College courses as meeting “Foundations requirements.” The Foundations Board also has the authority of the FSEC to negotiate agreements with other University of Hawai`i campuses regarding articulation of Foundations designated courses, and to implement the decisions made in those
negotiations. The Foundations board further has the authority to revoke Foundations designation from any instructor or course that is for any reason not compliant with the board's requirements and guidelines.

Self Evaluation:

While I believe Honolulu Community College uses faculty input, I was unable to find confirmation from the survey questions. The CPC and DCC meeting minutes do not appear to furnish supporting documentation.

Planning Agenda:

[under construction]

---

IV.A.3. Through established governance structures, processes, and practices, the governing board, administrators, faculty, staff, and students work together for the good of the institution. These processes facilitate discussion of ideas and effective communication among the institution’s constituencies.

---

Descriptive Summary:

The established governance structures at Honolulu Community College are the FSEC, the SSEC, and the Associated Students of the University of Hawai‘i-Honolulu Community College (ASUH-HCC) Other entities include the CLT, the Planning Council and numerous campus committees, i.e., Committee on Programs and Curricula and Committee on Student Affairs. Evidence of the internal workings of these various entities is found in the Organizational chart [Organizational Chart] and functional statements [Functional Statements], and the committee descriptions [Committee Information]. Also, the Strategic Plan [Strategic Plan] sites the mission statement and goals of the campus.

The organizational structure and numerous established campus committees form working relationships to carry out the mission and goals of the college. Additionally, the various groups participate in decision-making process through their liaisons, i.e., departmental liaisons, Division Chairs and Deans. The Strategic Plan timeline [Strategic Plan Review Process] provides a calendar for revisions and additions to the Strategic Plan. Established college policies and procedures [Policies and Procedures] are located on the College’s internal website. Communication among the various constituencies occurs via committees, town meetings, and email. Minutes of meetings are posted on the College’s internal website.

Self Evaluation:
The Leadership and Governance Survey [Faculty/Staff Survey Data], conducted in Spring 2005, indicates the level of satisfaction regarding working together and communication among the constituencies.

Question 4 - The Chancellor establishes a collegial process that sets values, goals and priorities.
51.3% strongly agree/agree; 27.2% have no opinion;
21.6% disagree/strongly disagree

Question 5 - The FSEC plays a significant role in determining campus priorities.
44.7% strongly agree/agree; 40.2% have no opinion;
15.1% disagree/strongly disagree

Question 6 - The SSEC plays a significant role in determining campus priorities.
25.4% strongly agree/agree; 52.3% have no opinion;
22.4% disagree/strongly disagree

Question 9 - The CLT plays a significant role in determining campus priorities.
52.8% strongly agree/agree; 31.7% have no opinion;
15.6% strongly disagree/disagree

Question 16 – I have sufficient opportunity to participate in campus governance.
60.1% strongly agree/agree; 24.7% have no opinion;
15.1% strongly disagree/disagree

Question 28 – The administration at Honolulu Community College listens to and relies on faculty and staff for recommendations regarding student learning and services.
41.1% strongly agree/agree; 26.4% have no opinion;
32.5% strongly disagree/disagree

The majority of the responses to the questions were positive, with the exception of the SSEC. As a relatively new governing body, they are concentrating on communicating their mission and goals to the staff and the campus in general. There is concern, however, with the high percentage of “have no opinion.” It is not clear why this was chosen. Reasons may include: don’t have an opinion, don’t know enough to have an opinion or don’t care. Question 28, combining the have no opinion with the strongly disagree/disagree, is 58.9%. This response, combined with some of the other questions, suggests that the campus needs to improve its communication process and participation in campus governance.

Planning Agenda:

The campus needs to ensure that the faculty, staff, administrators and students are represented at all levels of governance and leadership. [Do we want to site Aero/Avit lack of Division Chair, Dean of Students reporting directly to the Chancellor?]
Continue to share information through meetings, minutes of meetings, email and the campus intranet site. The faculty, staff, administrators and students need to be responsible. They need to keep abreast with the information sent out via email, frequently check the campus intranet, attend town meetings, and in general participate in campus governance and leadership.

IV.A.4.a The institution advocates and demonstrates honesty and integrity in its relationships with external agencies.

Descriptive Summary:
To elicit information that would help the team determine the extent to which the College demonstrates honesty and integrity in its relationships with external agencies, an assessment of was conducted to develop a comprehensive list of agencies with which the College conducts business with. The search produced the following results:

| Executive Advisory Council | Chancellor’s Executive Advisory Council  
Hawai‘i State Senate, Hawai‘i State House of Representatives, Honolulu City Council, First Hawaiian Bank, Kamehameha Schools, Good Beginnings Alliance, Hawai‘i Tech Trade Assoc, Samoan Service Providers, Home Street Bank, Plumbers & Pipefitters Fund, Cisco Systems, Atlas Insurance, Building Industry Assoc, Employment Training Center, Hawai‘i Carpenters Union, Sandwich Isle Communications, Enterprise Honolulu, Pacific Gateway Center, Servco Pacific |
| Career and Technical Program Advisory Committees | Administration of Justice  
Honolulu Police Department; Security, Kahala Mall; Security, Queen’s Medical Center  
AERO  
Bradley Pacific Aviation; United Airlines; Boeing Commercial Airlines; International Association of Machinists & Aerospace Workers; Northwest Airlines; Continental Airlines; Gold Wing, Inc.  
AEC  
Computer Aided Technologies International, Inc; State of Hawai‘i Department of Human Services; Lyon Associates; Architects Hawai‘i Ltd.; Group 70 Architects, Ltd.; Suzuki/Morgan Architects, Ltd.; Engineering Solutions  
ABRP  
Pearlridge Fender & Body; A.C. Marketing; Kamo Auto Repair, Inc.; Classic Bodyworks; Servco Automotive Vehicle Processing Center; Central Body & Paint; Auto Body Hawai‘i; Kamehameha Schools; Waipahu High School; Island Fender; Hi Line Distributors, Inc; James Campbell High School  
AMT  
Kaimuki High School; Car Doc; Cutter Mitsubishi; Snap On Tools; Theo Davis Euro Motors, Ltd.; Honolulu ford; Toyota |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Companies/Institutions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CARP</td>
<td>Building Industry Association of Hawai<code>i; WM Ishii Contracting; Components Inc.; Hawai</code>i Carpenters Apprenticeship &amp; Training Office</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communication Arts</td>
<td>Rick Noyle Photography; Òbun Hawai`i, Inc.; Loomis and Pollock; Lee Schaller Marketing; DiscMaker</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CENT</td>
<td>CATI; HMSA: Olelo: KHOK TV-2; Marconi Communications; Hawai<code>i Pacific Health; Bishop Museum; Bank of Hawai</code>i</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COSM</td>
<td>Hairscapes; SkinCare by Elaine; J&amp;J Beauty Supplies; Salon 808; Supercuts Hawai`i</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DISL</td>
<td>Detroit Diesel Allison; Highway Transportation &amp; Contracting; HT&amp;T Truck Center; Marine Diesel Repairs &amp;B Rental; Oah; Transit Group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EIMT</td>
<td>International Brotherhood of Electrical Workers; Merritt Electric; Frito Lay of Hawai<code>i; Hawai</code>i Baking Co.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fashion Tech</td>
<td>Retail Merchants; Elsie`s Designs; Hilo Hattle; Waipahu High School; You and Me Naturally; Paula Rath Designs; Bevlin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FIRE</td>
<td>Danaway and Assoc; Unocal; Federal Fire Training “Division; Honolulu International Airport; Fire Dept City and County of Honolulu; Hawai`i National Park; Hickam Air Force Base; State Fire Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Early Childhood</td>
<td>Kama<code>aina Kids; KCAA Preschools; UH Manoa; Oahu Head Start; Mililani Baptist Preschool; Kamehameha Schools Early Childhood Programs; Hawai</code>i Assoc for the Education of Young Children; Good Beginnings Alliance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OESM</td>
<td>Hawaiian Electric Company; King &amp; B Neel, Inc; Verizon Hawai<code>i; First Insurance Co; Grace Pacific Corp; Hawai</code>i Occupational Safety and Health</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RAC</td>
<td>Carrier Hawai`i; Trans Pacific; Oahu Sales</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SMP</td>
<td>Heide &amp; Cook; SMWIA Local 293; Hawai`i Sheet Metal Workers Training Fund; Sheet Metal Contractors Association; HIS Mechanical</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VSL</td>
<td>Pearl Harbor Shipyard; Keehi Marine; Servco Marine Supply; Plas-Tech, Ltd; Marine “Surveyors and Consultants; Art Nelson Sailmaker, Inc; Outrigger Connections</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WELD</td>
<td>Ironworkers Training Office; Hawaiian Iron Craft; Gaspro Welding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apprenticeship/Journeyworker Training</td>
<td>Local Joint Apprenticeship Committees</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Policy and Oversight Board**

Pacific Center for IDSI; University of Hawai`i; LavaNet Inc; Maui Community;
Upon reviewing the list, the Standard IV team finds that the College’s association with external agencies is conducted through the: 1) Chancellor’s Executive Advisory Board; 2) Career and Technical Program Advisory Committees; and 3) PCATT Policy and Oversight Board.

_The Chancellor’s Executive Advisory Board_, comprised of 15 members, provides guidance, leadership and critical feedback to help Honolulu Community College achieve its mission; serves as a “sounding board” in establishing campus initiatives, goals and outcomes; assists in forming relationships and strategic partnerships with the private sector and ids with the development of Honolulu Community College’s annual fundraiser.

_Career/Technical Program Advisory Committees_ provide direction and guidance to the instructional programs to ensure that the curriculum is current with industry standards and training needs. Functions and responsibilities include curriculum content advisement; career guidance and student placement; community public relations; community resource identification; equipment; facilities and resources review; and program review. For apprenticeship/journeymen, committees devise standards for Apprenticeship agreements and provide assistance to the operation and development of the program.

**Self Evaluation:**

The future of Career and Technical Education Programs is dependant upon the College’s ability to successfully meet the training demands of the workforce and the employment needs of students and employers. Developing and maintaining mutually cooperative and collaborative relationships with these constituencies through the formation of advisory bodies has been crucial to the design, implementation, evaluation, and revision of successful career and technical education programs. Advisory committees provide an invaluable service to the educational process by helping the college maintain a curriculum that is current and relevant to business and industry needs. The establishment and effective utilization of these advisory committees is an important and key element to the success of our vocational training and education program.

While it is evident the College has developed solid and honest relationships with numerous external agencies with whom it interacts, systematic documentation related to an assessment of their effective utilization is lacking. Documentation is available that reflects the extent to which the College collaborates with external agencies (e.g., contracts, regulations that direct curriculum content, memorandums of understanding, grants, contracts for training services provided by the College, meeting minutes, etc.). However, the systematic integration of results into the planning and program review process has not been formalized.

**Planning Agenda:**
To systematically assess, document, and integrate the utilization of advisory committees into the College’s planning process.

**IV.A.4.b** The institution agrees to comply with Accrediting Commission standards, policies, and guidelines, and Commission requirements for public disclosure, self study and other reports, team visits, and prior approval of substantive changes. The institution moves expeditiously to respond to recommendations made by the Commission.

Descriptive Summary:

The College has given highest priority in efforts to comply with Commission standards, policies and guidelines, and requirements for public disclosure, self-study and other reports, team visits, and prior approval of substantive changes. Public disclosure is extensive and information has been widely disseminated through email announcements and on the College’s website [http://www.honolulu.hawaii.edu/intranet/accred/index.html](http://www.honolulu.hawaii.edu/intranet/accred/index.html) as outlined below:

**Accreditation**

**I. Fall 2005 Progress Report**
- Report submitted to WASC-ACCJC, October 14, 2005 [PDF]
- Draft Report [PDF]
- System Supporting Documents
- Visiting Team Report - June 2005 [PDF]
- WASC-ACCJC Letter - June 2005 [PDF]
- Report submitted to UH system - Sept. 26, 2005 [PDF]

**II. 2006 Comprehensive Self-Study Report**
- Data Profile - Honolulu Community College [PDF]
- Accreditation Standard Committee Membership
- Timeline for Accreditation
- Evidence Template
- Report Writing Guidelines [PDF]
- Surveys

**III. 2006 Self-Study Standard Committee Work - Minutes and Drafts**
- Steering Committee
- Standards 1 | Standard 2 | Standard 3 | Standard 4
- Campus Meetings

**IV. Archives / Past Reports**
The institution moves expeditiously to respond to recommendations made by the Commission. Honolulu Community College has responded to recommendations made by the Commission as evidenced by:

- Progress Report submitted to WASC-ACCJC, October 14, 2005
- Progress Report - Submitted September 7, 2004 [PDF]
- Progress Report - Submitted August 30, 2004 [PDF]
- Progress Report - Submitted August 23, 2004 [PDF]
- Progress Report - Submitted August 11, 2004 [PDF]
- Progress Report - Submitted July 2, 2004 [PDF]
- Progress Report - Submitted May 25, 2004

Self Evaluation:

As an example of the College’s efforts to expeditiously to respond to recommendations made by the Commission, Honolulu Community College was informed by WASC-ACCJC on June 28, 2005 that a Progress Report was required for submission by October 15, 2005 documenting progress the College has made in institutionalizing systematic and integrated educational and financial review of all programs and services. The Chancellor immediately informed the college community of the Commission's decision to extend the warning status. He also reaffirmed the institutional goals to focus on addressing the Commission recommendations. The letter from WASC ACCJC was placed on reserve in the library and posted on the campus intranet (the internal College website) to ensure dissemination. The complete visiting team report was also posted.

In direct response to WASC ACCJC recommendations, the College implemented required actions throughout the spring, summer, and fall of 2005, based on recommendations made by visiting team members. The College continued to implement revisions to the planning processes and accelerated efforts in standardizing program review activities. The groups participating in this review included: administration, the College Leadership Team (CLT), the Assessment Committee, the Faculty Senate Executive Committee (FSEC), and the Staff Senate Executive Committee (SSEC). Responses to Commission recommendations regarding the University of Hawai‘i Community Colleges (UHCC) system were drafted and revised under the coordination of the Office of the Vice President of Academic Affairs (VPAA). The Progress Report submitted on October 14, 2005 summarizes the actions taken and progress made by Honolulu Community College since the Commission team visit in April.

With regard to a substantive change request, as part of a University system administrative reorganization, the University of Hawai‘i Board Of Regents received a proposal in
November 2002 that included the elimination of the Office of the Chancellor for Community Colleges. This reorganization proposal was approved by the BOR in December 2002 and by the ACCJC through its Substantive Change approval process in April 2003. As part of the action approving the reorganization, the ACCJC requested a series of reports (August 1, 2003, November 1, 2003, April 1, 2004, November 1, 2004, and April 1, 2005) detailing various aspects of the implementation of the reorganization. In January 2005, the Commission placed six of the seven colleges on warning because of concerns expressed over system level governance issues and inconsistent development of program review and assessment policies and practices. Those colleges remaining on warning were asked to submit progress reports on campus specific concerns and all campuses were asked to submit a report by October 15, 2005 that describes system progress on recommendations related to program review and assessment, system organizational issues, and Board governance.

Planning Agenda:

To continue the College’s commitment to public disclosure as evidenced by the accessibility of documents on reserve in the library and posted on the campus intranet (the internal College website) to ensure dissemination.

Descriptive Summary:

As the result of self-assessment processes related to Accreditation Self-study activity, Honolulu Community College has recently put into place a Planning Council (PC) whose specific responsibility is to act as an independent body that responds to the continuous assessment activities of every governance body and functions as a driver of continuous improvement in governance structures. Governance committees at Honolulu Community College are in the process of creating charters which spell out the source and nature of the committee’s authority and purview, as well as the relationship of the committee to stated college and program mission and goals. The faculty and staff of Honolulu Community College were consulted in survey form to determine the perceived level at which governance committees are functioning and decision-making processes may need reassessment.

Self Evaluation:

The role of the PC is still in discussion among council members. The current thinking is that the PC [Planning Council Charter] will exist to the side of the current governance structure as a consultative body for planning, and that after planning steps are concluded,
The Accreditation Oversight Committee (AOC) [Accreditation Oversight Committee Purpose and Function] and the Assessment Committee [Assessment Committee Purpose and Function] have been responsible for some of the institutional planning steps, and moves toward greater centralization and institutionalization of the planning process that have resulted in the creation of the PC since their inception in the Spring Semester of 2003. The AOC was created as a powerful committee whose job was to provide continuity to the accreditation process by following up on recommendations made in the Accreditation Self Study, and by the WASC/ACCJC Visiting Team. The goal of creating a permanent committee to oversee accreditation issues was the idea of making Honolulu Community College’s self study activities into catalysts for continuous improvement by creating a committee to oversee activities and steps identified as necessary during each self-study cycle.

The Assessment Committee – also created as a powerful committee with major campus decision-makers represented – was designed to require assessment from the campus at every level, and to keep tabs on how assessment processes are being carried out. The committee has the mandate to require assessment in the college wherever it sees a need, and to take action where that assessment activity may not be adequate.

These two committees have identified the college planning process as having been inadequate, and up to now carried out in a decentralized form, with various pieces of the process going through faculty, administration, and division leadership channels, but with little communication or perceived overlap of authority between the groups. This realization led to an ad hoc committee whose job was to identify and organize process and governance flows on campus (a job that has not yet been completed). The creation of this committee led, on campus, to spontaneous, and nearly simultaneous calls in the Spring of 2005 for a College congress or central planning council. This growing awareness of need on campus coincided with a WASC midterm visit in which the need for a planning council was emphasized [link to report?], and eventually the body itself was formed.

At this time, though, the Standard IV team cannot make any comment as to the effectiveness of the planning structure, nor can we say how it will be evaluated, or how it will evaluate other campus structures. The PC has had, at the writing of this report, only two meetings, and those have not yet touched on the business of planning itself, but have been largely organizational in nature. The meeting minutes show that there is still some contention as to the roles of various members of the committee, and the appropriateness of the use of the Executive Assistant to the Chancellor as convener for the committee. The roles of the various members are still unsettled, and the actual function of the council as an effective representative body for the campus community at large is not yet clear.
In other planning-related activities, currently, the Honolulu Community College Committee on Committees [Committee on Committees Purpose and Function] is reviewing and revising the charters of all FSEC subcommittees, and when that is finished, the committees are likely to be tasked as a part of their charters with regular review of the charter and the adequacy with which it reflects the mission and activities of each given committee.

The FSEC requires regular reports from all of its subcommittees, including the two campus-wide committees – CPC and COSA. These reports are given to the full FSEC in both written and presentation form for two committees each month. The FSEC then reviews these reports and acts on accordingly.

**Planning Agenda:**

The Standard IV team recommends that the PC move as quickly as possible to answer two primary questions – first, how each governance entity is related to every other, preferably through a chart or other easily readable graphic document, which should be annotated in detail. This will complete the work of the now-defunct ad hoc process committee from the 2004-2005 academic year.

Second, the team recommends that the PC establish membership, procedures, and a mission, all to be encapsulated in an official, up-to-date, revised charter, as soon as possible.

The Standard IV team also recommends that every committee be given the mandate from the FSEC to review the adequacy of its charter every three years. Further, written reports and presentations to FSEC should be given in terms of outcomes that support the mission of the committee, and the FSEC should mandate adjustments to committee mission and activities to fit the needs of the mission and the outcomes. These changes should then be reflected in the next annual report to FSEC.

**IV.B**  
**In addition to the leadership of individuals and constituencies, institutions recognize the designated responsibilities of the governing board for setting policies and of the chief administrator for the effective operation of the institution. Multi-college districts/systems clearly define the organizational roles of the district/system and the colleges.**

**IV.B.1**  
The institution has a governing board that is responsible for establishing policies to assure the quality, integrity, and effectiveness of the student learning programs and services and the financial stability of the institution. The governing board adheres to a clearly defined policy for selecting and evaluating the chief administrator for the college or the district/system.

**IV.B.1.a**  
The governing board is an independent policy-making body that reflects the
public interest in board activities and decisions. Once the board reaches a decision, it acts as a whole. It advocates for and defends the institution and protects it from undue influence or pressure.

IV.B.1.b The governing board establishes policies consistent with the mission statement to ensure the quality, integrity, and improvement of student learning programs and services and the resources necessary to support them.

IV.B.1.c The governing board has ultimate responsibility for educational quality, legal matters, and financial integrity.

IV.B.1.d The institution or the governing board publishes the board bylaws and policies specifying the board’s size, duties, responsibilities, structure, and operating procedures.

IV.B.1.e The governing board acts in a manner consistent with its policies and bylaws. The board regularly evaluates its policies and practices and revises them as necessary.

IV.B.1.f The governing board has a program for board development and new member orientation. It has a mechanism for providing for continuity of board membership and staggered terms of office.

IV.B.1.g The governing board’s self-evaluation processes for assessing board performance are clearly defined, implemented, and published in its policies or bylaws.

IV.B.1.h The governing board has a code of ethics that includes a clearly defined policy for dealing with behavior that violates its code.

IV.B.1.i The governing board is informed about and involved in the accreditation process.

IV.B.1.j The governing board has the responsibility for selecting and evaluating the district/system chief administrator (most often known as the chancellor) in a multi-college district/system or the college chief administrator (most often known as the president) in the case of a single college. The governing board delegates full responsibility and authority to him/her to implement and administer board policies without board interference and holds him/her accountable for the operation of the district/system or college, respectively.

In multi-college districts/systems, the governing board establishes a clearly defined policy for selecting and evaluating the presidents of the colleges.

IV.B.2 The president has primary responsibility for the quality of the institution he/she leads. He/she provides effective leadership in planning, organizing, budgeting,
selecting and developing personnel, and assessing institutional effectiveness.

**IV.B.2.a** The president plans, oversees, and evaluates an administrative structure organized and staffed to reflect the institution’s purposes, size, and complexity. He/she delegates authority to administrators and others consistent with their responsibilities, as appropriate.

---

**Descriptive Summary:**

The Office of the Chancellor provides general direction for all college administration and development; plans, organizes, and directs the institution's academic and support programs in accordance with established policy and procedural guidelines and applicable statutes, and oversees the management and operations of the College in the following functional areas [Functional Statements]:

- Campus planning and research
- Academic program development and delivery, including credit and degree programs and non-credit training programs and related support services
- Management of curricula, programs, and articulation with external colleges and organizations
- International Affairs
- Student Services
- Library and Learning Resources, and other learning assistance services
- Information and Media Technology Services
- Public affairs, marketing, and public information
- Resource Development, including fund raising
- Finance, accounting, and budgeting
- Human resource management
- Physical plant management, including parking and security
- Institutional Research
- Accreditation Process
- Statewide UHonolulu Community College/K-12 Partnerships

**Self Evaluation:**

The team met with the Chancellor of the College, Ramsey Pedersen, on September 19, 2005; at that time he stated:

He is the CEO of a campus that engages in teaching/training of students, community/business workforce development, and UH System interactions. He seeks the input of administrators, division chairs, and various committees in the planning process, and he looks favorably on the newly formed Planning Council. He strives to create a structure that empowers those below him, but he reserves the right to initiate action when needed. He delegates authority, but does not micromanage the day-to-
day activities of the College. On all personnel matters that are two or more levels below him, he makes the final decision and does not need higher approval from the UH System.

When asked “What are three projects that you would like to see the College undertake in the future?”, he replied that he would prefer that the College, through the Planning Council, would suggest such ideas. The Chancellor or his representative attends meetings of the FSEC, CLT, and CPC when key issues such as planning, governance, or curricula are being discussed. The Chancellor's Executive Advisory Board [College Catalog 2005-2006] consisting of twenty members from business, government, and education, provides input for the design or modification of training programs.

While the above seems to indicate that the Chancellor has a keen sense of his role, there are many at the College that are not so clear about what his role is. In the Faculty/Staff Survey, on Question 9: “The role of the Chancellor is clear” [Faculty/Staff Survey Data] the responses were:

- Out of 101 faculty responses, 56 (55.5%) either agreed or strongly agreed, 35 (34.7%) either disagreed or strongly disagreed, and 10 (9.9%) had no opinion.
- Out of 77 staff responses, 33 (42.9%) either agreed or strongly agreed, 14 (18.2%) either disagreed or strongly disagreed, and 30 (39.0%) had no opinion.

This difference of opinion might be due to recent changes stemming from the UH System reorganization. The Chancellor was noticeably off campus either representing the College on a newly-formed decision making group of ten chancellors, meeting with community-business leaders for fund raising, or attending conferences. Two vice-chancellor positions were created: a Vice-Chancellor for Academic Affairs and a Vice-Chancellor for Administrative Services (replacing the positions of Dean of Instruction and Director of Administrative Services). The VCAA acts in the Chancellor's behalf when he is absent for an extended period, followed by the VCAS, when the VCAA is also absent. The delegation of overall duties to the VCAA appears to be appropriate, as the majority of faculty and staff understand her role. On Question 12 “The role of the Dean of Instruction is clear,” [Faculty/Staff Survey Data] the responses were:

- Out of 101 faculty responses, 58 (57.4%) either agreed or strongly agreed, 28 (27.7%) either disagreed or strongly disagreed, and 15 (14.9%) had no opinion.
- Out of 77 staff responses, 35 (45.5%) either agreed or strongly agreed, 13 (16.9%) either disagreed or strongly disagreed, and 29 (37.7%) had no opinion.

In 2003 the position of Executive Assistant to the Chancellor was created to deal with community affairs, fund raising, and legislative affairs [Progress Report]. On Question 10 “The role of the Assistant to the Chancellor is clear,” [Faculty/Staff Survey Data] the responses were:

- Out of 99 faculty responses, 21 (21.2%) either agreed or strongly agreed, 51 (51.5%) either disagreed or strongly disagreed, and 27 (27.3%) had no opinion.
• Out of 77 staff responses, 21 (27.3%) either agreed or strongly agreed, 21 (27.3%) either disagreed or strongly disagreed, and 35 (45.5%) had no opinion.

The lack of clarity can be attributed to the recent creation of the position. The position was first filled in the summer of 2004, and for only a few months at that. The position was re-advertised, but only in late October 2005 was it again filled.

The roles assistant dean and division chair are more clearly understood by the overall group of faculty, lecturers, and staff than not. On Question 12 “The role of the Assistant Dean is clear.” the responses were:

• Out of 197 overall responses, 99 (50.3%) either agreed or strongly agreed, 36 (18.3%) either disagreed or strongly disagreed, and 62 (31.5%) had no opinion.

On Question 13 “The role of the Division Chair is clear.” the responses were:

• Out of 198 overall responses, 122 (61.6%) either agreed or strongly agreed, 33 (16.7%) either disagreed or strongly disagreed. And 43 (21.7%) had no opinion.

On Question 7 “Honolulu Community College has an appropriate number of administrative positions,” the responses were:

• Out of 198 overall responses, 88 (44.4%) either agreed or strongly agreed, 41 (20.7%) either disagreed or strongly disagreed, and 69 (34.8%) had no opinion.

• The only comments were “Honolulu Community College has always been and still is a top heavy college. There are some administrative positions that are questionable while lower levels have to make do with what/who they have. I think though that it’s expected to have more administrators if some faculty only want to teach and not get involved with things outside the classroom.” “Honolulu Community College has too many administrators at the expense of counselor positions.” “Definitely not! We are very top-heavy in administration, which was supposed to be addressed in the great reorganization of several years ago; it wasn’t.”

Planning Agenda:

While the Chancellor communicates with the campus on a regular basis via e-mail and town meetings, he needs to direct special attention to the purpose of his activities when he will be off campus for an extended period of time.

The new Assistant to the Chancellor should communicate his activities on a regular basis to the faculty, lecturers, and staff.

After a suitable amount of time, the effectiveness of the newly formed Planning Council will have to be assessed.

---

IV.B.2.b The president guides institutional improvement of the teaching and learning environment by the following:

• establishing a collegial process that sets values, goals, and priorities;
• ensuring that evaluation and planning rely on high quality research and analysis on external and internal conditions;

• ensuring that educational planning is integrated with resource planning and distribution to achieve student learning outcomes; and

• establishing procedures to evaluate overall institutional planning and implementation efforts.

**Descriptive Summary**

As described in the Introduction to this section of the report, there is a system of committees on campus that are involved with campus governance. Those committees and others – such as the Accreditation Oversight Committee and the Assessment Committee – are continually involved with the improvement of the learning environment at Honolulu Community College. While the Chancellor was not responsible for forming those committees – they have existed for many years – he has consistently supported their function. In a meeting with a member of the Standard IV team, the Chancellor indicated that he saw it as his job to “modify and maintain” the collegial process.

The Chancellor uses the Strategic Plan of the College for guidance. He indicated that he strives to make sure that the College creates a planning process that adheres to the policies and procedures of the University and that is in line with the Strategic Plan. He indicated that he shares what he learns from his external contacts with his staff and with faculty leaders and expects them to use the Strategic Plan and these ideas in planning for the future. When asked to estimate how much of his time is spent on off-campus efforts – such as meeting with the Board of Regents (BOR), the President, the Legislature, etc. – and how much is spent on on-campus activities, he indicated that it was about 50 – 50.

The Director of Management, Information and Research is regularly asked to prepare data for the Chancellor for reports that he presents to the BOR, President, Legislature, etc. She uses a number of sources for the data, including course registration reports, degrees earned reports, program reviews. Self Evaluation:

The faculty see the Chancellor and the Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs (VCAA) as being effective in handling their responsibilities. However, the Standard IV Team placed a question on the Faculty-Staff survey that exactly parallels this sub-section of the Standard: “The Chancellor establishes a collegial process that sets values, goals and priorities.” Of the 98 full-time faculty who responded to this question,
54 (55%) indicated that they strongly agreed or agreed with this statement. 30 (31%) disagreed or strongly disagreed. In the case of the part-time lecturers and the staff, there was a large number of “no opinions,” but that is to be expected. When compared to the other questions on the survey, the faculty responses to this question were in the lower half, indicating that perhaps there is significant concern about whether or not the Chancellor is as effective as he could be in establishing and maintaining the collegial process.

Indeed, it appears the faculty are more satisfied with the performance of the VCAA than with that of the Chancellor, but in both cases a large percentage either strongly agreed or agreed that these two primary administrators are effective. On the other hand, the role of the Executive Assistant to the Chancellor remains a mystery to the majority of the faculty. Only 20% of the full-time faculty respondents agreed or strongly agreed that his role was clear and over 50% either strongly disagreed or disagreed. Indeed, this question on the survey ranked at the very bottom of the 29 questions [Faculty/Staff Survey Data].

The Chancellor and the College rely on research and analysis for modification and improvement of programs.

As an example, the program review for Sheet Metal (SMP) [SMP Program Review] was used to validate the changes in that program from a 2-year AA program to a 1-year certificate program. It was thought that most of the students did not stay on to complete an AA program but instead switched to an apprenticeship program either at the College or at the Naval Shipyards at Pearl Harbor. The program review showed that that was indeed the case.

In the case of Automotive Technology (AMT), the program review [AMT Program Review] indicated that the NATEF requirements for each student needed to be tracked more closely. This led to the use of Palm Pilots by the AMT instructors to track the students’ progress. Perkin’s Funds were used to purchase the Palm Pilots and the software.

The five-year schedule for program reviews [Five-Year Schedule] will continue to be used to analyze programs at the College.

Planning Agenda:

[under construction]

IV.B.2.c The president assures the implementation of statutes, regulations, and governing board policies and assures that institutional practices are consistent with institutional mission and policies.

Descriptive Summary:
The Chancellor (the University of Hawai`i System campus CEO is called a Chancellor, with the President as the overall system CEO) has all necessary authority to implement statutes and to assure that Institutional Practices are consistent with statutes, regulations, governing board policies, and the College’s mission and policies [Functional Statements] [Testimony of Chancellor Ramsey Pederson, Oct. 2005, and Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs Sharon Ota, Oct. 2005].

Self Evaluation:

The Chancellor of Honolulu Community College does function as the primary responsible party in terms of the implementation of Honolulu Community College’s responsibilities according to its Mission Statement [Mission Statement], and the relevant statutes and regulations. [Functional Statements]. In the Standard IV Team survey, 57.3% (93 individuals) agreed that the Chancellor is effective in handling these responsibilities. 51.3% (100 individuals) also agreed that the Chancellor establishes a collegial process within which he conducts his decision-making activities [Survey].

Planning Agenda:

Faculty, staff, and lecturers at Honolulu Community College seem to agree that the Chancellor is in fact the Chief Executive Officer of the College, and that he is effective in carrying out his responsibilities to implement the College Mission, and abide by statutes and regulations. In this particular area, the team has no recommendations for change. However, clarification of the Chancellor’s responsibilities, and the role of faculty, staff, and lecturers in the decision-making process, as well as better communication of the Chancellor’s activities, decisions, and reasoning would likely improve campus morale and provide better direction to all employees of the college in carrying out their individual pieces of the mission.

IV.B.2.d The president effectively controls budget and expenditures.

Descriptive Summary:

[Honolulu Community College Strategic Planning and Budgeting Process] is a very detailed plan to guide budget decisions for the college. The Honolulu Community College Administration analyzes programs and data in consultation with faculty, staff, and students, including the FSEC, SSEC, and CLT, to develop strategic financial plans and an operating budget. The recently formed Planning Council is expected to be part of the process. The budget requests are finalized by the campus and sent to the Board of Regents for approval. The approved budget then moves on to the Legislature and Governor for additional scrutiny.

Self Evaluation:
Unfortunately this puts the campus at the mercy of the legislature. In recent years the campus has had to make adjustments in many areas to keep the campus functioning. For example, repair funds have had to fund instruction.

This is reflected in the [Faculty and Staff Survey]. A third (33%) of the respondents strongly disagreed or disagreed with the statement that the Chancellor effectively controls the budget and expenses. Comments from respondents include: “pet projects get more $$ with little outcome,” “I perceive inequity of budget and expenditures,” and “we're always short of money.”

Planning Agenda:

The newly formed Planning Council is expected to play a major role in the budget process.

IV.B.2.e  **The president works and communicates effectively with the communities served by the institution.**

IV.B.3  **In multi-college districts or systems, the district/system provides primary leadership in setting and communicating expectations of educational excellence and integrity throughout the district/system and assures support for the effective operation of the colleges. It establishes clearly defined roles of authority and responsibility between the colleges and the district/system and acts as the liaison between the colleges and the governing board**

Descriptive Summary:

Honolulu Community College has found an anchor in the University of Hawai`i System in a reorganization which makes Community College Chancellors jointly responsible to a new Vice President for Community Colleges and the current President of the University of Hawai`i [Reorganization Proposal]. This new organization of the Community Colleges in the University of Hawai`i System is expected to allow the system to take the lead in providing continuity in educational standards among the Community Colleges in the system, and in coordinating those standards with the baccalaureate degree granting institutions in the system. According to the proposal for the reorganization, which was passed and mandated by the University of Hawai`i Board of Regents in their August, 2005 meeting [Board of Regents University of Hawai`i Organization Chart], it is the new office of the Vice President for Community Colleges “which will be responsible for community college related system policies, resource allocation, and central services and support for the seven Community Colleges. The new Vice President for Community Colleges will be the central leadership position, reflecting the collective mission of the
Community Colleges.” [Reorganization Proposal] [Board of Regents University of Hawai`i Organization Chart].

Self Evaluation:

It would appear at present that this reorganization to include a Vice President for Community Colleges will be an excellent step for Honolulu Community College and the Community Colleges of the University of Hawai`i System as a whole. Since the Presidency of the University of Hawai`i System was held by Dr. Evan Dobelle, the Community Colleges have experienced numerous shake-ups in leadership and leadership organization. However, perhaps none had the impact that the abolition, in 2003, of the previous office of Chancellor for Community Colleges has had on the well-being, responsiveness, funding, and cooperation of mission, of the Community Colleges in the University of Hawai`i System. With the Chancellor for Community Colleges gone in 2003, the Community Colleges were faced with a number of dilemmas, not the least among which was lack of a single voice in representing community college funding needs and accreditation positions. Instead, all seven chancellors attended meetings with the President of the University of Hawai`i, and though the seven had agreed to cooperate on issues of common cause, there was certainly an intensification of competition among community college campuses in the system for funding and position.

The lack of standardization in educational and administrative practice among University of Hawai`i Community Colleges can be seen in the variety of reorganization systems adopted by the Community Colleges, and the broad range of goals that followed. [Honolulu Community College Organizational Chart] [Leeward Community College Organizational Charts] [Windward Community College Organizational Charts]. While each college has its own unique mission, and serves a clientele/student base with needs tailored to the unique programs offered by each campus, the variation in the organization of administrative leadership and campus decision-making processes suggests some disagreement as to the way in which each institution expects to function at the system level, and this reflects a competition for funding and curricular support that should be minimized by the position of the new Vice President for Community Colleges.

The current reorganization of the Community Colleges of the University of Hawai`i System under a Vice President for Community Colleges does have some shortcomings, however. The first, and perhaps least damaging in the long term, is the extended absence of the current Vice President for Community Colleges, who is undergoing much-needed medical treatment at this time. The UH System needs to step in with an articulate and qualified interim Vice President as quickly as possible to ensure the success of the office in its mission.

Second, the proposal for the office of Vice President for Community Colleges was itself ambiguous in that it provides for a dual reporting framework for Community College Chancellors, who must report to the President himself, and to the Vice President. It seems that the ambiguity of authority here may make for difficulties in organization and system cooperation.
Planning Agenda:

The Standard IV Team recommends that the Office of Vice President for Community Colleges be staffed with an interim Vice President as soon as possible, and that the interim VP maintain close contact with the current Vice President for Community Colleges during his absence in order to provide for a smooth transition and agreement on policy during this crucial period for all of the Community Colleges. Further, the team wishes to recommend that the Vice President for Community Colleges be given a more centralized role that does not force him to deal with the divided loyalties of seven competing campuses, so that better decisions regarding funding equity, program development, articulation of courses, and personnel issues can be handled both expeditiously and with a minimum of inter-campus conflict.

Beyond that, the committee recommends that the Accreditation Oversight Committee find some way to monitor the activities of the new office, perhaps by asking that it evaluate and report on its own performance according to measurable official outcomes specified by a Community College-system-wide working group, and based on both University of Hawai`i Community Colleges needs, and WASC/ACCJC standards for system performance.

IV.B.3.a  The district/system clearly delineates and communicates the operational responsibilities and functions of the district/system from those of the colleges and consistently adheres to this delineation in practice.

Descriptive Summary:

In June 2005, the Board of Regents approved the creation of a new Office of the Vice President for Community Colleges [BOR Minutes June 05]. The VPCC will be responsible for community college-related system policies, resource allocation within the community colleges, and central service and support for the seven community colleges.

Each community college chancellor will retain responsibility and control over campus operations, administration, and management. Community college chancellors will continue to have access to the President of the University of Hawai`i for system-wide policy on a par with the chancellors of four-year campuses.

Self-Evaluation:

Prior to January 2003, the University had a Chancellor serving as the chief executive officer for the community college system and a Provost for each of the seven community colleges. In December 2002, the Board of Regents approved a reorganization of the system office resulting in the abolishment of the Office of the Chancellor for Community
Colleges and realignment of the Provosts as direct reports to the President [Minutes, Special Meeting BOR December 2002]. The titles of ‘Provost’ were subsequently changed to ‘Chancellor’ and a Council of Chancellors was formed that reported directly to the President.

During this time, then-President Dobelle expected his Chancellors to engage in fund-raising activities for the University of Hawai`i system. With having to also attend regular Council of Chancellors meetings as well, Chancellor Pedersen had to devote noticeable time off campus. Eventually, two Vice-Chancellor positions were created at Honolulu Community College, with authority to act on the Chancellor's behalf during his absence. The position of Executive Assistant to the Chancellor was also established to deal with community, legislative, and fund-raising affairs.

In a January 2005 report, the Commission on the Accreditation of Community and Junior Colleges expressed concern that a lack of clarity and coherence persists regarding decisions distinct to the role and mission of the community colleges within the University of Hawai`i System due to its current organizational structure. To address these concerns, the Office of the Vice President for Community Colleges was established. In June 2005, President McClain proposed to the Board of Regents a dual reporting relationship, where community college chancellors report to the VPCC for leadership and coordination of community college matters, and concurrently report to the President for University system-wide policymaking and decisions impacting the campus. The proposal was approved, with the provision that the matter will be revisited by the Board in June 2007.

Planning Agenda:

[under construction]

---

**IV.B.3b** The district/system provides effective services that support the colleges in their missions and functions.

---

**IV.B.3.c** The district/system provides fair distribution of resources that are adequate to support the effective operations of the colleges.

---

Descriptive Summary:

The University of Hawai`i Community College System budget is submitted to the legislature by college request. It is the practice of the system to follow legislative intent and allocate to the college funds approved by the legislature plus revenue generated by the college.

Self Evaluation:
In theory, Honolulu Community College has, over the last three years, since the abolition of the Office of the Chancellor for Community Colleges, participated in a working group system, in which the Honolulu Community College Strategic Plan [Strategic Plan] is reviewed by major campus committees, including the Campus Leadership Team (CLT) and the Faculty Senate Executive Committee (FSEC). From there, it goes for approval through the Chancellor’s office, and then provides the priorities that the college uses to make decisions, even when faculty is not on campus during Summer, Winter, or Spring recess. Those priorities are then matched with the priorities of the other Community Colleges in the Community College Strategic Plan (which has since 2003 been an informal document listing common goals, but not a binding policy document) [Community Colleges Strategic Plan] which is a compromise document born from negotiations. The final stage is inclusion in the University of Hawai‘i System Strategic Plan [System Strategic Plan] The newly prioritized System Strategic Plan and Community Colleges Strategic Plan then become the basis for a system-wide budget request from the Hawai‘i State Legislature. The Strategic Plan is then reviewed annually to help bring it in line with the college’s needs, community needs, and workforce needs of the State of Hawai‘i. [Strategic Plan Review Process]

In practice, the Strategic Plan Review Process rarely works well for a number of reasons.

Prior to Fall 2005, Honolulu Community College had no central Planning Council. The charter of the new Planning Council make it clear that it has the responsibility to review the needs of the college on a continuing basis, and provide the priorities to the Chancellor with great care and sufficient deliberation.[Planning Council Charter] However, the administration regularly brings to the Planning Council, as it did in the past with the CLT and the FSEC, decisions that must be made within a short time-frame, and uses the needed time to get a rubber-stamp decision from the committee to agree to the proposed policy or action, when asking for a set of meetings, and providing for adequate discussion, despite the difficult time frame, would be a better way to get the decision made, and would improve faculty and staff moral as well as “buy in” into whatever the new program might be.[Div Chairs meeting minutes][ FSEC/SSEC meeting minutes] Further, nearly 40% of 101 faculty who answered our survey felt that the Chancellor does not do a sufficient job at delegating his authority, while only 44% (89 faculty members) thought that the FSEC plays a significant role in setting campus priorities. The disconnect here, along with the fact that both numbers are well below 50%, seems to suggest that while faculty and staff value their governance institutions, they also perceive a “listening gap” between faculty and administration. That gap is there for the college staff, as well, where 25% agree that the SSEC plays a significant role in setting campus priorities, but 20% see the Chancellor as having established a collegial process[faculty/staff survey data]. Thus it is clear that the planning process at the Honolulu Community College campus has been flawed. Whether the new Planning Council can solve that problem is still unclear.

Further, while the system claims to distribute funds according to the wishes of the legislature, in practice, that distribution also includes a system wide “assessment” of each campus of a percentage of funds for common system activities.[See Ken Kato]
This assessment would be unnecessary if the system was fully funded for its activities. It appears, then, that the system strategic plan does not do an adequate job of asking for the proper budget to meet its needs, and that the State Legislature in underfunding the University of Hawai‘i, thus forcing the system to “steal from Peter to pay Paul”. This will, in the long run, lead inevitably to inequities in funding across the system, and may force the smaller campuses in the University of Hawai‘i System, including the Community Colleges, for whom a small percentage of the budget is a comparably larger chunk of cash in real terms, to forego important projects, technology, and faculty in order to meet ongoing system assessments.

As revenue generated by the college in the form of tuition and fees continues to provide an ever-smaller piece of the financial pie on every campus, the difficulties in funding, and the nature of competition among the campuses, combined with system assessments, seems likely to drive the continued paring of campus services and course offerings, as Honolulu Community College is already seeing on a semester-by-semester basis, because of declining ability to pay for even maintenance of the curricular and educational status quo. This seems likely to cause major issues with the quality of education at the Community Colleges in general unless the new Vice President for Community Colleges is able to rally the Chancellors, provide for a more equitable distribution of funds available, changes in the tuition structure, and a more united front in presentations to the legislature in terms of what is needed by the Community Colleges.

Planning Agenda:

The ability of the University of Hawai‘i System to provide financially and administratively for the upkeep of educational standards and facilities, as well as long-term planning and articulation of courses among the Community Colleges and the University of Hawai‘i System as a whole depends on the ability of the new office of the Vice President for Community Colleges to act as a unifying policy and financial voice within the system and among the Community Colleges. The Standard IV Team recommends that Honolulu Community College’s planning and implementation bodies work closely with the new Vice President, and with other Community Colleges in the system. The office of the Vice President for Community Colleges needs also to be evaluated annually in terms of outcomes in the areas specified by the WASC/ACCJ standards in this area.

**IV.B.3.d  The district/system effectively controls its expenditures.**

Descriptive Summary:

[under construction]

**IV.B.3.e  The chancellor gives full responsibility and authority to the presidents of the**
colleges to implement and administer delegated district/system policies without his/her interference and holds them accountable for the operation of the colleges.

For clarity, in the University of Hawai`i system, the highest ranking administrator is called the “President” and the CEOs of the Community Colleges are called “Chancellors.”

The relationship between the President of the University and the Chancellors of the Community Colleges also involves the newly implemented position of Vice President of Community Colleges [BOR Minutes June 05] which was approved by the BOR on June 21, 2005 and is subject to review in June 2007. In this new organization, the Chancellors “report to the new Vice President for Community Colleges for leadership and coordination of the community college matters, and concurrently report to the President for University systemwide policymaking and decisions impacting the campus.”

The minutes of the June 2005 meeting continue to say: “The reorganization proposes to realign the community colleges academic and administrative affairs support services as subordinate to the new Office of the Vice President for Community Colleges. The academic affairs support functions are being transferred from the Office of the Vice President for Academic Planning and Policy and the administrative affairs support functions from the Office of the Vice President for Budget and Finance/Chief Financial Officer.” [BOR Minutes June 05]

The final approval was based on a proposal created by John Morton, then Chancellor of Kapi`olani Community College [VPCC Proposal]. Morton was appointed as Interim Vice President for Community Colleges.

Self Evaluation:

The Chancellors have the responsibility and authority to implement and administer policies and they report both to the President of the University and to the Vice President for Community Colleges.

Planning Agenda:

The position of Vice President for Community Colleges and the new model that it represents are new and it will require some time to see how things are changed.

This is further complicated by the health problems of the Vice President for Community Colleges. At the time of this writing, there are several things that are unclear and only time will make them more clear.

IV.B.3.f The district/system acts as the liaison between the colleges and the governing board. The district/system and the colleges use effective methods of communication, and they exchange information in a timely manner.
Descriptive Summary:

The Office of the Vice President for Community Colleges acts as liaison between the Community Colleges and the Board of Regents. [VPCC Proposal] [Board of Regents University of Hawai‘i Organization Chart].

Self Evaluation:

The Documentary evidence suggests that with the new Vice President for Community Colleges, the descriptive summary is accurate. However, that office has been in existence for such a short time, and for much of that time without an active Vice President, so that the Standard IV Team is unable to say what things are like in practice.

Planning Agenda:

The Standard IV Team sees no need at the present for major changes. However, there is an immediate and pressing need to fill the post of the Vice President for Community Colleges, with an acting Vice President if necessary, so that the work of this important new body can go on in an expeditious way during this critical phase of accreditation, new attempts at system-wide articulation, and financial stress.

IV.B.3.g The district/system regularly evaluates district/system role delineation and governance and decision-making structures and processes to assure their integrity and effectiveness in assisting the colleges in meeting educational goals. The district/system widely communicates the results of these evaluations and uses them as the basis for improvement.

Descriptive Summary:

Currently the only possible evaluation for the University of Hawai‘i System’s success in supporting Community Colleges comes from a set of goals articulated in the Community Colleges’ Strategic Plan. This document is both forward-looking, and provides for achievable and laudable goals. However, there are no measurable outcomes on which to base a clear assessment of levels of achievement of the goals the system has set for itself.

Self Evaluation:

The Community Colleges have a Strategic Plan which sets out goals for the University of Hawai‘i System in the area of Community College needs. There is no set of measurable outcomes, however, which can be used to assess the activities or the methods for implementation of plans by the system [Strategic Plan]. The Community Colleges Strategic Plan provides some goals, nominal achievement of which can allow success to
be claimed, but it does not provide for a cross-sectional analysis of how well all goals were achieved, how they were achieved in relation to each other, or what direction the system might go following achievement, or lack thereof, of goals in the Strategic Plan. There are also no clear goals or objectives regarding how best to communicate and carry out those objectives once they are decided upon.

Planning Agenda:

The Standard IV Team recommends that the UH System implement a set of official, and specific, goal-oriented outcomes that can be easily and regularly measured, and which will help to maintain its movement along paths directly related to achieving the mission of the University of Hawai`i System as a whole, and the mission of the Community Colleges as a group, as well as meeting its financial and educational objectives in serving the students of the University of Hawai`i as stated in the System Strategic Plan and the Community Colleges Strategic Plan. The basis for those outcomes exist in the original proposal for the creation of the office of Vice President for Community Colleges [VPCC Proposal] as well as in the ‘goals’ articulated in the Community Colleges’ Strategic Plan [Community Colleges’ Strategic Plan]. A system-wide working group consisting of faculty, staff, and administrators should be assigned to design outcomes and an assessment system so that the effectiveness and direction of the system administrative support can be measured, and improved, on a continuous basis.