Standard I

The institution demonstrates strong commitment to a mission that emphasizes achievement of student learning and to communicating the mission internally and externally. The institution uses analyses of quantitative and qualitative data in an on-going systematic cycle of evaluation, integrated planning, implementation, and re-evaluation to verify and improve the effectiveness by which the mission is accomplished.

I.A. Mission
The institution has a statement of mission that defines the institution’s broad educational purposes, its intended student population, and its commitment to achieving student learning.

I.A.1. The institution establishes student learning programs and services aligned with its purpose, its character, and its student population.

Descriptive Summary

Honolulu Community College (HCC) has a statement of mission that defines the institution’s broad educational purposes, its intended student population, and its commitment to achieving student learning. [Mission Statement]

The College’s Mission Statement is:

Serve the community as an affordable, flexible, learning-centered, open door, comprehensive community college that meets the post-secondary educational needs of individuals, businesses and the community.

Serve the Pacific Rim as the primary technical training center in areas such as transportation, information technology, education, communications, construction, and public and personal service.

To accomplish this mission, the goals of Honolulu Community College are to:

1. Provide two-year transfer educational programs that offer students the general educational component of the Baccalaureate Degree.

2. Provide two-year, four-year, short-term and apprenticeship occupational-technical curricula for employment, skill upgrading and career advancement and transfer to four-year technical programs.

3. Insure general education competency in communication, problem-solving, ethical
deliberation, cultural diversity and global awareness.

4. Provide developmental instruction to build skills necessary to pursue educational objectives.

5. Maintain flexible educational delivery systems to enhance student access by providing affordable education when and where it is needed.

6. Establish a systemic institutional effectiveness program that regularly assesses expected student and Program learning outcomes to ensure the highest quality education.

7. Develop activities to increase resources for programs and operations.

8. To provide co-curricular programs and activities to promote student learning and development and to prepare students for leadership roles and responsibilities in a global community.

9. Contribute to the support of the community's economic and social growth.

10. Maintain a multicultural environment where ethnic and gender diversity is appreciated, respected and promoted.

11. Provide an opportunity for students to gain an understanding and knowledge of the host culture of Hawaii, the Native Hawaiian language, culture and values.

Honolulu Community College seeks to fulfill its mission by determining the needs of its intended students and community as well as the business and technical needs of the State of Hawai`i and the Pacific Rim, using both quantitative and qualitative data. Data sources include reports, studies, and surveys, as well as input derived from a continuous dialogue among all stakeholders.

The College’s intended student population is determined by its unique location in the Kalihi section of the city of Honolulu on the island of Oahu in Hawai`i, and by our specific role in the University of Hawai`i system, dictated by legislative mandate, of an emphasis on workforce development. This population is also determined by our purpose of being an affordable, flexible, learning-centered, open door institution, and our mission of offering both a comprehensive community college education and serving as the primary technical training center of the Pacific Rim. The data gathered by the College strongly indicate that the College’s mission and goals serve the needs of our student population.

Our students are enormously diverse. They come from a wide range of cultures and ethnicities. They range from high-school students to senior citizens. Many are the first in their family to attend college. Basic summary data for Honolulu Community College, including enrollment, student demographics, and course information, are available on the web. [Demographics] The needs of our students, community and statewide workforce, as
identified in our mission statement, provide an essential rationale for the creation, support and continuous improvement of programs, curricula, courses and services. The current and future needs of Hawai`i’s businesses and community members, as well as future employment opportunities for our students, are determined using a variety of sources. The reports and studies utilized include Department of Labor and Industrial Relations forecasting reports [Department of Labor], UH Community College Graduate and Leavers Survey [Assessment/Surveys], and Occupational Surveys done by the Honolulu Community College Career Readiness and Job Placement Center. In addition, the Chancellor regularly consults with his Executive Advisory Council, which is composed of 20 members from the business, governmental, planning, educational and University of Hawai`i communities. Program Advisory Committees, which are composed of industry professionals, are also consulted. Further, the Chancellor has served on three national president’s councils and currently serves on the State Workforce Development Council, the National Governor’s Academy Pathways to Advancement State Team, and the National Coalition of Advanced Training Centers’ (NCATC) Corporate College Planning Group.

Relevant data and input derived from all these sources are shared with the College’s recently formed Planning Council, summarized in the Chancellor’s monthly report to the Faculty Senate on which he sits as an ex-officio member, published by e-mail and on the web in committee minutes, detailed in Chancellor’s Updates to the College, and explained at town meetings. All reports and studies cited are available in print or electronic form. [Assessment Plan]; [Chancellor’s Memo]; [Committees]

Student needs are also assessed using a variety of measures most often obtained by specifically soliciting student input. Student Senate leaders are included in campus communication and decision-making processes. The Student Senate President is included on the College e-mail list-serve. There are standing meetings between Student Senate Executive leaders and the Dean of Student Services. Student representatives provide a student voice on important committees, such as the Planning Council, Faculty Senate Executive Committee (FSEC), the Committee on Programs and Curricula (CPC), the Assessment Committee, and the Committee on Disabilities Access-Honolulu (CODA-H) [Committees]. Student Senate members were given the explicit opportunity to provide input into the evolving campus eight-year strategic plan. Additionally, a substantial portion of the Student Senate Fall 2005 leadership retreat was devoted to reviewing the College’s Midterm Accreditation Report. In all cases student leaders provided thoughtful feedback that was incorporated into the final drafts. Furthermore, student surveys and focus groups are used to determine student satisfaction, projected needs, and opinion on major issues. [Student Survey] Other quantitative data that highlight student needs include student retention and transfer rates, post-transfer success rates, Perkins core indicators, licensures and employment data, surveys of employer satisfaction, as well as assessment of student success in individual courses. [Strategic Plan]; [Accreditation Info]; [Committees]

All areas in Student Services focus on identifying and meeting the needs of students. Each area now has a mission statement accompanied with Student Learning Outcomes
(SLOs) all designed to meet the College’s mission and goals and constantly improve student learning. In the past, the success of the Student Service Programs has been measured by the number of students served and demonstrated by student surveys, which have also used to target and address areas for improvement. Student Services has recently adopted the guidelines of The Council for the Advancement of Standards in Higher Education (CAS) [CAS] and will be producing new data sets that can be effectively used to design and implement program improvement, which translates in turn to increased student achievement and the achievement of the College’s Mission.

In addition, faculty and staff engage in this dialogue through a number of forums including participation on committees, e-mail publication and discussion of committee minutes, town meetings on major issues, chancellor’s retreats with faculty and staff leaders [Retreat]; [Retreat2], program, division, department and college meetings, and in a yearly “Excellence in Education day,” which is set aside for all faculty and staff to discuss college wide concerns. Faculty and staff surveys are also conducted. All key documents including surveys, studies, reports, and committee minutes are posted on the College’s intranet and thus readily available for information, review, and comment. [Committees]; [Faculty Development]; [Faculty/Staff Survey Data]

To meet its mission, HCC offers 23 Career-Technical Education and Liberal Arts programs leading to a certificate, license, or degree. Faculty and staff in all these areas have always worked closely with Student Services to meet students’ needs, support student learning, aid students in the achievement of personal and professional success, and to ensure that the college meets its stated goals. However, procedures designed and implemented over the past two years now explicitly require that program outcomes and course student learning outcomes guide campus decisions and actions, and that these are directed toward meeting these goals. Success is measured utilizing a variety of assessment tools. Assessment data are employed in designing and implementing improvements to maximize student learning.

**Evaluation**

The College meets this standard. Students seem to be quite satisfied with their experience at HCC based on their responses to specific questions from the Community College Survey of Student Engagement (CCSSE) [CCSSE] on how attending HCC contributed to their knowledge, skills, and personal development. Consistent attention to issues of articulation between two-year and four-year institutions in the state system has also facilitated movement of students between campuses, although some barriers still remain. Retention rates have been consistently above 80% over the last five years. However, persistence rates have fluctuated between 64% and 73% for the same period. Additionally, based on data provided by IPEDS, 11% of those enrolled in 2001 graduated within 5 semesters, 24% transferred to other institutions, and 18% continued their education at HCC. [MAPS]

**Planning Agenda**
The College must continue to monitor student learning programs and services to ensure their alignment with the college mission, following a complete cycle of assessment.

The College must continue to work collaboratively within the University of Hawai`i system to create a seamless articulation process that will provide better service to students focused on baccalaureate studies and beyond.

**I.A.2. The mission statement is approved by the governing board and published.**

**Descriptive Summary**

The FSEC, the SSEC and the Campus Leadership Team (CLT) approved the current mission statement in early fall, 2005. [FSEC 8/26/05]; [SSEC 9/12/05]; [CLT 8/22/05]

It is published in several college documents including the catalogue, the website, The Strategic Plan and accreditation reports.

**Evaluation**

The College meets this requirement. The 2004 faculty/staff survey, “The Campus Pulse,” indicates that a significant percentage of HCC employees feel strongly that they are aware of and fully support the College’s mission. However, the survey also strongly indicates that the College needs to improve the communication of this mission to the general public. It is particularly emphasized that while the Career Technical Education aspects of our mission are well understood, the General Education component and the Liberal Arts Program are less effectively communicated.

**Planning Agenda**

The College must evaluate its current extramural communication practices, and will create and implement strategies to improve the communication of the comprehensive nature of the College’s mission to the general public.

**I.A.3 Using the institution’s governance and decision-making processes, the institution reviews its mission statement on a regular basis and revises it as necessary.**

**Descriptive Summary**

As documented in the college’s Institutional Self Study 2000, the mission statement was under continual review and revision between 1994 and 2000. A review of the mission statement was again undertaken in Fall 2004 at the recommendation of the Assessment and Accreditation Oversight Committees. The Accreditation Liaison Officer (ALO) presented a motion to the Faculty Senate Executive Committee (FSEC) asking that a sub-committee be formed to coordinate review and revision of the mission statement. That committee was formed and included the FSEC campus chair, the FSEC system chair, and the Staff Senate Executive Committee (SSEC) chair. The document was initially
reviewed by both the FSEC and the SSEC and subsequently by other all-campus committees including the Campus Leadership Team, the Accreditation Oversight Committee, and the Assessment Committee. All agreed to leave the two basic paragraphs of the Mission Statement as is and to change only the goals. In June 2005 the resulting draft was emailed to all faculty and staff and further suggested changes were incorporated. In early Fall 2005 this new draft was again presented to the FSEC, SSEC, and CLT; after further discussion a final draft was again provided to faculty and staff for feedback. The new mission statement was then unanimously approved by the FSEC, SSEC and CLT, as noted above.

In Fall 2005, the charter of the new Planning Council was also approved by the FSEC. Among the duties of this committee is to conduct a periodic review of the mission statement based on institutional/program assessment and strategic planning goals. The Planning Council also passed a resolution adopting a set timeline and process for this review. [Functional Statements]; [PC]; [Mission Review]

Evaluation

The College meets this standard, having recently completed a review and revision of this core document and its associated institutional goals, and having established a timeline and process for subsequent reviews. The process will be fully established once the review process mandated by the Planning Council completes a full cycle.

Planning Agenda

The Planning Council must publish the timetable and procedures for regular review of the mission.

I.A.4 The institution’s mission is central to institutional planning and decision-making.

Descriptive Summary

The College’s mission statement has been extensively reviewed with campus-wide input. It identifies the broad-based educational goals Honolulu Community College seeks to achieve, and defines the students the college intends to serve. This mission statement has always been identified as central to institutional planning and decision-making, although that linkage has not always been clearly articulated. Processes designed and implemented over the past year ensure that the mission is the more explicit reference point and standard in an on-going and systematic cycle of evaluation, integrated planning, implementation, and re-evaluation to verify and improve student learning and institutional effectiveness.

These recently instituted policies and procedures now dictate that the following actions will take place.
• The Planning Council will conduct an annual review of the College’s Strategic Plan (the college’s key planning document) and make recommendations on budget and resource allocations to the Chancellor. As per Planning Council procedures, all items submitted to the council for inclusion in the Strategic Plan must be linked explicitly to the Community College System Strategic Goals and the Mission and Goals of Honolulu Community College. [PC]

• The budget and resource allocation recommendations are made using a priority system determined in part by this linkage and on program assessment findings.

• Program assessment findings are also linked to the College’s mission. All programs are reviewed annually and must conduct a comprehensive review every five years. Both the Annual Assessment and comprehensive Program Review templates specifically ask that the college and program missions be stated. The program mission is to be linked to the college mission, and both statements inform the analysis of the program assessment data. [Assessment facts]; [Assessment Plan]; [Program Review Templates]

• The Planning Council, which guides the Strategic Planning process, is also the committee that undertakes annual review of the college mission, and that review is fully informed by the process described above. [Retreat]; [Retreat2]

Evaluation

The college meets this standard, even as it completes the transition to full implementation of the centrality of the mission in institutional planning and decision-making. The College’s recently instituted cycle of planning, implementation and re-evaluation to verify and improve student learning and institutional effectiveness is linked in multiple and interdependent ways to the college’s mission. The requisite structure is in place, but the full assessment cycle has yet to be implemented. Completion of several Program Reviews indicates that faculty and staff have an increasingly clear understanding of the cycle and its rationale, and it is anticipated that it will soon be fully established.

Planning Agenda

The College must ensure that the mission remains the focus for planning and decision-making.

The Planning Council must establish and communicate clear policies and procedures, and will monitor their full implementation.

I.B. Improving Institutional Effectiveness

The institution demonstrates a conscious effort to produce and support student learning, measures that learning, assesses how well learning is occurring, and makes changes to improve student learning. The institution also organizes its key processes and allocates its effectiveness by providing 1) evidence of the achievement of student learning outcomes and 2) evidence of institution and program
performance. The institution uses ongoing and systematic evaluation and planning to refine its key processes and improve student learning.

I.B.1. The institution maintains an ongoing, collegial, self-reflective dialogue about the continuous improvement of student learning and institutional processes.

Descriptive Summary

Honolulu Community College engages in a multi-layered, cross-campus, self-reflective dialogue regarding student learning, institutional processes, and the continuous improvement of the college as a whole. Significant dialogue has taken place and continues to occur related to the mission statement, college goals and strategies, accreditation, student learning outcomes, the curriculum development process, program review, the budget and planning process, and other aspects of college life that affect student learning.

These discussions occur in many forms, and include the faculty, staff, students, businesses and the community, as well as other community colleges in the system. The dialogue includes the presentation of new ideas, discussion of concerns, objections, review of documents, revisions, and specific outcomes. Although some of these forums may not be seen conventionally as a place where dialogue may occur, they do promote discussions, foster a sense of collegiality and encourage development of new ideas, new procedures and processes—all in an effort to achieve the college’s mission and improve student learning.

Education about Assessment: One important part of the process has been to first educate the campus community about the assessment model focusing on student learning, institutional outcomes, and institutional effectiveness. One way that faculty and staff have increased their understanding of student learning and assessment is by attending workshops sponsored by the Faculty Development and Assessment Committees [Faculty Development], Excellence in Education day, and the General Education Board [GE Board]. The knowledge gained from these workshops has been used to increase the dialogue across campus about Student Learning Outcomes (SLOs), and to develop course and program SLOs and program review reports. Attendees have had the opportunity to discuss student needs, share ideas, create plans, and write measurable outcomes, all with the goal of increasing institutional effectiveness.

Intranet: The college intranet [Intranet] continues to be an important source of information for college faculty and administration. It is in part an electronic archive of information on college structure, policy and procedures, committee work, reports, memos, flow charts, and organizational charts. It is continually revised and updated, and postings are quick to go on-line for college access and review. While this is a one-way type of communication, it is still a good place for Intranet users to find the information needed to participate in dialogue regarding campus issues. Increasingly the college Intranet site is the primary resource for information and the official posting site for a variety of assessment evidence, from course SLOs to completed Program Reviews.
E-mail: E-mail is another form of communication used to facilitate dialogue across all areas of the campus. Many committees use the college e-mail system to announce the posting of minutes, introduce new issues at hand, to ask for campus feedback, and to inform the college of meetings or voting that will be taking place. Committees also send out drafts and then revised versions of reports, surveys, and policy documents so that the college faculty and staff may offer comments and suggestions. Recent examples include the mission statement revisions, the accreditation progress report, and the student engagement survey. There is often feedback to these announcements, as people respond with their concerns and suggestions. However the feedback generally goes directly back to the committee, and not to the college at large. This limits the discussion, so the sender or committee knows the college response to the issue, but the college as a whole is sometimes not aware of all the feedback.

Campus committees: The committee structure at Honolulu Community College creates another forum for dialogue regarding student learning outcomes and institutional processes, both within the committees as well as across committees. Several committees are directly concerned with improving student learning at the college, and with developing or institutionalizing processes that will achieve that goal. There are also several committees that regularly discuss the mission statement, college goals and strategies, research on student learning and student learning outcomes, program review, and student learning and budget decisions. [Committees]

Cross-committee discussion continues and expands the dialogue process. This is defined as: members who are also members of other committees and introduce information from one committee meeting into another committee meeting for the purpose of further discussion of the issue, to spread the information across divisions and to staff and student members, and to garner feedback and new ideas. Most committee members participate or serve on several committees. In fact, the overlapping membership is often mandated and institutionalized to ensure that important issues are discussed from multiple perspectives and given different levels of review. [Org Charts]

Committee meeting minutes are usually posted on the HCC intranet. Over the last two years most of the committees have greatly improved their communication with the college at large by consistently and quickly posting their minutes after each meeting. A college-wide e-mail is usually sent to announce the posting of the minutes, to give a summary of the minutes, and to include a direct link to the minutes on the committee web page. They are a source of information as well as an officially recorded document of any dialogue that has taken place. [Committee Minutes]

Among the key campus committees involved in planning, governance and assessment are the Faculty Senate Executive Committee (FSEC), the Staff Senate Executive Committee (SSEC), Campus Leadership Team (CLT), Committee on Programs and Curricula (CPC), Division Curriculum Committees (DCCs), the General Education Board, and the new Planning Council.
Other Forums: There are several other forums for dialogue across the college, including department and division meetings. Dialogue regarding student learning, measurable outcomes, program review, and institutional effectiveness are often key agenda items at these meetings. Each division usually holds a meeting at the beginning of each semester and may meet more frequently to deal with division concerns. These division meetings are generally informal in nature, though a specific agenda may be set, and are not always documented with minutes.

Town Meetings: Occasional campus-wide meetings provide another forum for open discussion on issues and concerns pertinent to the college. Open to the entire campus community, they offer an opportunity for the broad-based communication of information and for dialogue with a broad spectrum of participation.

The college has engaged in the dialogue process regarding several key issues related to student learning and institutional processes. These include revising the College Mission Statement, chartering a College Planning Council, writing new Curriculum Proposal Flow Charts and a Curriculum Reference Book, creating the General Education and Articulation Process Reference Book, developing the Strategic Planning/Budget Process, the Program Review Schedule, program review templates, writing new department and course SLOs, and designing assessment tools to measure the SLOs.

Revised Mission Statement: After considerable dialogue throughout the college campus, the FSEC, SSEC and CLT have approved the revised mission statement, a move that will provide a clearer understanding of the goals of the college, and allow the various programs to investigate how well their curriculum and Student Learning Outcomes fulfill the mission statement. [FSEC 8/26/05]; [SSEC 9/12/05]; [CLT 8/22/05]; [Catalog 05-06]; [Intranet]; [HCC]

The Planning Council: Discussion about the Planning Council began last year in response to comments and suggestions made by AACJC/WASC. It was suggested that the college needed better cross-college discussion and transparency regarding planning, budget decisions, and how this linked to program review, student learning, and the mission statement. After broad-based discussion, the Planning Council Charter was approved, members were selected, and the council has begun to meet. [PC]

Curriculum Handbook and Curriculum Proposal Flow Charts: The Curriculum Handbook contains policy and instructions related to curriculum and program development at HCC. It is intended to provide information to anyone involved in the design, modification or evaluation of programs and curricula. A draft of this document was created in Spring 2005. The 2005-06 CPC is preparing a revised version with input from the FSEC and the Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs. As part of the effort to ensure that all involved understand how the curriculum process proceeds for each type of curriculum action, the CPC has also developed a Curriculum Proposal Flow Chart. [CPC]

Honolulu Community College Strategic Planning/Budget Process: Through extensive dialogue across campus, the college also developed another institutional process called
the Strategic Planning/Budget Process, which links student learning and program outcomes together with the college’s planning and budget decisions. The various components were put into a timeline/flow chart, and it provides the college with a specific timeline and deadlines for assessment, planning, proposals, and decision-making. There are also allotted times in this schedule for Town Meetings and formal college-wide discussion regarding all these issues. [Planning Documents]; [Chancellor’s Memo]

Program Review/ Schedule: The program review schedule, which includes use of a uniform template and process, the customized review of individual programs, assessment and program revisions, was developed to guarantee linkages between a) course, department, and college SLOS and the Mission Statement; b) course-based Student Learning Outcomes and Program Learning Outcomes; and c) program planning and budget decision-making. The FSEC discussed and revised the program review schedule during 2004-2005, then posted it on the Intranet and sent it to other committees and the college for review, discussion, and feedback. The schedule has been implemented and the first Program Reviews are now completed. [Program Review Guidelines]; [Program Reviews]

As an essential part of the program review process, the campus has focused on the identification of Student Learning Outcomes (SLOs) beginning at the individual course level and expanding to the program and unit levels. Attention has also been paid to developing consistency, where needed, between institutions in order to facilitate the articulation of courses. There continues to be extensive dialogue regarding SLOs at various levels within the campus community.

This year the Assessment Committee, the CPC and the FSEC formally approved a timeline for all programs to complete their SLOs. In the spring of 2006, all departments will also have to identify the assessment tools they will use to measure the SLOs. The CPC also approved the decision that all proposals for new courses and the courses applying for recertification would have to include SLOs, as well as assessment tools and student evaluations. SLOs for most of the college programs are currently listed on the Intranet [Intranet], the HCC Website [HCC], and a few are included in the 2005-2006 college catalog. [Catalog 05-06]

**Evaluation**

The College partially meets this standard. It has been able to differentiate between the transmission of information (one-way communication) and genuine dialogue in which multiple perspectives may be brought to bear on the issues at hand. Dialogue broadens the base of participation in planning and decision-making, and makes more transparent those processes, as more members of the campus community, including lecturers and part-time faculty are informed and engaged.

The College has also been able to utilize dialogue in the context of key issues of concern to the campus. As a result of discussions and assessment activities, changes indicated as necessary have already been implemented at various levels, including courses, programs
and institutional operations. Such discussions, while engaging various committees involved in governance and other aspects of campus life, have also created an awareness of the need to coordinate more effectively the work of committees, their areas of responsibility and their lines of communication.

As noted above, the College is in a period of transition, in which much of the conceptual foundation for an assessment-based cycle of planning, review, refinement and modification has been laid, but not yet fully implemented. In other words, the loop has not been closed that would allow another phase of assessment (including research and the gathering and analysis of data) to guide further growth and the continuing improvement of the institution. In general, the College recognizes the need to engage in ongoing dialogue as a key component of the process of improvement of student learning. It generally encourages that dialogue by supporting various venues for exchange and discussion of ideas. It continues to work on institutionalizing that process, most notably in getting feedback from all areas of the college and in recording the dialogue process.

HCC is committed to achieving its Mission Statement and improving student learning, and recognizes that engaging in college-wide dialogue is one way to improve institutional processes. HCC has always engaged in dialogue regarding these issues, but realizes that it can always improve the quality of that dialogue and the ways in which it is documented.

It is too soon to tell whether dialogue has led to a collective understanding of the meaning of data and research used in the evaluation of student learning because a) not all programs and units of the college have completed a full cycle of planning and assessment; and b) no assessment at the institutional level has been conducted to measure the breadth of that collective understanding.

**Planning Agenda**

The Planning Council must work to ensure transparency in discussions regarding major campus initiatives including review of the Strategic Plan and budget cycles, so that all members of the campus community are informed about and have an opportunity to participate in those discussions. The Planning Council will, prior to the College’s next mid-term review, develop and implement an assessment of the extent to which a comprehensive understanding of the new cycle of research, planning, implementation and assessment has become part of the institutional culture.

The College must ensure that dialogue about other matters of interest and concern to the campus is as broad-based as possible, encouraging active participation and timely opportunities for feedback. This may involve more department- and division-level projects that would improve participation in and feedback on college-wide projects.

The College must make more effort to include lecturers and part-time faculty in more dialogue and decision-making, and will ensure that they are included in channels of communication.
The FSEC and other bodies involved in campus governance must review committee structure to enhance cross-committee communication while avoiding counter-productive redundancy. This should also ensure that opportunities for participation in campus governance and decision-making are open to as many interested faculty and staff as possible.

I.B.2. The institution sets goals to improve its effectiveness consistent with its stated purposes. The institution articulates its goals and states the objectives derived from them in measurable terms so that the degree to which they are achieved can be determined and widely discussed. The institutional members understand these goals and work collaboratively toward their achievement.

Descriptive Summary

The College Institutional Goals are included as part of the Mission Statement. As described in Section I.A., the college recently completed a review of the Mission and revision of institutional goals and adopted a systematic Mission Review Process in December 2005.

The Strategic Goals of the College are identified in the 2003-2010 Strategic Plan. They are linked to the strategic themes of the Strategic Plan of the UH Community Colleges. The pathways to achieving Strategic Goals are defined by strategies and activities. Activities are sometimes but not always stated in measurable terms, e.g. “increase,” “expand,” “collect,” “create.” None of the activities have quantitative or qualitative benchmarks or indicators attached to them. Institutional Goals are also generally stated, e.g., “provide,” “insure,” “maintain,” without benchmarks or indicators.

In Spring 2005 an annual Strategic Plan review cycle was approved. A revision of the Strategic Plan was completed in February 2006 during the first year of implementation of the complete integrated planning, budgeting and review cycles. The revision is more detailed than previous versions of the Plan including four additional areas that must be addressed. Proposed activities must specify their relationship to system CC Strategic Planning goals and HCC Mission and Goals, provide justification and supporting data, and address possible consequences if the activity is not implemented.

From December 2005 until February 2006 Strategic Plan revisions were solicited from all campus units through division chairs and general email notices. Drafts were posted on the intranet for campus wide review. The final revision along with the Budgeting Review process to be completed in Spring 2006 will provide evidence of institutional commitment to achieve identified goals.

In response to the ACCJC/WASC Progress Visit Team Report (April 7, 2005), the College established a Planning Council in Fall 2005 to centralize and guide planning functions, including the annual review and revision of the Strategic Plan. Initial design of
the Planning Council emerged from the Chancellor’s Retreat in August 2005. Administrators, faculty and staff leadership attended the retreat.

In its charter the Planning Council is charged with “ensuring integration of results of Annual Assessments and Program Reviews into the College Strategic Plan and decision-making processes.” The Planning Council is responsible for ensuring broad-based understanding of the Institutional and Strategic Goals and the processes to implement them through the following responsibilities as outlined in the charter: “... developing, publicizing and utilizing criteria to prioritize planning and budgeting initiatives; ... coordinating communication with and between governance bodies; ... discussing, and convening forums for campus-wide discussion of key College issues ...” The Chancellor has committed to a review of the Planning Council’s effectiveness at the end of one year. [PC Review], p. 16

Evaluation

The College partially meets the standard. Significant progress has been made. Requiring connection between the Institutional Goals of the Mission and the Strategic Goals of the Strategic Plan is a good first step. While the Annual Assessment, Program Review and Strategic Planning and Budgeting Cycles and processes are well defined, the college has not yet experienced a complete cycle. The current Strategic Plan revision does not reflect the planning and analysis that completion of the cycle will yield for future revisions. The new Planning Council appears to be on track in ensuring that goals are consistent with the mission and in giving the campus community many opportunities to contribute to the plans, strategies and activities that will be used to achieve the goals. The next challenge will be to determine short term, intermediate and long term outcomes as well as benchmarks and/or progress indicators at the institutional level that will allow the College to track the extent to which the goals have been met. Action plans emerging from Program Reviews and Annual Assessments already incorporate outcomes and benchmarks at the program level as the result of analysis of data elements and assessment of student and program learning outcomes.

There is good use of the college Intranet and e-mail to disseminate information about the Institutional and Strategic Goals. Division Chairs are charged with working with instructional program faculty, and faculty and staff development activities have been helpful for those who are able to attend them. However there are no standard policies and procedures that would help to ensure equitable opportunities for faculty and staff members' participation in the integrated planning cycle. Additional strategies may be needed to help all college units truly understand the relationship between their activities and the institution's goals. Evaluation of the effectiveness of these approaches could strengthen future implementation of the Strategic Planning and Budgeting Process.

Planning Agenda
The Planning Council must establish short term, intermediate and long term measurable outcomes along with progress indicators for each Strategic Goal, along with a method for tracking progress.

The Planning Council and Campus Leadership Team must work together to develop policies and procedures to ensure that all members of the campus community have formal and informal opportunities to give input to the development of outcomes and indicators as well as to any changes in Strategic Goals.

I.B.3. The institution assesses progress toward achieving its stated goals and makes decisions regarding the improvement of institutional effectiveness in an ongoing and systematic cycle of evaluation, integrated planning, resource allocation, implementation, and re-evaluation. Evaluation is based on analyses of both quantitative and qualitative data.

Descriptive Summary

The College has fully embraced ongoing planning and is functioning as a learning community, constructing a shared understanding of the processes and outcomes that will result in the use of planning to improve institutional outcomes for students, programs and the community.

An integrated planning process is in place, guided by the newly established Planning Council. The process links program assessment (through Annual Assessments and Program Reviews) to the Strategic Plan and Budgeting Process, which are designed to fulfill the Mission and Institutional Goals. The cycle calls for annual review of the Strategic Plan and Budgeting Process, annual program assessments, and 5-year cumulative program reviews to determine trends. The Planning Council is taking care to ensure that all components of the College are meaningfully assessed and the results of assessment incorporated in the planning process. For example, the Council has agreed to investigate processes for assessing the College administration as a unit just as instructional programs and academic support programs are assessed. [PC 1/27/06]

The Community College System has agreed upon a common data set for Annual Assessments and Program Reviews. For the College, Management Information and Research (MIR) and Administrative Services provide the data and technical assistance in their interpretation. Institutional and system level data are also available on the Assessment website [Assessment] and in Management and Planning Support (MAPS) reports. [MAPS] Qualitative data is available through faculty, staff and student opinion surveys, focus group reports and minutes of advisory committee meetings.

Evaluation

The College partially meets the standard through the establishment of the systematic cycle of evaluation, integrated planning, resource allocation, implementation, and re-evaluation outlined in the Strategic Plan Review and Budgeting Process flow chart, the
completion of scheduled Program Reviews, and the on-going dialog and decision-making in the Planning Council as processes and procedures are fine-tuned. The breadth and depth of quantitative and qualitative data available to support evaluation and planning is further evidence of the College’s commitment to improving institutional effectiveness. Specific processes and procedures for assessing progress and decision-making based on such assessment await the identification of measurable outcomes and indicators as well as procedures for incorporating assessment outcomes in the decision-making process.

Planning Agenda

The Planning Council must develop criteria and procedures to integrate results of Annual Assessments and Program Reviews into the Strategic Plan and decision-making process.

The Planning Council must develop measures for assessing institutional progress.

The Planning Council must develop guidelines for making recommendations to the Chancellor for decision-making and resource allocation purposes.

I.B.4. The institution provides evidence that the planning process is broad-based, offers opportunities for input by appropriate constituencies, allocates necessary resources, and leads to improvement of institutional effectiveness.

Descriptive Summary

The Planning Council composition guarantees representation of all college units and constituencies in the planning process. The Faculty Senate Executive Committee (FSEC) agreed to the faculty representation on the Council with the condition that FSEC will review after one year and make adjustments to faculty representation if it deems it necessary. [FSEC 9/09/05] Broad-based participation of faculty and staff in College planning is also supported through the Campus Leadership Team’s (CLT) oversight of short term planning and decision making, for example in the determination of the allocation of resources among programs such as equipment purchases and student assistant positions. In addition all campus units participate in Annual Assessments and 5-year Program Reviews and the incorporation of their results and recommendations for action into the Strategic Plan and Budgeting Process. The planned overlapping membership on College committees (see I.B.1) is another mechanism that facilitates broad participation.

Priorities identified in the Strategic Plan are incorporated in the budget submitted to the Board of Regents for approval as part of the University’s budget. The Planning Council recommends priorities to the administration which finalizes the budget. (email from Ken Kato, Vice Chancellor of Administrative Services, April 3, 2006) When resources to fully fund priorities are not received through the University or legislative budgeting process, the College may reallocate resources internally or seek external sources of funds through expanding revenues for noncredit workforce training, obtaining grants from government agencies or private foundations, or establishing partnerships with private
businesses or nonprofit entities. Examples include short-term funding of an Assessment Officer through the Perkins grant; non-credit training offered through the International Students Program and the Pacific Center for Advanced Technology Training (PCATT); Native Hawaiian programs developed through a Title III grant; a partnership with the Polynesian Voyaging Society and the Marine Education and Training Center, and initial development of a 2+2 program in early childhood education through a P-20 Innovation Grant.

Examples of changes that have occurred as a result of implemented plans include:

- Reorganization of the College administrative structure [Org Charts]
- Implementation of an integrated cycle of Annual Assessments, Program Reviews, institutional planning and budgeting [Program Reviews]; [Strategic Plan Review]
- Development of a 3rd year certificate for the Communications and Electronic Networking Program (CENT) [CENT]
- Development of a 2+2 AS to BA articulation in Early Childhood Education
- Development of a Native Hawaiian Resource Center and partnership with the Polynesian Voyaging Society [Retreat2]
- Implementation of a Construction Academy in partnership with public high schools [Retreat2]

Evaluation

The College partially meets this standard. The planning process guarantees broad-based participation from all College constituencies. Resources are allocated or sought based on planning priorities. However there is no evidence of systematic tracking of the implementation of plans and the results that document the improvement of institutional effectiveness.

Planning Agenda

The Planning Council and MIR must develop and implement a system for tracking the results of plan implementation in order to document and measure progress in achievement of Institutional and Strategic Goals.

I.B.5. The institution uses documented assessment results to communicate matters of quality assurance to appropriate constituencies.

Descriptive Summary

Management and Planning Support (MAPS) Reports [MAPS] are the primary source of data. These are reports that are based on data from the Operational Data Store (the data warehouse) that extrapolates data from Banner, a computerized student information system (SIS) utilized by the state’s institutions of higher education. The College also uses STAR (Student Tracking and Auditing Report) for certifying that students have met their degree requirements, for creating reports on low-enrolled courses, for reporting
class fill rates, and for reporting persistence and retention. The National Clearinghouse Database is used primarily for reporting transfers, but also for stop-outs and graduation. The Community College Survey on Student Engagement (CCSSE) [CCSSE]; [Student Survey] and in-house reports generated through Survey Pro help track and report on student satisfaction and success. The College also uses Access Database (with data taken from the MAPS Reports) to supply information to programs engaged in Annual Assessment and Five-Year Program Reviews.

These various sources of data, utilized on a day-to-day or periodic basis by the college and the state system as a whole, are assumed to be accurate as there is no evidence to suggest otherwise. The Banner system, developed to provide better management of student and curriculum data and to facilitate transfer of information between institutions in the University of Hawai‘i system, continues to undergo modifications and refinements as its users become more familiar with and proficient in its use. There are several levels of accessibility (e.g., for students, for faculty, for system administrators.) The MAPS reports, prepared by the system’s Institutional Research Office and accessible through the UH website, are current through the 2003-2004 academic year.

While Banner and MAPS could provide reports in various forms on student achievement, the only kind of report that is generally made available is the Dean’s List, generated each semester. This list is published in the student newspaper [Ka La], intended primarily for in-house communication and not broadly read. The college in general does little in the way of systematic public communication about student learning and achievement. Data on student learning and achievement may underlie statements of student success as highlighted in promotional brochures prepared for individual programs at the college. The HS2HCC outreach program, implemented in 2003 and targeted for high-school juniors and seniors and their counselors, provides another venue for sharing information on opportunities for student learning and achievement. Assessment of HS2HCC has begun to track whether students who attend this event subsequently register at HCC or in the system [HS2HCC]. Phi Theta Kappa (honor society) Induction and Graduation ceremonies are the most public occasions during which student achievement is noted and celebrated, but these are informed more by holistic assessment than by statistics. General public relations for the college have been handled informally by one faculty member, who has been very resourceful in using contacts with the media to highlight noteworthy individuals and college events on campus and in the community. To date there have been no sustained efforts to institutionalize this function within the college.

Evaluation

The College does not meet this standard. The College is still in transition in the process of becoming an assessment-based institution, and the data that have been or are being gathered are most relevant to individual courses, programs or units within the college, rather than to the institution as a whole. Further, those data (and other tools of assessment) are being used primarily for decision-making internal to the college, rather than for the creation or ongoing cultivation of the public face of the institution as a whole.
As noted above, the college has not invested significant resources in public relations, advertising for student recruitment purposes or in the general cultivation of public awareness of its full mission. There has been, therefore, little reason or incentive to assess the effectiveness of communication efforts. To the extent that HCC is known in the community it is more often perceived as focused on Career Technical Education, with the comprehensive nature of its mission and the quality of its Liberal Arts program less visible. The lack of effective and sustained communication ensures that that perception is unlikely to change.

**Planning Agenda**

The College, through the Planning Council or its designee, must conduct a communications audit, assessing its own methods of conveying information about the college and the quality of its programs. In an increasingly competitive enrollment environment, the college’s mission, programs and services should be accurately and attractively communicated. If, as is likely, the audit indicates a need for more substantial investment in public communication, that need should be addressed in future budget planning.

1.B.6. **The institution assures the effectiveness of its ongoing planning and resource allocation processes by systematically reviewing and modifying, as appropriate, all parts of the cycle, including institutional and other research efforts.**

**Descriptive Summary**

The Planning Council is charged with the responsibility of overseeing the cycle of evaluation, integrated planning, resource allocation, implementation and re-evaluation. The Chancellor has committed to a review of the Planning Council's effectiveness after one year. [Retreat] The Faculty Senate Executive Committee (FSEC), at its March 24, 2006 meeting, agreed to conduct brief surveys of Planning Council members and the campus community with the intention of providing the Planning Council with feedback that would enable mid-course corrections if needed. [FSEC 3/24/06]

Although these preliminary efforts are encouraging, there is no evidence of other plans to systematically assess the planning and resource allocation processes, and there is no evidence to date that the college planning process is effective in fostering improvement.

**Evaluation**

The College does not meet this standard. The effectiveness of the cycle of planning, implementation and review cannot be fully assessed until completion of a full cycle. However, an evaluation design that includes gathering information throughout the cycle will provide not only an assessment at the conclusion of the cycle, but also the opportunity to make adjustments that will improve effectiveness along the way.
Planning Agenda

The Planning Council, the Assessment Committee and MIR must design and implement a systematic assessment process for the planning and resource allocation processes that includes formative evaluation and procedures for recommending appropriate modifications and adjustments.

I.B.7. The institution assesses its evaluation mechanisms through a systematic review of their effectiveness in improving instructional programs, student support services, and library and other learning support services.

Descriptive Summary

The College has long mandated the evaluation of individual courses and instructors by students. These evaluations provide valuable immediate feedback for faculty in refining their courses, and are also used, along with peer evaluations, in the assessment of faculty, particularly lecturers and probationary faculty, in the process of contract renewal. The College has for some time also used the process of Program Review to assess the status of its programs in Career Technical Education. More recently, the model of Annual Assessment and Program Review model has been streamlined and more comprehensively applied to all academic programs and to other support and administrative units in the college. A schedule for completion of Program Reviews has been established, so that within five years all areas will have completed a current program review. A common set of data fields for academic programs has been identified and the college’s institutional research staff is providing those to each program as a basis for more detailed narrative and qualitative as well as quantitative assessment. [Program Review Guidelines]; [Program Review Templates]; [Program Reviews]

Previously, Program Reviews (as noted above, for Career Technical Education programs) were useful in identifying areas that needed closer attention or remediation (e.g., frequency of intake, course offerings and sequence, program viability.) Though the new model of Program Review for more areas of the college is too newly implemented to have produced significant results, it is expected that such review will become an essential assessment tool and will factor significantly into institutional planning and resource allocation. The Program Review model has been adopted by the campus library [Library Review], Student Services, and by other units of the campus. In several instances it has led to already-implemented improvements.

Evaluation

The College partially meets this standard. The Program Review process, though newly implemented, has already produced the first set of completed reviews, which are now posted on the college intranet for in-house review, and can serve as models for those programs scheduled for review at a later date. Closing the loop, i.e., using conclusions drawn from the Program Reviews to institute future refinements in each program and in the review process itself, is the next critical step.
Planning Agenda

The college must proceed with full implementation of the system of comprehensive Annual Assessments and Program Reviews at the college, and monitor their use in a) generating modifications at the program level, and b) integrated planning and resource allocation at the institutional level (e.g., through the college’s newly established Planning Council.)