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.

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

The leaders at Honolulu Community College are members of the administration, faculty, staff, and students. Governance at Honolulu Community College is a joint responsibility of that leadership. Various committees and individuals discuss and plan improvements in the practices, programs and services of the College.

The Standard IV Team has identified the following key individuals and committees as crucial to governance:

- Chancellor
- Vice Chancellor of Academic Affairs
- Vice Chancellor of Administrative Services
- Program Deans and Directors
- Director of Management Information and Research
- Dean of Student Services
- Division Chairs
- Planning Council
- Campus Leadership Team
- Faculty Senate Executive Committee
- Staff Senate Executive Committee
- Student Senate

Governance at Honolulu Community College requires the involvement of representatives of all major campus constituencies in the campus decision making and prioritization process.
Figure IV.1: Governance Flowchart

Figure IV.1 shows the relationships between the individuals and committees listed here. [Note: this Flowchart is also posted on our web page, using layers. The layers make it possible to see the “reports to,” “recommends to,” and “is a member of” relationships separately.]

[Governance Flowchart]
Self Evaluation

The College partially meets the Standard. The structure described above makes it possible for any member of the College community to have access to the governance process. There is some question, however, about the collegial process. There is concern, for example, about how ideas for improvement are received by the administration.

To measure the perceptions of the faculty and staff regarding that access and how well it works, the College conducted a 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. [Faculty/Staff Survey] Of the 135 full-time faculty, 101 (75%) completed and returned the survey. Of the 123 members of the staff, 77 (63%) completed and returned the survey. And 21 of the 105 lecturers (20%) returned their surveys. That survey found a disparity between the 60% of the respondents who felt that they have “sufficient opportunity to participate in campus governance” and the 51% of the campus at large that felt that the Chancellor establishes a collegial process. These numbers suggest that there is some way to go to make the structure of governance collegial and participative. There is a perception of access to the governance process, but the feeling of collegiality in governance is less solid. [Faculty/Staff Survey Data]

In an attempt to measure actual practice, the Standard IV Team met with past and present Division Chairs, past and present chairs of the Faculty Senate Executive Committee (FSEC), members of the Staff Senate Executive Committee (SSEC), and with the Chancellor and the Vice Chancellor of Academic Affairs (VCAA) during the Spring and Fall Semesters of 2005. [FSEC] [SSEC] Members of the Team attended the question and answer sessions with the Vice Chancellor of Administrative Services (VCAS). The results of those meetings and other research follow.

Encouraging collegiality and effectiveness in the governance process is clearly a part of the Chancellor's responsibilities, both according to ACCJC/WASC, and according to the descriptions of the responsibilities of the Chancellor in the University of Hawai‘i System and the College's Functional Statements. [Functional Statements, page 2] The Chancellor is responsible for the operations of the College and the professional growth of its faculty and staff, as well as making certain that the College provides for community needs and a safe, flexible, and effective learning environment for students. The Board of Regents policies provide for faculty participation in governance as partners with the Chancellor. [BOR Policies Ch1, page 8] The Chancellor characterized himself in his interview with the Standard IV Team as the CEO of the College. [Chancellor Interview] In all, these perceptions of the content of the Chancellor's job correspond with the perceptions found in the survey, and most faculty understand what the Chancellor’s job is. The degree of collegiality on the campus, then, to some degree will reflect the Chancellor’s commitment to that part of his responsibilities.

In the Team’s discussions with former Division Chairs about their role in Campus Governance and their perceptions of the collegiality of the process, some Division Chairs raised concerns about constant change in the purview of the CLT without consultation, and hence in the
responsibilities of the Division Chairs. The consensus was that such change was based on evolving critical College needs. [Div Chairs minutes] According to these current and past Division Chairs, the Campus Leadership Team (CLT) has no real authority or role in campus decision making. The minutes of CLT meetings show only a few occasions where votes are taken on campus matters. There is also evidence in the meeting minutes that the Division Chairs and former FSEC Chairs are correct in their characterization of the CLT as being “more operational” in nature than the FSEC. [CLT Minutes] [FSEC/SSEC minutes] The general inconclusiveness in the discussion with both FSEC chairs and Division Chairs leads to a sense that both bodies can perform in the place of the other, and this lack of clarity can impede the decision-making process.

A further concern in this area is the fact that the Aeronautics faculty do not have a Division Chair. This has resulted in spotty representation at CLT meetings, and difficulty in handling other responsibilities that normally belong to the Division Chair as a member of the faculty, including episodes in which Aeronautics faculty have been uninformed about important College issues. Without proper representation on CLT, the Aeronautics faculty cannot participate in the governance process. The same thing can be said about representation on the FSEC. In order to be fully participating members of the faculty at the College, the Aeronautics faculty should be represented on the FSEC.

Similar concerns have been voiced about the faculty in the Pacific Center for Advanced Technology Training (PCATT). There is a PCATT representative on the CLT, but there is no “Division Chair” representation, and there is no PCATT representation at all on the FSEC.

This evidence appears to suggest that collegiality in the governance processes is not a top priority when administrators organize campus structures. That appearance, whether true or not, can itself be damaging to collegiality in the College, and to morale within the faculty and staff.

The SSEC is the voice of the staff. The SSEC provides input and makes recommendations to the administration on matters relating to College operations, budget, and staffing. The SSEC solicits and considers all suggestions and inquiries from staff members and then makes appropriate recommendations. The existence of this committee has been a major improvement in staff access to governance at the College, and has resulted in Planning Council, FSEC and CLT invitations to the Chair of SSEC to be a regular participant in their meetings. The SSEC has in the two years of its current form become integral to governance at the College. The Chancellor has encouraged the formation and participation of SSEC in College governance, and continues to encourage administrators to provide time for staff to attend meetings and do governance-related work.

The Chancellor was instrumental in creating the Planning Council, and this body is becoming the primary planning advisory body to the Chancellor. [PC] The responsibilities of the Planning Council include reviewing and analyzing Program Review Reports as well as Annual Assessment Reports (required of all programs). Program needs gleaned from these reports will be prioritized and integrated into the College’s Strategic Plan, which is the primary document
used to prioritize budget proposals for the College. [Strategic Plan] The Planning Council was formed after the Faculty/Staff survey was designed so none of the questions on that survey were concerned with that committee. Although the Planning Council has held few meetings by the time of the writing of this document, it is clear that proper use of the Planning Council by members of the College, including the faculty, staff, and administrators, to facilitate discussion about College priorities and planning for the future will ensure the integrity of College governance and its relevance to the success of the College in the future. Misuse of the Planning Council could result in the developmental decay of governance at the College, and the eventual obsolescence of FSEC, CLT, and other critical governance committees. The gravity of a committee at the level of the Planning Council suggests that the Council needs to decide how its discussions will be governed, and whether the necessary formality of discussion requires a chair, and how that chair will be selected. The Planning Council also should provide formal published minutes after each meeting. [PC]

In all, the key to stable and effective governance at the College for the foreseeable future appears to be the degree to which collegiality is encouraged and flourishes in these major committees and their sub committees, and the degree to which they can work together to achieve truly consultative decision-making practices. As the final decision-maker at the College, the Chancellor holds primary responsibility for encouraging this kind of collegiality, and should do so by being himself an exemplar of collegiality in practice.

Planning Agenda

- The College should continue to encourage faculty and staff to participate in leadership and governance.
- The Chancellor should affirm his commitment to collegiality in governance, and demonstrate support for faculty and staff participation and consultation on College issues as discussed in the ACCJC/WASC Standards and the Board of Regents policies.
- The College should review the organizational structure to insure that all faculty members have appropriate representation on the Planning Council, FSEC and CLT.
- The Charter of the Planning Council should be amended so that the Council has a Chair.

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
As mentioned above, the University of Hawai`i Board of Regents’ policies state that the faculty of each college is the primary body responsible for curriculum. The policy also states that the faculty and Chancellor must work together to create a governance structure in which all issues which might affect the institution's ability to achieve its mission be discussed, and that the campus have a major advisory voice in all decisions about those issues. [BOR Policies Ch1, page 8]

Outside of the University of Hawai`i Board of Regents policy, Honolulu Community College does not have a specific written policy providing for faculty, staff, administrator, and student participation in decision-making processes, nor is there any mechanism specified by which issues, concerns and ideas can be brought to the governance structure. The College’s Strategic Plan is the basis for institutional planning and budget formulation. [Strategic Plan] While the ultimate decision rests with the Chancellor, governance committees have a strong voice in specific areas of responsibility and expertise. These committees are the primary way by which the faculty and staff of the College participate in governance and provide leadership within the College community. [Committees] The history and role of the Planning Council, FSEC, SSEC and CLT are described in more detail in the Introduction.

The Associated Students of the University of Hawai`i, Honolulu Community College (ASUH-HCC), is the Student Senate, composed of sixteen voting senators. [Student Senate] Most of the standing governance committees have a student representative from ASUH-HCC.

Self Evaluation

The College partially meets the Standard. The Standards in this section overlap with those in section IV.A.1., which have been discussed above. Thus the Self Evaluation in that Standard applies also to this one.

Continuing reorganization of the College has led to as many questions as answers when it comes to the mechanisms by which Faculty and Staff members make their ideas and concerns known to the governance system and to those in leadership positions at the College.

While the CLT is a decision-making body, those decisions that are made appear to be for day-to-day operations and not for decisions at the strategic level. FSEC minutes show that the statements of some of the former FSEC chairs are accurate in that often the Chancellor comes to FSEC meetings in order to distribute information rather than to consult and hear what the faculty are thinking. One of the key concerns that came up a number of times was that committees should not function only as information dissemination systems, but should be a part of the decision making structure.

The Faculty/Staff survey contained two statements designed to help determine how the faculty feel about the Division Chair selection process. The first was “The faculty in each division should be responsible for the selection of their Division Chair” and the second was “The faculty
in each division are responsible for the selection of their division chair.” There was a significant
difference of opinion among the faculty on these two questions. The first question received the
highest mean score of all the questions on the survey, and the second ranked near the middle.
The Agreement between the University and the faculty covers the selection process for Division
Chairs. That Agreement stipulates that faculty have a strong voice in selecting their Division
Chairs. [Faculty Contract, page 43] There is a difference of opinion on campus regarding the
Division Chair selection process. Some people feel that the choice is often made by the
administration, while others would argue that so few faculty members have been willing to serve
that no real selection process works. It would appear to be important to address this question by
finding data on which to base a real discussion.

One of the least clearly defined governance roles is that of Division Chair. This person is
responsible to both administration and faculty. According to former Division Chairs, their role
is often unclear, there is no orientation for new Division Chairs, and there is no clear description
of the duties and responsibilities of a Division Chair. [Div Chairs minutes]

Planning Agenda

- The Chancellor should consult with and listen to the faculty and staff, rather than simply
  disseminate information.
- The College should determine whether or not the UHPA Agreement is being followed in the
  Division Chair selection process, and if it isn’t being followed, steps must be taken to insure
  that it is followed in the future.

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 Board of Regents gives primary responsibility on curriculum matters to the faculty. [BOR
Policies Ch1, page 8] The faculty—via the FSEC—has delegated that responsibility to the
Committee on Programs and Curricula (CPC).

The CPC is a subcommittee of the FSEC responsible for curriculum matters. [CPC] The CPC
is responsible for approving all changes in curriculum (which in most cases have been approved
by and passed up from the individual Division Curriculum Committees). The faculty have
primary responsibility for curriculum content, subject matter, and methods of instruction. The
CPC represents the faculty’s interest in maintaining the quality of curriculum at Honolulu
Community College. For example, the CPC recently approved a motion to require that all new
course and program proposals have SLO’s in order to be approved.
The Division Curriculum Committees (DCCs) represent the curriculum interests of each Division. Their members review course and program proposals originating within the Divisions prior to those proposals being sent to and considered by the CPC. [DCCs]

The General Education Board, a sub-committee of the CPC, is responsible for articulation issues. [Gen Ed Board]

Assessment of student learning related issues is the concern of the Assessment Committee. This committee is a campus-wide committee responsible for assessment of all activities of the College, including student learning and student services. The Assessment Committee has broad authority to determine assessment policies and procedures.

Self Evaluation

The College meets the Standard. The Board policy on curriculum gives faculty the responsibility for the curriculum at the College. [BOR Policies Ch1, page 8] Honolulu Community College believes successful student learning is a campus-wide responsibility. The CPC and the Assessment Committee are doing their jobs effectively.

Planning Agenda

No action is required.

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 the College include the Planning Council, the CLT, FSEC, SSEC, ASUH-HCC and other campus committees who have worked together for many years (with the exception of the Planning Council which is a new committee). The members of these various committees regularly meet, discuss, vote and take action on matters that concern the College. Minutes of most meetings are posted on the campus Intranet website. [Committee Minutes] Often “town meetings” are held to discuss campus issues. Communication with members of the College community is frequently conducted via e-mail and the campus Intranet website. [Intranet] Established policies and procedures are available through the website. In an effort to reduce the usage of paper, many forms are also available via the website. [Forms]

Self Evaluation

The College partially meets the Standard. As noted earlier, there is a governance structure at the College that provides for input from faculty, staff, and administrators. The functioning of that
structure is attested to by the fact that the major campus committees meet regularly. The issues these committees discuss in their meetings are critical to campus decision-making, and they regularly make recommendations to the Chancellor and Vice Chancellors regarding budget and organizational issues, as well as curriculum. [Committee Minutes] However, there is a perception among the faculty that the efforts of the governance committees and the leadership on campus may have little effect in the final decision-making process. In the Faculty/Staff survey, faculty were asked whether or not the administration listens to and relies on faculty and staff for recommendations regarding student learning and services. Only 39% of the faculty strongly agreed or agreed with that statement while 43% either disagreed or strongly disagreed with it. [Faculty/Staff Survey Data] Taken together with the more positive responses to the other statements, this indicates that even though the structure exists, the administration could do a better job of listening to and relying on the opinions of the faculty and staff.

Part of the problem in this case has perhaps been that with the exception of curriculum, written explanations of the reasoning behind decisions taken by the Chancellor have not been required, and so few have emerged. The existence of the Planning Council may help to alleviate this problem because its charter requires that whenever the Chancellor makes a decision that contravenes the recommendation of the Planning Council, he must provide a written explanation to the College. [PC] Access to this information campus-wide and independent of official or unofficial conduits for communication may help faculty and staff to more easily see both the reasoning behind strategic decisions, and the long-term direction of the College. Having this information should, in turn, help the faculty and staff to better understand and evaluate their own position and contribution to the governance process. In order to facilitate such understanding, both the Planning Council and the administration need to create measurable outcomes, and regularly assess their performance in this area based on those outcomes.

There is also some concern that despite the opportunities, participation among the faculty is lower than it could be. The FSEC is currently attempting to find ways to rectify this situation. [FSEC 2/10/06] Here again, the FSEC might do well to establish outcomes for faculty participation in governance, and assess the number and diversity of faculty and the ways in which they serve based on those outcomes.

Planning Agenda

- The College should maintain and improve communication about governance issues.
- The College should encourage more faculty, staff and students to participate in campus governance.
- The Planning Council must establish measurable outcomes and regularly assess its performance based on those outcomes.
- The administration must establish measurable outcomes and regularly assess its performance in governance based on those outcomes.

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

The Standard IV Team decided to separate this Standard into two statements:

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

**Descriptive Summary**

The Chancellor’s Executive Advisory Board, comprised of 20 members, provides guidance, leadership and critical feedback to help the College achieve its mission.

All of the Career Technical Education (CTE) programs have advisory committees. These 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 and journeyworkers, committees devise standards for Apprenticeship agreements and provide assistance to the operation and development of the program.

The PCATT Board is composed of members from government, education, and industry. Its primary mission is to oversee the general operations of PCATT and provide suggestions that aid PCATT in the achievement of its stated mission and attendant goals.

**Self Evaluation**

The College meets the Standard. The future of career and technical education programs is dependent 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 crucial to the success of the College’s CTE programs.

As an example of the College’s advocation of integrity, PCATT prepares an annual report for the PCATT Board that is presented at a formal meeting in July or August of each year. This report provides a summary of all activities of PCATT during a given fiscal year, a financial summary, and specific reporting on the established goals and objectives for the fiscal year. The PCATT Board reviews this report and provides feedback and recommendations. The goals and
objectives of PCATT for the upcoming fiscal year are also presented to the PCATT Board for feedback and recommendations. Based on PCATT Board review and input, final goals and objectives are prepared for each fiscal year. In addition to the yearly PCATT Board meeting, the PCATT Director will invite Board members to PCATT to review specific proposed PCATT initiatives and to provide advice and feedback on such initiatives.

While this example argues that 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.). However, the systematic integration of results into the planning and program review process has not been formalized.

Planning Agenda

- The College should develop ways to systematically assess, document, and integrate the utilization of advisory committees into the 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 high priority to 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 e-mail announcements and on the College’s Accreditation website. [Accreditation Info]

Honolulu Community College has responded to recommendations made by the Commission. There are copies of the various reports on the website.

Self Evaluation

The College meets the Standard. The College began its most recent self-study in the Fall of 2004, even while in the midst of ongoing efforts to make improvements mandated by The Accrediting Commission in the previous accreditation cycle. The College took the suggestions and requirements of the Accrediting Commission seriously, and made significant changes in order to meet the Standards. [Visit Team Report]
The College has made an effort to be proactive in addressing the needs found in the current self-study cycle by creating the Accreditation Oversight Committee to oversee continuous improvement based on the recommendations of this report between the self-study cycles, indicating that the college intends to take accreditation seriously and use it as an opportunity for constant improvement and identification of strategic needs and direction. [AOC]

The College will continue its commitment to public disclosure as evidenced by the accessibility of documents on reserve in the library and posted on the campus Intranet.

Planning Agenda

No action is required.

IV.A.5. The role of leadership and the institution’s governance and decision-making structures and processes are regularly evaluated to assure their integrity and effectiveness. The institution widely communicates the results of these evaluations and uses them as the basis for improvement.

Descriptive Summary

There is no systematic process for evaluation of the College’s governance structure.

Self Evaluation

The College does not meet the Standard. The Accreditation Oversight Committee (AOC) and the Assessment Committee were created to provide continuity to the accreditation and assessment processes by following up on recommendations made in the 2000 Accreditation Self Study, and by the ACCJC/WASC Visiting Team. [AOC] [Assessment Charter] The goal of creating permanent committees to oversee accreditation and assessment issues was to turn the College’s self study activities into catalysts for continuous improvement.

The Assessment Committee was designed to encourage assessment from the campus at every level, and to keep tabs on how assessment processes are being carried out. The committee identifies locations where the College needs assessment, and encourages the use of assessment in all college activities. The Assessment Committee also provides information and training for members of the College community who wish to learn more about how assessment can work. [Assessment Charter]

The FSEC—via the Committee on Committees—is requiring all FSEC subcommittees to create charters which specify the authority, responsibility, and place within the governance structure of each committee. [FSEC 10/21/05]

The FSEC requires regular reports from all of its subcommittees, including the two campus-wide committees—the CPC and the COSA. These reports are given to the full FSEC in written form
Planning Agenda

- The College must establish an overall assessment program for the governance system, must communicate the results of these evaluations, and must use them as a basis for improvement.
- The FSEC should encourage the annual review of charters for its subcommittees.
- The FSEC should continue receiving annual reports from all its subcommittees.

**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.**

**Descriptive Summary**

Membership on the Board of Regents (Board) is controlled by State Law (Chapter 304-3, Hawai`i Revised Statutes - §304-3). That statute indicates that the “affairs of the university shall be under the general management and control of the board of regents,” that the members of the Board are appointed by the Governor of the State of Hawai`i, as well as the size of the Board, how the members of the Board are selected, their terms of office, when the Board is expected to meet, and how they are compensated.

The Board appoints and evaluates the President of the University and approves other executive appointments, including Vice Presidents, Chancellors, Vice Chancellors, and Deans. In November 2000, the citizens of Hawai`i approved a constitutional amendment to give greater autonomy to the University of Hawai`i. Although the Constitution had previously granted the Board authority to manage the University, a clause “in accordance with law” had been interpreted to mean that the Board could not take action unless legislation specifically permitted the action. The constitutional amendment removed that clause. The Board and administration are currently working with external and internal constituents to establish and carry
out the principles that will guide the changed relationship the University seeks with the Legislature.

The Board elects its own officers and hires its own staff. Currently, the Board has two professional staff members (the Executive Administrator and Secretary to the Board and the Executive Assistant) and three secretaries. System administrative staff also provides support to the Board as needed. The Board operates through seven standing committees: Academic Affairs; Finance and Facilities; Personnel and Legal Affairs; Student Affairs; University and External Affairs; Community Colleges; and Budget and Long-Range Planning. During regular monthly Board meetings (except for August and December), these committees meet concurrently to consider matters coming before the Board.

Board Policy Chapter 9, Part III, addresses recruitment and appointment of Executive and Managerial personnel. [BOR Policies Ch9] Board Policy Chapter 2 details the evaluation of the President. [BOR Policies Ch2]

In accord with the State’s Sunshine Act, all meetings are public, except those involving discussion of personnel and legal matters. Board of Regents By-Laws and Policies—as well as agenda and minutes of meetings—are publicly available at the Board’s website. [BOR]

Self Evaluation

The College meets the Standard. The Board of Regents is chosen by the Governor, and is thus directly responsible to the people of Hawai`i. The Board acts as an independent decision-making body. The recent constitutional amendment giving autonomy to the University of Hawai`i constitutes a significant increase in the Board’s independence and ability to make important decisions affecting all units of the University. [BOR Power] The Board is responsible for selecting the President of the University and the Chancellors of the community colleges. Although the Board uses a committee structure to insure a thorough airing of issues relevant to all different aspects of the University, the policy of holding committee meetings concurrently, then meeting as a unified board to make final decisions shows that the Board acts as a unit in making and carrying out its decisions. [BOR Policies, Bylaws, page 10] With its authority to hire and review the top University administrators, and independence from the State of Hawai`i Legislature, the Board is able to defend the University from adverse influence from within or without.

Planning Agenda

No action is required.

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.
Descriptive Summary

Board Policy Chapters 4 and 5 detail Board planning and evaluation policies. Additionally, at the September 2005 Board meeting, the Board changed its committee structure to more fully address ACCJC/WASC’s concerns. The reorganized and expanded Community College Standing Committee will conduct quarterly meetings additional to the full Board meetings. The meetings are designed to focus on the following areas:

- The broad community college mission
- The financial health of the community colleges
- Program review and assessment
- Planning directions for the next year

The November 4, 2005 meeting addressed the broad community college mission.

The University of Hawai`i Community Colleges Strategic Plan 2002-2010 states that within the overall mission of the University of Hawai`i, the Community Colleges have as their special mission:

- Access
- Learning and Teaching
- Work Force Development
- Personal Development
- Community Development
- Diversity

Self Evaluation

The College meets the Standard. According to the Board’s policy, “All proposals to establish new programs shall be consistent with the institution’s mission.” The Board reviews programs after the first year, and in the event of any changes, in order to ensure that they meet this requirement. The Board’s interest and involvement with the quality, integrity, and continuous improvement of student learning is evidenced in the policies the Board has established regarding Academics in the University of Hawai`i System. The Board’s intention is to maintain academic freedom while providing a high quality education based on rigorous standards and taught by qualified instructors. All colleges in the system are required to have a general education core, as well as high quality courses specific to the mission of the campus. All colleges are further required to conduct program reviews to ensure program quality and integrity.

Planning Agenda

No action is required.
**IV.B.1.c.** The governing board has ultimate responsibility for educational quality, legal matters, and financial integrity.

**Descriptive Summary**

The Board is responsible for the internal organization and management of the University. These responsibilities include overall responsibility for legal and financial matters as well as for educational quality on all of the campuses in the System. The increased autonomy granted to the University by the Legislature (discussed in IV.B.1.a. above) has clarified the University’s right to determine where budgets will be cut or reallocated when state appropriations are reduced within limits set up by the limited autonomy provided by the law, and subject to earmarks and other special funding from the Hawai‘i State Legislature. The University also does its best to insure that money provided by the Legislature goes where the Legislature intends. Implementation of Board policies is the responsibility of the President and the executive and managerial team. The Board has delegated authority to establish, review, and improved curricular and academic issues to the faculty of each campus, and in the interests of maintaining continuous improvement of educational quality has specified that College and System administrators may exercise their authority over such matters adversely “only in exceptional circumstances and for reasons communicated to the faculty.” The Board’s policies, and its stated responsibility for overall management of the University of Hawai‘i System, make the Board responsible for legal matters. [BOR Policies Ch1, page 8]

**Self Evaluation**

The College meets the Standard. The Board of Regents policies and bylaws specifically state, or imply by related statements of authority and responsibility, that the effectiveness of education, planning, and policy for all campuses within the System, all legal matters relating to the campuses, or System, and the financial integrity of the UH System are the responsibility of the Board.

**Planning Agenda**

No action is required.

**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.

**Descriptive Summary**

The Board maintains a web site on which the bylaws, policies and meeting minutes are regularly posted. All of the policies mentioned in this Standard are discussed on this site. [BOR]

**Self Evaluation**
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The College meets the Standard. All policies of the Board are published and available via the World Wide Web.

Planning Agenda

No action is required.

**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.**

Descriptive Summary

Board policy does not include a system for evaluating and revising its policies on a regular basis. The administration submits recommendations for policy and policy revisions as necessary. The most recent comprehensive Board policy review was conducted in October 2002. In the October 2004 Board self study workshop, the Board suggested regular review of its own performance.

Self Evaluation

The College partially meets the Standard. While there is no formal process for regularly evaluating its policies, the Board has amended its policies on occasion. Below are two examples of policy review and action based on that review:

- In October 2002 the Board approved an amendment to its policies “in light of the University’s autonomy and to add clarity as well as to update the current Board policies following the separation of the President and Manoa Chancellor’s office.” [**BOR 10/18/02**]

- In May 2005 the Board approved a change in its policy regarding University employees working at the Legislature. In particular, this new policy “provides that University employees working at the Legislature shall comply with applicable Executive Branch policies.” [**BOR 5/19/05**]

When the Board decides not to follow its own policies, it identifies the action as an exception to policy. For example, on October 22, 2004 the Board approved, as an exception to policy on graduate programs, the establishment of a College of Pharmacy at University of Hawai‘i at Hilo. [**BOR 10/22/04, page 2**]

Planning Agenda

- The Board should establish regular review of its policies and procedures.
**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.**

**Descriptive Summary**

The statute mentioned above in *Standard IV.B.1.a.* indicates that the members of the Board are appointed by the Governor of the State of Hawai`i. The statute also specifies the size of the Board, how the members of the Board are selected, their terms of office, when the Board is expected to meet, and how they are compensated. The statute does not provide for “staggered terms of office” but it does ensure that new board members will be selected whenever a term expires. That statute does not describe a program for “board development” or “new member orientation.” [*BOR Appointment*]

At the September 2, 2004 special meeting, the Board was presented an overview of an “Orientation Manual.” [*BOR 9/2/04*]  The developer of the manual explained to the Board that the manual is primarily designed for new Regents. [*Board of Regents Orientation Manual*]

**Self Evaluation**

The College partially meets the Standard. The orientation manual described is available to all regents, and gives an overview of Board policies and procedures, as well as ethics and the orientation and mission of the various units of the University of Hawai`i System. There is, however, no other formalized process for using the manual, and no specific orientation workshop for Board members. This leads to a situation in which Board members have access to information on how they are expected to operate, but must implement that information in an “on-the-job” fashion.

**Planning Agenda**

- The Board should formalize its orientation process for new Regents.

**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.**

**Descriptive Summary**

Although Board policy does not appear to call for regular self-evaluation, at its October 2004, self-study workshop, the Board agreed to self-study on a three-or-four year cycle. [*BOR 10/22/04, page 2*]

**Self Evaluation**
The College does not meet the Standard. The Board is not sufficiently aware of the need for evaluation and assessment.

Planning Agenda

- The Board should develop and implement a clearly defined process for evaluation and assessment of Board performance.

**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.**

Descriptive Summary

Board Policy, Article X, and HRS Chapter 84 addresses the Board’s stated process for dealing with unethical behavior. [BOR Policies, Bylaws, page 11]

The Board of Regents Orientation Manual contains a 10 page appendix called an “Ethics Guide.”

Self Evaluation

The College meets the Standard. The Board of Regents has clear standards by which the Board must deal with such transgressions. At the November 4, 2005 meeting, the University’s General Counsel stated that there may have been examples of dealing with unethical behavior in the Board but that those examples were related to personnel matters and so their reviews were conducted in executive session. The General Counsel stated that he would need to review the minutes to determine whether those examples could be released. Additionally, the General Counsel stated that when necessary Board members recuse themselves from discussions when participation might be ethically questionable. As of the time this report is being written, the minutes from the November 4, 2005 meeting have not been posted.

Planning Agenda

No action is required.

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

Descriptive Summary

The Standard IV Team attempted to schedule a meeting with the Board of Regents to discuss Accreditation and the development of this report but was not successful in scheduling such a meeting. Another “Team,” a workgroup made up from representatives from the seven community college campuses and from the office of the Associate Vice President for Academic Affairs, attended a meeting of the Board of Regents Community College Committee on November 4, 2005. At that meeting, the Associate Vice President for Academic Affairs made a
brief presentation to the Board of Regents Community College Committee about accreditation, and presented the Committee with a binder about accreditation as well as a set of questions prepared by the workgroup and based on the Standards in this section of the report. In addition, the Standard IVB workgroup in attendance at the meeting reviewed the Standards and engaged in a brief discussion with the Committee on the accreditation process.

The reorganized Community College Standing Committee is expected to receive additional training and information about the accreditation process.

Self Evaluation

The College does not meet the Standard. The response from the Board of Regents Community College Standing Committee at the November 4, 2005 meeting was disappointing. Indeed most of the members of the Committee remained silent the whole time. The answers that were given were given by the President of the University and by the General Counsel. Near the end of the meeting the Committee was asked “How familiar are you with the accreditation process?” and it was clear from the responses—indeed, lack of response—that few members of the Committee had given much thought to the accreditation process prior to the meeting. As of the time this report is being written, the minutes from the November 4, 2005 meeting have not been posted.

Planning Agenda

- The Board must become more involved with 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.

Descriptive Summary

The reader of this document should remember that in the University of Hawai`i System, the CEO of the University is called the “President,” and the CEOs of the individual campuses are known as “Chancellors.” Board of Regents Policy Chapter 2 provides for the duties and evaluation of the President of the University of Hawai`i System. [BOR Policies Ch2] The President of the University of Hawai`i System has full responsibility and authority for execution of the policies authorized and established by the Board. The Board is also responsible for selecting the Chancellors.
Self Evaluation

The College meets the Standard.

Planning Agenda

No action is required.

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 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, page 2]

- 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 Honolulu Community College/K-12 Partnerships.

The Standard IV Team met with the Chancellor on September 19, 2005. [Chancellor Interview] He stated that he is the CEO of a campus that engages in teaching and training of students,
community and 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 on the organizational chart, he is authorized to make the final decision and does not need approval from the UH System. The VCAA acts in the Chancellor's behalf when he is absent, followed by the VCAS if the VCAA is also absent. [Org Charts]

The Chancellor or his representative attends meetings of the FSEC, CLT, and Planning Council where key issues concerning governance are discussed.

Self Evaluation

The College partially meets the Standard. Insight on the overall effectiveness of the administrative structure can be gained by examining responses on the Faculty/Staff survey concerning the roles of the VCAA (“Dean of Instruction”), Program Deans (“Assistant Deans”), and Division Chairs indicated a high level of understanding of the role of the VCAA and the Division Chairs, but understanding of the Program Deans only in the 50% range. The higher percentage for the role of the Division Chair probably reflects the more frequent contact that the faculty have with their Divisions Chairs than with their Program Deans or the VCAA. It may also reflect the fact that many faculty have not had a regular Program Dean for some time. [Faculty/Staff Survey Data] The Program Dean positions have been filled with temporary deans or interim deans many times recently. The University College has not had a permanent Program Dean since the inception of the current division structure in July 1, 1999. Currently, the College has only one permanent Program Dean, and a permanent Dean of Student Services, along with the Chancellor, the VCAA, and the VCAS.

Since the last major reorganization of the College on July 1, 1999, nineteen different people have served as Program Dean, Assistant Dean, Dean of Student Services, Director, or VCAA. Eight of the nineteen served on an interim basis; all as Program Dean or Assistant Dean. There has been a significant turnover in these positions. This turnover is a matter of concern. The Team solicited responses to three questions from people who served either as Program Dean or Assistant Dean, and who are no longer in the administration at the College. Seven people responded. A general summary of their responses to the three questions is given below. [Summary of Responses from Past Deans]

When asked “Why did you accept the job?” they generally felt that they would be able to help the College. Some wanted to test the administrative waters, with an eye on possible advancement. Some welcomed the change from teaching.

When asked “Why did you leave the job?” they generally felt that the workload was too much. In addition to a full plate of normal duties of overseeing the daily operations of their division,
they were often assigned management of entire programs or projects. The hours were too long, with only a small increase in monthly pay compared to teaching. Also, when another administrator would quit, the position would usually remain unfilled for several months, with the other Program Deans or Assistant Deans assuming the workload. Two people felt that their ideas were not given due consideration, especially in budget matters. One person felt that requested time for attending conferences was not equally awarded.

When asked “What would it have taken for you to stay on?” the responses were varied. One person replied “nothing,” and another did not respond at all. Three people suggested better staff support, more flexibility or creativity or independence, or less workload. One person wished to see less pork barrel politics and more mutual respect among administrators.

In addition to the traditional administrative positions, in 2003 the position of Executive Assistant to the Chancellor was created to deal with community affairs, fund raising, and legislative affairs. The role of the Executive Assistant to the Chancellor in College affairs is not at all clear to the faculty and staff according to the Faculty/Staff Survey. This can, perhaps, be partially attributed to the recent creation of the position, but almost surely it is also due to the fact that the Chancellor has not effectively communicated the role of his new assistant, or its importance, to the campus.

A further concern is the delegation of the Chancellor's authority when he is off campus, and particularly when he is traveling. The Chancellor travels frequently as a part of his job, but the campus is rarely informed in a systematic way as to when the Chancellor will be away, and where authority lies when he is not available.

**Planning Agenda**

- The College should create a system of public notice of the Chancellor's presence on campus and the location of authority in his absence.
- The Executive Assistant to the Chancellor should communicate his activities on a regular basis to the campus.
- The Chancellor must clarify the role of his Executive Assistant to the College.
- The College must make it a priority to hire permanent Program Deans.
- The Chancellor must solicit input regarding workload before deciding that the College will take on new programs or projects.

**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.
Establishing procedures to evaluate overall institutional planning and implementation efforts.

Descriptive Summary

As described earlier, there is a system of committees on campus that are involved with campus governance. While the Chancellor was not responsible for forming those committees—they have existed for many years—he has 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 governance process. The Board of Regents has mandated that the Chancellor participate with the faculty in creating and maintaining a governance process in which all stakeholders in the college are consulted on issues which concern them, or which concern the effectiveness of the college in educating students or generally meeting its mission. [BOR Policies Chi, page 8]

The Chancellor uses the Strategic Plan of the College for guidance. [Strategic Plan] 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 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, 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 Board, President, Legislature, etc. She uses a number of sources for the data, including course registration reports, degrees earned reports, and program reviews. [Fall 2004, page 14] [Degrees Earned, page 3] [AMT Review] [SMP Review] [FIRE Review]

Self Evaluation

The College partially meets the Standard. Generally, the faculty and staff see the Chancellor and the VCAA as being effective in handling their responsibilities. But there are concerns about some of the areas of this Standard.

The Standard IV Team placed a question on the Faculty-Staff survey that exactly parallels this section of the Standard: “The Chancellor establishes a collegial process that sets values, goals and priorities.” [Faculty/Staff Survey] Of the full-time faculty who responded to this question, only 55% indicated that they strongly agreed or agreed with this statement. This indicates concern about whether or not the Chancellor is effectively establishing and maintaining collegiality in the governance process. [Faculty/Staff Survey Data]
As the Standard IV Team gathered data for this report, a number of negative incidents regarding collegiality were reported. Taken separately, any one of these incidents could be considered insignificant, but in the whole, the number of such incidents reported raises doubts about the regard the Chancellor has for a collegial process.

Given the requirements of the Board policies, and the Functional Statements of the College, and the statements of the Chancellor himself, it is a high priority to establish agreement among the faculty and staff of the college that they are effective participants in the governance process and what they have to say matters.  [BOR Policies Ch1, page 8]  [Functional Statements, page 2]  [Chancellor Interview]

Another issue of concern is a recent controversy over the reporting structure for some campus committees. Traditionally, committees like the FSEC and SSEC have “recommended to” members of the administration and have never “belonged” to any particular administrator. The Team believes that it is important for these committees to retain that independence. As this report is being written, the faculty and staff of the College have called for a “town meeting” to discuss the issue.

While the Chancellor has been given the authority by the Board of Regents to make final decisions for the campus, attention to collegiality implies a willingness to consult with the faculty and staff, and to allow those consultations to matter to the future of the College. The requirement of the Planning Council that contraventions of its recommendations must be accompanied by a written explanation from the Chancellor should go some distance toward providing information both on decisions, and on the process of decision-making and the value of faculty and staff committees at the College.  [PC]

When making decisions on the future direction of the College and its programs, the Chancellor and the College rely on research and analysis for modification and improvement of programs. This research and analysis is now firmly based on integrated program plans which have specific, stated outcomes. Those outcomes are mapped into the curriculum planning process to insure that students of each program graduate with a set of skills that has been devised with reference to the needs of the professional or academic field being targeted, and the requirements of each successive stage of learning. Each course is then placed within the program based on the effectiveness with which it addresses the program outcomes, and each course is evaluated based on stated student learning outcomes. While each of these steps are undertaken independently by instructors, then departments, and then divisions, the central integrating assessment system is the process of program review established at the College.  [Program Reviews]  This system is comprehensive, is undertaken by every unit of the College, and is carried out on a regular schedule to insure that the College is reacting to the evolving needs of students and of the community at large.

As an example, the program review for Sheet Metal (SMP) was used to validate the changes in that program from a 2-year AAS program to a 1-year certificate program.  [SMP Review]  It was thought that most of the students did not stay on to complete an AAS 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 indicated that the NATEF requirements for each student needed to be tracked more closely. [AMT Review] 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 will continue to be used to analyze programs at the College. [Five-Year Schedule]

Planning Agenda

- The Chancellor must affirm his commitment to collegiality in governance at the College so as to foster that collegiality.
- The administration must work with, not manage, governance-related committees.
- The Planning Council should establish performance-based outcomes with which to measure its effectiveness in encouraging collegiality through empowering all constituencies at the College.
- The Planning Council must be strict in requiring written explanations of decisions made by the Chancellor and administration.
- Program review should continue to receive emphasis, and programs should make recommendations to the governance structure based on their findings.

**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 has all necessary authority to implement statutes and to assure that institutional practices are consistent with statutes, regulations, Board policies, and the College’s mission and policies. [Functional Statements, page 2] [Chancellor Interview] [VCAA Interview]

Self Evaluation

The College meets the Standard. The Chancellor is responsible for the implementation of the College’s mission according to its Mission Statement, and the relevant statutes and regulations. [Mission Statement] In the Standard IV Team survey, 57% agreed that the Chancellor is effective in handling these responsibilities. [Faculty/Staff Survey Data]

Planning Agenda

No action is required.
IV.B.2.d. The president effectively controls budget and expenditures.

Descriptive Summary

The College’s strategic planning and budgeting process exists to guide budget decisions. The Chancellor is responsible for implementing that process.

Self Evaluation

The College partially meets the Standard. The Chancellor—working with the administration, faculty, staff and students—analyzes programs and data to develop a strategic plan and an operating budget. The Planning Council is now part of the process. The budget requests are finalized by the campus and sent to the Board for approval. The approved budget then moves on to the Legislature and Governor for additional scrutiny.

Unfortunately this puts the campus at the mercy of the Legislature. In recent years the College has had to make adjustments in many areas to keep the campus functioning. Decisions regarding those adjustments are made by the Chancellor in accordance with the Strategic Plan.

The problems that these adjustments cause are reflected in the Faculty and Staff Survey. The statement regarding how well the Chancellor controls the budget and expenditures ranked below the mean on the survey. Often these outside constraints make it impossible for the Chancellor to have complete control over the budget.

Planning Agenda

- The Planning Council should fully exercise its role in the budget planning process.
- The CLT should continue to be responsible for day-to-day financial management and expenditures.

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

Descriptive Summary

To fulfill the College’s mission, the Chancellor is a member of numerous community associations, advisory boards and executive committees. Some examples are the Kalihi Business Association, the PCATT Board, the Economic Development Project, the Pacific Resource Partners, the Sheet Metal Advisory Committee, and liaison to Department of Education high schools. The Chancellor is also a member of several national organizations, such as the National Coalition of Advanced Technology Centers, the Presidents Council on the Center for Occupation Research and Development, and the National Governor’s Academy.
Self Evaluation

The College meets the Standard. The Chancellor collaborates and communicates with these various organizations on educational initiatives and programs that assist the community. One example of his collaboration is the creation of the Construction Academy. The need for a qualified workforce in the construction industry for Hawai‘i resulted in a partnership with the construction industry, the Department of Education (DOE), and Honolulu Community College. In 2004, the Chancellor was instrumental in obtaining a $1.4 million dollar grant from the United States Department of Labor to create and sustain a model construction academy. Participating DOE schools included Kailua, Kahuku, Waialua, Mililani, Waipahu, Radford, Pearl City, and the Hawaii Academy for Arts and Sciences.

Planning Agenda

No action is required.

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

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 December 2002, the Board approved a reorganization of the University of Hawai‘i System Office resulting in the abolishment of the Office of the Chancellor for Community Colleges and realignment of the Provosts to directly report to the President. The title of ‘Provost’ was subsequently changed to ‘Chancellor’ and a Council of Chancellors was formed that reported directly to the President. The goal of this reorganization was 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, while still allowing the Chancellor of each college to hold autonomous decision-making authority to maintain campus flexibility in meeting its mission.

To address the concerns expressed by the ACCJC in a January 2005 report 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 that organizational structure, the UH System Community Colleges have recently undergone a further reorganization which makes Community College Chancellors jointly responsible to a new Vice President for Community
Colleges (VPCC) and to the President of the University of Hawai`i. [VPCC Proposal] In June 2005, President McClain proposed a dual reporting relationship to the Board, 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. [BOR 6/5/05, page 8] 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. 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.

The plan is for each community college Chancellor to 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. The community college Chancellors are currently working to provide the UH System with a “Functional Road Map” which will function as a flow chart and will designate the authority of each member of the executive team in the UH system. As of the writing of this Descriptive Summary, that document has not been completed.

Self-Evaluation

The College partially meets the Standard. The Office of the VPCC is now functional. However, due to the fact that the position is new, an assessment of its effectiveness is not yet possible. Work is progressing, and the current effort to create a Functional Road Map is apparently intended to solve the problems of lack of clarity and coherence in decision-making between the colleges. Current difficulties with the Functional Roadmap, as well as other policy issues are currently awaiting decisions from the Office of the VPCC.

Planning Agenda

- The Council of Chancellors and the VPCC should complete and make public the Functional Road Map as soon as possible.
- The VPCC should clarify the goals of his office in terms of measurable outcomes, and begin assessing its effectiveness as soon as possible.

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

Descriptive Summary

The UH system, and the Office of the VPCC, are tasked with providing fiscal, legal, insurance and other risk-related support, [VPCC Proposal] as well as with the task of coordinating the administrative decision-making process in order to provide mutually acceptable procedures for all of the community colleges while maintaining support for the unique mission of each campus.
In June 2005, the Board approved the reorganization of the community colleges mentioned above that includes the creation of the VPCC. [BOR 6/5/05, page 8] The VPCC is responsible for executive leadership, policy decision-making, resource allocation, and development of appropriate support services for the seven community colleges, and for the re-consolidation of the academic and administrative support units for the community colleges.

Self Evaluation

The College partially meets the Standard. The creation of the office of the VPCC is viewed as a hopeful step in the right direction in terms of re-creating a system that can effectively provide services to support the community colleges in their missions and functions.

Currently, there are no systematic assessments, other than individual personnel evaluations of administrators, that measure the effectiveness of services that have been provided by the system in support of the community colleges. However, there are other outcome indicators that may have a causal relationship including: a high rate of position turnovers, vacancies and interim appointments among managerial positions; a lack of clearly defined common policies and practices across the community college campuses; and a perceived state of “flux” in decision making authority resulting from system and campus level reorganizations.

Planning Agenda

• The Office of the VPCC should create and mandate use of outcomes-based assessment of the administration of the system.
• The VPCC should require that improvements be made based on the results of outcomes-based assessments.

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 each college funds approved by the Legislature plus revenue generated by each college. [Chancellor Interview]

Self Evaluation

The College partially meets the Standard. Honolulu Community College has participated in a working group system, in which the College Strategic Plan is reviewed by major campus committees, including the CLT and the FSEC. [Strategic Plan] From there, it goes for approval through the Chancellor’s office, and then provides the priorities that administrators use
to make decisions, even when faculty are not on duty. Those priorities are then matched with the priorities of the other community colleges in the Community College Strategic Plan which is a compromise document born from negotiations, and not a binding plan. The final stage is inclusion in the University of Hawai`i System Strategic Plan. The newly prioritized System Strategic Plan and Community Colleges Strategic Plan then become the basis for a system-wide budget request to the Hawai`i State Legislature. The Strategic Plan is reviewed annually to help bring it in line with the College’s needs, community needs, and workforce needs of the State of Hawai`i.

Prior to Fall 2005, Honolulu Community College had no central planning committee through which campus priorities could be clearly debated and enunciated to the administration. The charter of the Planning Council makes it clear that this body has the responsibility to review the needs of the College on a continuing basis, and provide priorities to the Chancellor. 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 Council to agree to the proposed policy or action. In such circumstances, 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 morale as well as “buy in” into whatever the new program might be.

Further, according to the Faculty/Staff Survey, almost half of the faculty felt that the interaction between the Chancellor and major committees that have done the Planning Council's job up to this point leaves something to be desired. They also perceive a “listening gap” between faculty and administration.

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. This assessment would be unnecessary if the system was fully funded for its activities. The UH-System Strategic Plan does not do an adequate job of creating the proper budget to meet its needs. The State Legislature is also underfunding the University of Hawai`i. This is likely to lead inevitably to inequities in funding across the system, and may force the smaller campuses in the System to forego important projects, technology, and hiring of new faculty in order to meet ongoing System assessments.

Planning Agenda

- The Office of the VPCC should unify and formalize the community colleges' budgeting process.

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

Descriptive Summary

Honolulu Community College is subject to a rigorous system of inclusive prioritization and public critique of all expenditures prior to their implementation. There are State of Hawai`i
regulations which are binding on the process of budget preparation. [State of Hawai`i Current Operating Budget Preparation Process] There are priorities set on all community colleges in the University of Hawai`i System by the President and the Board. [BOR Policies Ch8] Finally, there are budget priorities set according to the planning process of the UH System, the Community Colleges System, and Honolulu Community College’s strategic plan. [UH Strategic Plan] [CC Strategic Plan] [Strategic Plan] The strategic planning process at Honolulu Community College is presided over by the Planning Council, but involves many elements of the campus, including the CLT and the FSEC, as well as input from outside elements which include the various advisory boards of Honolulu Community College’s various divisions, as well as input to the Chancellor from the Hawai`i State Legislature and business and community leaders as to workforce preparation needs.

Self Evaluation

The College partially meets the Standard. Honolulu Community College’s control of expenditures is driven by the budgeting process. All expenditures are subject to a list of priorities that are rigorously created by the system, and the campus community as a whole. According to the charter of the Planning Council, any decisions made by the College that do not fit within those priorities, or that appear to be outside of the College strategic plan and budget must be justified to the campus community by the Chancellor. [PC] In this way, the input of all members of the College community is assured, and the College cannot make expenditures without this review process.

Planning Agenda

- The Planning Council should establish outcomes by which to measure its effectiveness.
- The Planning Council should assess its effectiveness based on those outcomes annually.

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.

Descriptive Summary

The relationship between the President of the University and the Chancellors of the Community Colleges also involves the newly implemented position of Vice President for Community Colleges which was approved by the Board on June 21, 2005 and is subject to review in June 2007. [BOR 6/5/05, page 8] 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 system-wide policymaking and decisions impacting the campus.” [VPCC Proposal]

Self Evaluation
The College partially meets the Standard. 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. [BOR 6/5/05, page 8]

The position of VPCC and the new model that it represents will require some time before clear statements can be made about their effectiveness. The need for this office is illustrated by the fact that following the dissolution of the former Chancellor for Community Colleges office, the authority to make all campus-related decisions fell to the Chancellors of each college. Along with this change, the former Community College Chancellor's Memoranda (CCCM) became invalid. [CCCM] Those policies need to be replaced with policies based on the new organizational structure of the community colleges. Honolulu Community College has so far produced only one “HCCCM”, which set out procedures for program review. As the Council of Chancellors realized the need to work together, in October of 2005 they promulgated a “UHCCM” (University of Hawai`i Community Colleges Memorandum) which accomplished the same goals. Only one such document has so far been produced by the UH System, while other campuses have continued the process of creating their own full set of policy documents independently. The need to unify procedures and policies with regard to intra-campus activities and cooperation is not being well served by the absence of official policy documents.

Planning Agenda

- The Council of Chancellors should decide how to replace the earlier policies and make that clear across the system.
- The Council of Chancellors should implement their decisions on policies so as to provide for unity between the colleges.

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. [VPCC Proposal] [BOR Policies Ch3, page 3]

Self Evaluation

The College partially meets the Standard. The evidence suggests that with the new VPCC, 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 Office of the VPCC should be assessed annually in order to see how it is meeting the Standard.

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

There is no systematic program of assessment or specific outcomes for the Community College System within the University of Hawai‘i. However, the Community Colleges do have a Strategic Plan which sets out goals for the University of Hawai‘i System in the area of Community College needs. [CC Strategic Plan]

Self Evaluation

The College does not meet the Standard. The services provided by the UH System to the Community Colleges office are often difficult to measure. Establishing performance outcomes and assessing the system based on those outcomes will help the Community Colleges ensure that the VPCC’s office is clearly helping to meet the mission of the community colleges as a group.

The basis for such outcomes exists in the original proposal for the creation of the Office of Vice President for Community Colleges as well as in the ‘goals’ articulated in the Community Colleges’ Strategic Plan. [VPCC Proposal] [CC Strategic Plan] A system-wide working group consisting of faculty, staff, and administrators could 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.

Planning Agenda

• The UH System should establish a set of outcomes by which it can assess its own performance.
• The UH System should carry out and publish results of, an outcomes-based assessment on an annual basis.

Additional Evidence in the Evidence Room

• Board of Regents Orientation Manual
• State of Hawai‘i Current Operating Budget Preparation Process
• Summary of Responses from Past Deans