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The process of preparing a report in response to the recommendations of the visiting team began almost immediately after receiving the team's report and letter from ACCJC. That first response was, in fact, a plan of focused and deliberative action, a closing of the loop addressing the team’s assessment, as outlined in a plan developed by the Chancellor and sent to members of her executive team on April 1, 2013 [ACCJC Action Memo.]

Honolulu Community College’s Accreditation Follow-Up Report, as the document presented here, was prepared by members of the Chancellor’s executive team, with multiple opportunities provided to members of the college community for broad-based campus review.

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

Individual team members took the lead for drafting specific sections, based on assignments made at the annual Executive Retreat on August 1-2, 2013. [Notes from Retreat.] Working drafts were circulated to the full team as well as to members of the Accreditation Oversight Committee (AOC) for initial review and feedback. The team also decided to add an additional concluding section highlighting the various “closing the loop” actions that have been taken recently in response to assessment in various contexts. Comments on the draft responses to recommendations were incorporated, and the drafts as well as concluding section were posted for full campus review, so that faculty, staff, and students could be prepared to attend and discuss the report at a special Town Hall meeting on September 20, 2013. [Town Hall notes 9-20-13] The Town Hall meeting provided an opportunity for feedback on the individual recommendations as well as the Distance Education Strategic Plan. The final report includes the response to recommendations directed specifically to the College, as well as responses to recommendations directed to the UHCC and UH systems as a whole; the latter were prepared by the Office of the Vice President for Community Colleges.
EVIDENCE FOR REPORT PREPARATION:

R.1  ACCJC Action Memo 4-1-13

R.2  Notes from Executive Retreat 8-1,2-13

R. 3  Town Hall Notes 9-20-13
As a result of the visit in Fall 2012 in response to its Self-Evaluation Report, Honolulu Community College was made aware that it could do a better job of reporting data regarding key categories of institutional effectiveness, including enrollment, persistence and retention, so that better information was available in relation to key demographic indicators including age, race/ethnicity and socio-economic status. The following brief Campus Data Profile presents disaggregated data for the past five-year period and provides more nuanced information on which to base our assessment.

In Fall 2013, census enrollment at Honolulu Community College declined by 5% to 4,368, a level not witnessed since before Fall 2009. The number of recent high school graduates enrolling in the College fell to 406 in Fall 2013, continuing the trend of declining numbers albeit at a decreasing rate (see Figure 1). From Fall 2008 to Fall 2013 the number of recent high school graduates contracted by 25% (543 to 406) even as overall enrollment over that span grew by 4% (4,218 to 4,368). The College administration is aware of the situation and has implemented as part of its recruitment and retention plan specific efforts to boost new enrollment from feeder high schools and reverse the trend.

The College also looked at persistence data, particularly fall to fall persistence, where keeping students presents an even greater challenge than over one semester (fall to spring). As shown in Figure 2, the overall persistence rate from fall to spring semesters has grown steadily from 64% in AY 2008 to nearly 70% in AY 2013. Over that time
span, however, the fall to fall persistence stubbornly remained around 45% with very little fluctuation (Figure 3.)

In delving into the details, certain patterns emerge with respect to the differences between ethnic categories. Asian students persist at rates that are two to six percentage points higher than for all students as a whole. This is true for fall to fall as well as fall to spring persistence. Other ethnic groups such as Native Hawaiians, Pacific Islanders, and even White students underperform relative to Asian students, which suggests that despite previous interventions, much work remains to improve persistence. Moreover, the fall to fall persistence rates often reflect a greater disparity between Asian and non-Asian students than fall to spring rates, indicating the need for increased focus on the period between academic years.

Not surprisingly, students receiving Pell awards persist at higher rates between fall and spring than those not receiving that form of aid. Although the percentage point difference between Pell and non-Pell awardees in fall to fall persistence rates grew from five to eight percentage points, this change is relatively small even as the number of Pell recipients more than doubled. This is suggestive of the need to examine non-monetary considerations affecting students’ decisions to re-enroll. Nevertheless, the ongoing College and UHCC System emphasis on increasing the number of Pell Grants and dollars awarded appears to at least help stabilize persistence rates. It will be interesting to
continue monitoring the data to see if rates, particularly fall to fall rates, will rise if the College is successful in further increasing Pell awards.

Figure 3
Honolulu Community College Fall to Fall Persistence
Denominator and Rate
Overall

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>3,295</td>
<td>3,386</td>
<td>3,543</td>
<td>3,623</td>
<td>3,657</td>
<td>3,593</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Denom %</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>46%</td>
<td>46%</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>47%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Indian or Alaska Native</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>1,684</td>
<td>1,696</td>
<td>1,719</td>
<td>1,695</td>
<td>1,662</td>
<td>1,618</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Denom %</td>
<td>49%</td>
<td>48%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>53%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black or African American</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Denom %</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic/Latino of Any Race</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Denom %</td>
<td>47%</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>37%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Native Hawaiian</td>
<td>624</td>
<td>656</td>
<td>730</td>
<td>927</td>
<td>962</td>
<td>962</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Denom %</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>43%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Pacific Islander</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>162</td>
<td>147</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>135</td>
<td>143</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Denom %</td>
<td>48%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>37%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>291</td>
<td>288</td>
<td>296</td>
<td>299</td>
<td>317</td>
<td>349</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Denom %</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two or More Races</td>
<td>403</td>
<td>386</td>
<td>434</td>
<td>396</td>
<td>420</td>
<td>398</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Denom %</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>47%</td>
<td>47%</td>
<td>47%</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>49%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unknown/Other</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Denom %</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>55%</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>54%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Socio Economic (Pell)

| Received Pell | 415       | 443       | 668       | 792       | 1,009      | 1,098      |
| Denom %       | 49%       | 51%       | 51%       | 52%       | 51%        | 52%        |
| Did not receive Pell | 2,880 | 2,943 | 2,875 | 2,831 | 2,648 | 2,495 |
| Denom % | 44% | 44% | 44% | 44% | 43% | 44% |

Data Source:
Persistence calculated for Honolulu CC Home Institution students only
ODS - IRAO Freeze Tables - IRO_BASE_UH, CENSUS
CERTIFICATION OF CONTINUED INSTITUTIONAL COMPLIANCE
WITH ELIGIBILITY REQUIREMENTS

1. Authority

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

2. Mission

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

3. Governing Board

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

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

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

5. **Administrative Capacity**

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

6. **Operational Status**

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

7. **Degrees**

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

8. **Educational Programs**

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

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

10. Student Learning Achievement

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

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

11. General Education

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

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

12. Academic Freedom

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

13. Faculty

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

14. Student Services

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

15. Admissions

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

16. Information and Learning Resources

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

17. Financial Resources

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

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

19. Institutional Planning and Evaluation

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

20. Public Information

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

21. Relations with the Accrediting Commission

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Administrative Services Report

Following their October 2012 visit to Honolulu Community College, the visiting team recommended that the College’s administrative services division demonstrate progress in developing and integrating appropriate assessment methods impacting student learning. The College has since taken the appropriate steps to ensure that on-going, continuous assessment is integrated into all facets of its operation. While the college continues to address recommendation #1, substantial progress to address areas of improvement is discussed below and provides an appropriate framework needed to support a culture of continuous improvement.

Historically, efforts supporting administrative unit assessment have been focused on common goals and specific measurements unique to each area. Both qualitative and quantitative data are used to provide evidence-rich information that drives decision-making related to student learning. Codified by the College’s Policy on assessment, HCCP #5.202 [policy document], all programs, including administrative services, are participating in ongoing assessment using specific parameters defined to indicate performance in relation to specific service area outcomes related to the campus’ strategic goals.
Previous assessment results and recent internal review of our assessment practices relating to Recommendation #1 have positively impacted the College, both internally (e.g., heightening awareness of how the effective provision of services contributes to a positive experience for students) and in the actual provision of those services. The results, based on work in all administrative service areas (Human Resources, Business Office, and Operations & Maintenance) include the development of the Service Area Outcomes, Unit Assessment Administrative Resource Guide [Unit Assessment Manual], and completion of the 2012-2013 Assessment Report [Assessment Report].

Part of the College’s ongoing commitment towards creating a culture of assessment included appropriate professional development for all administrative units. In April 2013, members from the divisions of Administrative Services, Academic Support, and Student Services participated alongside instructional faculty in a three-day Outcomes and Assessment Training [Skyriver workshop agenda.] The training days included specific work sessions for Administrative Services. These work sessions allowed for more in-depth training on how to create robust and assessable student learning and/or service area outcomes. The foundation of the training was rooted in the work of Dr. Ruth Stiehl and Dr. Les Lewchuk. The basic philosophical approach of Stiehl and Lewchuk’s work is to start with the development of robust outcomes. Stakeholders within and outside the program or department help to create the outcomes through a collaborative process of brainstorming concepts and issues, clustering of themes, and eventual development of written outcomes. The outcomes are then honed and edited in order to ensure they are robust enough to speak to the overall mission or goals of a program or department, but specific enough so that they are measurable. Only after the development of the outcomes are assessment tools designed. The assessments include the traditional quantitative and qualitative tools (surveys, open-ended questions, and numerical data) as well as new tools that may not traditionally be used in areas like Student Services or Administrative Services (rubrics, checklists, and process checklists.)

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

One additional area critical to the ongoing support of the assessment practices was the development of the Unit Assessment Administrative Resource Guide [Resource Guide.] This comprehensive training guide provides a framework for understanding assessment,
development of appropriate service area outcomes, and the time-frame for assessing each administrative unit. Specific checklists and benchmarks have been developed to guide units to conduct appropriate assessment moving forward [2012-2013 report.]

Executive Leadership Report

Honolulu Community College’s commitment to assessment also includes evaluation of the Chancellor’s executive leadership team, which includes Vice Chancellors of academic affairs and administrative services, as well as Deans of academic affairs, academic support, and student services. Executive assessment occurs on both an individual as well as a collective level. Each unit head is responsible for the development and evaluation of appropriate goals relating to the mission and strategic plan of the College. Unit heads meet with the Chancellor to discuss specific performance objectives, and are provided with recommendations for improvement and development of strategic goals for the following school year. In addition, the University of Hawai‘i’s 360 Performance Evaluations capture similar executive assessments, and are included as part of the executive assessment report [Chancellor’s report summary.] These performance evaluations for the 2012-2013 academic year have been reviewed, and resulting changes have been implemented.

An important part of executive review is the campus dialogue in response to the review. It is important for the administrative team to understand the campus’ assessment of the executive team’s performance. A team of seven individuals from the major governance committees is tasked with reviewing the executive team report and providing feedback to the Chancellor’s office.

EVIDENCE FOR RECOMMENDATION 1:

1.1 HCCP #5.202
1.2 Administrative Services Unit Assessment Manual
1.3 Administrative Services 2012-2013 Assessment Report
1.4 Outcomes and Assessment Training workshop agenda
1.5 Administrative Services SAO document
1.6 Unit Assessment Administrative Resource Guide
1.7 Chancellor’s summary report of executive assessment
Response to College Recommendation 2

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

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

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

As noted in the college’s response to Recommendation 1, members from the divisions of Administrative Services, Academic Support, and Student Services participated alongside instructional faculty in a three-day Outcomes and Assessment Training in April 2013 [Skyriver workshop agenda].] The training days included specific work sessions for both Administrative Services and Student Services. These specific work sessions allowed for more in-depth training on how to create robust and assessable student learning and/or service area outcomes. The foundation of the training was rooted in the work of Dr. Ruth Stiehl and Dr. Les Lewchuk. The basic philosophical approach of Stiehl and Lewchuk’s work is to start with the development of robust outcomes. Stakeholders within and outside the program or department help to create the outcomes through a collaborative process of brainstorming concepts and issues, clustering of themes, and eventual development of written outcomes. The outcomes are then honed and edited in order to make sure they are robust enough to speak to the overall mission or goals of a program or department, but specific enough so that they are measurable. Only after the development of the outcomes are assessment tools designed. The assessments include the traditional quantitative and qualitative tools (surveys, open-ended questions, and numerical data) as well as new tools that may not traditionally be used in areas like Student Services or Administrative Services (rubrics, checklists, and process checklists.)

Prior to this training, the Administrative Services Division, under the leadership of the Vice Chancellor for Administrative Services, had been working on creating Service Unit Outcomes (another term used could be Service Area Outcomes.) In several staff meetings over the course of the Spring 2013 Semester, lead personnel within the division spent
time at each staff meeting to learn about outcomes and assessment, and to develop unit mission statements, goals, and outcomes. Prior to this, the units within this division had not been asked to create outcomes. It became necessary to make sure staff were trained in assessment before outcomes could be developed. [Administrative Services staff meetings] Using a common framework, each area worked on developing and refining their mission, goals, and outcomes. [unit assessment manual, Admin Svcs 3-13-13] The three-day training session helped by offering more training and opportunities for refinement of outcomes.

By the end of the semester, each unit (including Human Resources, Business Office, and Operations and Maintenance) had not only created outcomes, but also had in place specific unit goals that tied into the unit’s ultimate mission. For each unit’s goals, relevant activities were identified. Many of these activities were then linked to some kind of assessment or measurement tool. In many cases, these assessments relied on looking at data reports or conducting a survey. As each unit identified outcomes, particular activities or assessments were noted that would help measure the intended outcome. All this information was pulled into one Planning Document, which will be used for tracking. [Admin Svc final 3-25-13.] The Planning Document also serves as a way for each unit to report on assessment results, and to document any changes made to processes or procedures due to the results. The units within the division are now using this as a yearly cycle of assessment and improvement.

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

In the Student Services Division, several of the offices and programs had some outcomes already developed but had not fully addressed them for assessment. [prior Student Services annual reports and program reviews] Prior to the Outcomes and Assessment Training workshop, the Dean of Student Services (DOSS) held a division meeting specifically centered on outcomes. The intent of this meeting was to pre-train the members of division in the philosophy and terminology of outcomes development in order to have a shared understanding of the work ahead. [Guide to Assessment 101.] Lead personnel in each of the Student Services areas were asked to attend the three-day training. After attending the April 2013 training, each office or program worked with the DOSS to either revise their Student Learning Outcomes (SLOs) or develop new outcomes. In areas where appropriate, Service Area Outcomes (SAOs) were developed. This work was done over a period of several months using the techniques and practices learned in the training. After the outcomes were set, attention turned toward choosing which two or three outcomes each program or department will measure during the upcoming academic year (AY 2013-2014.) [Student Services summary of workshop: Student Services SLOs] Selection of particular outcomes dictated what kind of assessment tools would need to be used or developed. In several cases, the assessment
tools did not exist, and work began over the last half of Summer 2013 to create these tools. Many of the new assessment tools being created (rubrics and checklists) will also end up being part of a program or department’s every-day work. Certain parts of the checklists will be used for assessment. These types of embedded assessments can help reinforce concepts or issues related to the outcomes. Due to the timing of the training, and the amount of time it took to revise or create outcomes, additional data are currently being gathered, and the assessment based on those data will take place in the current (2013-2014) academic year. Each program or department has an established Assessment Plan that includes which outcomes are up for assessment in 2013-2014, and how they will be assessed. At the end of Spring 2014, the results of the assessment will be completed and each area will use a common template for reporting results. This information will be used for the following: (a) program/department improvement, (b) division prioritization for funding and advocacy, and (c) program review data and documentation. [Student Services assessment plan 13-14; Annual Reporting Template.]

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

In addition to the work done specifically around outcomes and assessment, Student Services also engaged in two related activities in the Spring 2013 semester. First, an Accreditation Action Plan for the overall division was created, as well as one for each program or department within the division, was created. In conjunction with the members of the division, the DOSS worked to pull out specific items in Standard IIB: Student Support Services that needed to be addressed. The creation of the action plan was shared at a division meeting. [link, student svc accreditation presentation and accred. Action plan.] In addition to outcomes and assessment work, the action plan also includes changes and improvements that need to be made in order to serve the college’s Distance Education students, as well as other issues identified by the visiting team.
The second assessment-related activity in Student Services was the creation and implementation of a Student Satisfaction Survey. [Student Satisfaction Survey 2013.] The purpose of the survey was to take a baseline reading of how programs and departments within Student Services and related areas were doing in terms of serving the student population. The survey was deployed over the span of several weeks prior to summer registration, and was offered in both online and paper formats. Over 300 students responded to the survey. Results were analyzed by individual program/departments, and as a whole. Results of the survey were used to loop back to the Accreditation Action Plan for each area, as well as used to make changes in order to improve access to services and customer service. [division summary.] Overall, the results showed that students are satisfied with the level of service that they are receiving from programs and departments. Students also feel that the types of services and programs offered are valuable to their success. However, when students had trouble accessing services or felt unwelcomed, they were very unsatisfied with their experiences. The results helped the group consider how to address this issue. At this time, the college plans on deploying the survey again in Fall 2013. Small changes will be made to the survey to improve completion rates, and it will once again be accessible both online and in-person. Results from the survey may also be used in specific programs or departments to help measure specific SLOs.

During the Spring 2013 Semester the hiring process was underway for a permanent Dean of Academic Support Services, a process that has now been completed. This division is new in the college’s organizational chart, and includes a combination of instructional and support services. At the time of the three-day training around outcomes and assessment, the Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs oversaw the areas within this division. Members of these departments or program participated in the workshop with the intent of creating or refining SLOs or SAOs pertinent to their areas.

Outcome creation and refinement took place over the last part of spring semester and over the summer. Members of each department or program met with the Vice Chancellor of Academic Affairs during this time to make sure outcomes were measureable and robust. By the middle of summer, a permanent Dean of Academic Support Services was hired. Programs and departments under this division continued to work on refinement of outcomes. Consultants who led the three-day training were asked to provide input on several of the outcomes. A few programs and departments were also able to move forward with identifying what types of assessments could take place to measure specific outcomes.

Each program or department under Academic Support now has finalized SLOs or SAOs. The plan heading into the Fall 2013 semester is to work with each program or department to either finish identifying assessment tools, or to begin to create the assessment tools. Outcomes will then be measured, and results from the assessments will help to inform the Program Review, and will be used for program and department improvements and planning. [SLOs/SAOs for Design Center; Ed Tech Center; Library; PPIR; Student Access; Testing and Tutoring; Academic Success.]
In addition to the areas identified above, the Office of Communication and External Affairs also participated in the outcome and assessment training workshop. As a result of this, outcomes were developed specifically for the work of that office. Due to the extensive collaboration between this office and that of the Design Center (housed under Academic Support), outcomes were compared and aligned where necessary. In determining how to measure the established outcomes, the Office of Communication and External Affairs will draw upon the University of Hawaii Community College System’s data derived from in-depth media preference surveys that are completed every two years. Additionally, more campus specific surveys will be developed and deployed through the college’s social media channels over the upcoming academic year. Results from the assessments will be used in the annual report that is coordinated by this office. 

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

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

The College also developed three institutional-level outcomes that were approved by the Planning Council (PC) in October 2012; they are now published in the college catalog. An initial discussion of assessment measures took place in Spring 2013. A group of PC members created an assessment survey that would measure the success of the first ILO, related to the General Education component of all degree programs. This was administered to a sample of students prior to the graduation ceremony in May, 2013. Results of this indirect assessment were positive, and the PC will investigate other methods of assessment for this and the other ILOs in the future.
The College has also provided support for the participation of the Accreditation Liaison Officer (ALO) in the 2013-2014 WASC Assessment Leadership Academy. This has brought additional resources to the College in support of a more broad-based approach to assessment in multiple contexts at multiple levels.

EVIDENCE FOR RECOMMENDATION 2:

2.1 Outcomes and Assessment Training workshop agenda
2.2 Administrative Services staff meeting minutes
2.3 Administrative Services final report 3-25-13
2.4 Prior Student Services annual reports and program reviews
2.5 Student Services Guide: Assessment 101
2.6 Student Services workshop summary
2.7 Student Services SLOs
2.8 Student Services assessment plan 2013-2014
2.9 Student Services annual reporting template
2.10 Student Services ARPD
2.11 IR Data Request form
2.12 Student Services accreditation presentation and accreditation action plan
2.13 Student Satisfaction Survey 2013
2.14 Student Services division summary
2.15 SLOs/SAOs for Design Center
2.16 SLOs/SAOs for Education Technology Center
2.17 SLOs/SAOs for Library
2.18 SLOs/SAOs for PPIR
2.19 SLOs/SAOs for Student Access
2.20 SLOs/SAOs for Testing and Tutoring
2.21  SLOs/SAOs for Academic Success
2.22  System data on media preferences
2.23  Communications and External Affairs SAOs
2.24  HCC Annual Reports
2.25  AA Alignment Chart
2.26  SLO Inventory template
2.27  Course SLO Inventory summary chart
2.28  Sample SLO Inventory forms
2.29  Planning Council minutes (approval of ILOs in 2012)
2.30  HCC Catalogue 2013-2014, p. 15
2.31  Planning Council minutes (discussion of ILO assessment)
2.32  ILO Survey and data
2.33  Planning Council minutes 9-20-13 (discussion of ILO revision)
Response to College Recommendation #3

As was recommended by the 2006 evaluation team, in order to meet the Standards, the college must "develop a formal assessment process to evaluate the effectiveness of its Distance Education program in meeting the institutional mission. The process should include a systematic evaluation, analysis, communication, and improvement of the program, including assessment of how well each online course is satisfying its student learning outcomes, support for staff development, and technical assistance for faculty." This review must include a formal evaluation of student support services and learning resources including its design and delivery. The college should compare the instructional quality of face-to-face and distance education courses and develop a strategic plan for distance education. (Standards II.A.2.e, II.A.2.f, II.B, II.C.1.c, III.A.5.a)

HCC has fully addressed this recommendation in the following ways:

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

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

a. Most recently, a survey of all students enrolled in DE courses as of Spring 2013. The results of this survey were used extensively to guide development of the Plan. [survey results.] Prior forms of DE assessment include surveys of DE students and reports compiled from those surveys, documented discussions with DE faculty, as well as research on DE management at other institutions, and a review of the ACCJC manual governing Distance Education.
b. A campus-wide Town Hall meeting was held on May 3, 2013, attended primarily by faculty and IT staff. The results of the student survey were presented, and input on various aspects of DE was obtained. The Town Hall was critical in identifying immediate and longer-term actions that needed attention. [Town Hall minutes.]

Based on the assessment provided by the Town Hall in Spring 2013, a mandatory orientation providing technical support and course development assistance for all faculty teaching DE courses in Fall 2013 was held on August 21, 2013. [orientation agenda] A survey conducted at this meeting also provided additional perspective on critical issues. [faculty survey.]

A series of training workshops for faculty teaching DE courses in Fall 2013 (and planning to teach DE courses in Spring 2014) are being held during the first three weeks of the Fall semester. This will enable DE faculty to better serve their current DE students, and also to better plan for the Spring 2014 DE courses. Topics given priority for
the workshops were determined based on recent survey results, as well as prior discussions with DE faculty. [training session schedule.]

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

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

All faculty who taught DE courses in Spring 2013 were contacted regarding the need to document their SLO assessment and validation against face-to-face sections of the course (if applicable.) For faculty teaching DE courses in Fall 2013, this need was emphasized in the mandatory orientation and will be covered in the training sessions. [list of faculty doing comparative assessment] Several summary reports are posted of assessment analysis for specific departments or disciplines, and individual inventory reports are available for review upon request. [reports; inventory form.]

To address the possible classroom shortage due to the current renovation of building 7, one of the primary classroom facilities at the College, the College partnered with Kapi’olani Community College (KCC) to utilize training materials that KCC had developed in Laulima. KCC’s Director of the Center for Learning, Teaching and Technology, and their Distance Education Coordinator came to HCC to do an in-person presentation on their Laulima training site designed with information on standards and best practices for creating DE courses. Guest access to the Laulima group “HonCC.OnlineConnection” can be provided on request.

The College continues to support elements of institutional infrastructure for quality assurance of its Distance Education offerings. These include the following:

a. A Distance Education Coordinator, whose responsibility it is to oversee all aspects of the College’s distance education offerings;

b. A Distance Education Advisory Committee (DEAC), chaired by the DE Coordinator [DEAC.] The DEAC, with campus-wide membership, has provided important input on Distance Education issues and has contributed to the creation of a number of resources, including a DE Handbook [Handbook]; and

c. A process of regular certification and recertification of all distance education offerings (both online and cable), in which faculty must address issues of delivery, assessment, meaningful interaction between instructor and students, and security questions (e.g., proctoring of exams.) To facilitate and compile evidence of ongoing assessment of Distance Education classes, the effort was undertaken to meet and/or communicate with all instructors teaching DE courses in Fall 2012, Spring 2013 and Fall 2013. Instructors were asked to report on their assessment
strategies, the results found, and responses identified to improve courses based on results. In addition, where applicable, information regarding assessment strategies, results and identified improvements related to student achievement of SLOs was compared between DE sections versus face-to-face sections (see Item 7 above.) Individual course assessment reports are retained by the Distance Education Coordinator.

The College has carried out review and certification of Distance Education courses for several years. The Distance Education Review Board (DERB) was initially created by the campus-wide Committee on Programs and Curricula (CPC) and the process of reviewing and certifying has been assessed and revised a number of times in the past five years. Courses for which faculty are seeking certification/recertification are now reviewed by a Distance Education Review Board (DERB) pertinent to the specific discipline or field of study. The current process specifies clear standards to be met, and requires revision of those courses that do not meet established standards. The recent growth in the number of DE courses and the maturation of the DE program has led to the need to clarify processes and timetables for recertification. The DERB in conjunction with the DEAC will finalize this process in Fall 2013. [DERB guidelines for application; application form; updated list of DERB-approved classes.]

**EVIDENCE FOR RECOMMENDATION 3:**

3.1 Distance Education Strategic Plan
3.2 DE Survey Spring 2013
3.3 Town Hall minutes 5-3-2013
3.4 DE Mandatory Faculty Orientation Agenda 8-21-2013
3.5 DE Faculty Orientation Survey 8-21-2013
3.6 DE training sessions schedule
3.7 HCC website
3.8 HCC DE website page
3.9 DE Assessment Summary
3.10 DE departmental assessment reports
3.11 DEAC page
3.12 DE Handbook
3.13  DERB guidelines for application
3.14  DERB application form
3.15  DERB list of approved DE courses
Response to College Recommendation #4

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

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

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

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

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

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

**EVIDENCE FOR RECOMMENDATION 4:**

4.1 HCCP #5.213 (older policy from 2012)  
4.2 HCCP #5.213 (newer policy from 2013)  
4.3 New Technical Math  
4.4 New Technical English  
4.5 HCC Catalogue, General Education section  
4.6 GEB Charter  
4.7 GEB minutes  
4.8 GEB Approval by CPC (minutes from April or May, 2013)  
4.9 GEB Approval by FSEC (minutes from April or May, 2013)  
4.10 GEB criteria and process for approval (page to be updated)
Response to College Recommendation 5

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

In order to address the recommendation of confidentiality, the process of convening search committees has changed. In the past, the Personnel Director convened each search committee and required they sign a confidentiality agreement. In order to hold each committee accountable, the confidentiality agreement has been updated to include other expectations of those serving on the search committees. In addition, in order to elevate the importance of a confidential process, each search committee is convened by the Dean or Director responsible for the unit/division, where a discussion of these responsibilities occurs. Questions that occur throughout the search process will be directed to the Dean or Director of the unit, and not the Personnel Officer.

**EVIDENCE FOR RECOMMENDATION 5:**

5.1 Standard Operating Procedures for screening committees / hiring process

5.2 New Confidentiality Statement
Response to College Recommendation 6

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

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

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

Administrative, Professional and Technical personnel (APT) belong to the Hawaii Government Employees Association (HGEA) bargaining unit. HGEA employees undergo an annual performance review every November. This review includes an assessment of their performance, and a review of their accomplishments based upon their previous year’s goals. At that time, employees also set goals for the upcoming year in consultation with their supervisor. Supervisors are notified electronically of the schedule for review, which occurs October through November each year.

Civil service employees are also State of Hawaii employees and belong to the United Public Workers (UPW) bargaining union. All civil service employees are also evaluated on an annual basis, depending on their anniversary date with the University of Hawai`i. At this evaluation they review the previous year’s performance, and set performance goals for the following year.
When the ACCJC visiting team performed their accreditation visit in Oct 2012, the college was in the middle of the evaluation cycle for APTs. Data at that time indicated that not all employees were regularly evaluated. In response to this recommendation, the college has developed a policy to hold supervisors accountable for completing all subordinates’ evaluations within the specific timeframe. [HCCP #9.202.] The policy will be brought to the four governance committees for comment and approval in Fall 2013. In addition to this policy, a standard operating procedure was developed to ensure that the Chief Personnel Director performs routine checks on the evaluation status of all APT and Civil Service employees and reminds them of the pending review. The operating procedures indicate the repercussions for not completing the performance reviews. Deans and Directors will be responsible for ensuring all employees within their division are evaluated. The 2013-2014 academic year will be the first year this procedure is in place and will be reviewed for improvement for Fall 2014.

**EVIDENCE FOR RECOMMENDATION 6:**

6.1 Post-tenure Review Policy

6.2 Faculty classification plan

6.3 HCCP #9.202
Honolulu Community College Closes the Loop

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

Closing the Loop: Remedial Education

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

Closing the Loop: Organizational Structure

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Closing the Loop: Outreach and Orientation

In response to declining enrollments from specific groups such as high school students, an Outreach Office was created in the summer of 2012. The purpose of this office was to refocus efforts in creating relationships with the surrounding community and high schools, and in recruiting new students to the college. In November 2012, the then-new Dean of Student Services added the function of new student orientation to the office functions, thus creating an Outreach & Orientation Office. Prior to this, orientation had been housed with a committee that had a rotating chair. By adding this function into the outreach area, the college has provided a consistency of leadership and a strong tie with incoming students. The Outreach & Orientation Office will continue to improve services by focusing on two things. First is a revamp of the orientation process, which aims to make the process easier for students and bring more of the orientation components to the local high schools. Second, the office will work in conjunction with the Dean of Students to update and refocus the college’s recruitment plan. This plan will focus on high schools, and have built-in goals and assessments in order to increase our high school-aged population.

Closing the Loop: Academic Support

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

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

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

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

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

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

The campus-wide effort to look at assessment activities, applied to both instructional and non-instructional areas, has resulted in a common focus and shared concern with improving services to students linked to specific and measurable outcomes. The College
has moved from a climate where some areas were doing assessment well to an institutional focus on assessment as part of the general culture of the College. As one of the manifestations of that shift in focus, the College is developing a multi-year Assessment and Planning Calendar so that various assessment-related activities are more readily identified and given priority. Activities will also include an Assessment Day in late Spring 2014 (a “summative” event to review work done during the current year), and another focus on assessment projects in Fall 2014 (a “formative” event to determine what data-gathering and analysis will take place in the coming academic year.)

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

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

Closing the Loop: High School Transition
As part of the Community Colleges Strategic Plan, the community college system has been tracking the high school “going rate.” This is defined as recent high school graduates entering fall semester at the community college following their spring graduation from high school. The overall community college system has been able to meet the annual goals. However, Honolulu Community College declined in the high school going rate over the past four years beginning in 2009 and has not met the established goal. (See also Campus Data Profile.)

To address this decline, the campus has increased its activities with the high school campuses. The Dean of Student Services identified an outreach counselor. Summer bridge programs were established to target high school students. These programs were designed to introduce high school students to the various programs at Honolulu Community College, and to develop a relationship with participating student, parents, and
high school counselors. The belief was that familiarity with the campus would translate to a smoother transition to Honolulu Community College for students.

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

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

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

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

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

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

Below is a brief description of each project funded through Perkins, the amount of money received, and the semester of implementation. Specific proposals can also be found in the appendix.

Table 1.1
Carl D. Perkins Vocational and Technical Education Act 2013-2014 HonCC Awards

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strategy Title</th>
<th>Department</th>
<th>Amount</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Philosophy 109: Reasoning and Critical Thinking</td>
<td>Philosophy/Tech. 1</td>
<td>$7,520</td>
<td>Spring 2014 Course Offered</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CTE Gen. Ed. Accelerated English 60/100</td>
<td>English/Tech. 2</td>
<td>$5,820</td>
<td>Fall 2013 Course Offered</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College-Level Physics for Automotive, Electrical Installation and Maintenance, Metallurgy, and Fire Science Students</td>
<td>Physics/Tech. 1</td>
<td>$66,838</td>
<td>Spring 2014 Courses Offered</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College Level Math Course for CTE</td>
<td>Math/Tech. 1, Tech. 2</td>
<td>$7,015</td>
<td>Spring 2014 Course Offered</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Funding</td>
<td></td>
<td>$87,193</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

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

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

**Closing the Loop: Support for Distance Education Faculty**

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

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

**Closing the Loop: Resources for Distance Education Students**

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

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

**Closing the Loop: HCConnect**

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

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

Closing the Loop: Continuing Education (non-credit customers)
For several years the limitations of the Non-Credit registration system at Honolulu Community College (HCC) have been evident, including the inability to handle on-line registrations and having limited access to data reports. The college had already moved to a University-wide on-line registration system for our customers taking credit classes. Through a lengthy Request for Proposal (RFP) process, the Destiny One registration system, provided by Destiny Solutions, was selected as the new University of Hawai'i Community Colleges (UHCC) non-credit registration system with a Go-Live date of November 25, 2013. Destiny One provides a rich online experience that improves student self-service while maximizing staff efficiency. It includes an on-line shopping cart and multiple registration and payment options that streamline registration processes and improve customer satisfaction. Up-to-the-minute data allows staff to quickly respond to inquiries, saving valuable time and work effort. HCC has closed the loop for our customers expecting web-based equivalents for in-person transactions by supporting the acquisition of a UHCC-wide registration system.
UHCC Recommendation 1: Institutional Mission and Effectiveness

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

- The VPCC and the Chancellors develop broad-based, ongoing, collegial dialogue between and among the UHCC and the colleges to better assess the breadth, quality, and usefulness of UHCC analytical tools (e.g., UHCC Annual Report of Program Data (ARPD)) and planning processes through feedback from college stakeholders. In addition, the UHCC and Chancellors should provide training for the appropriate use of the tools to support on-going improvement and effectiveness.

- The Chancellors provide clear descriptions and training regarding the planning timeline and budgeting process. The information and training should be available to all college constituencies and reviewed regularly to ensure accuracy for resource allocations that lead to program and institutional improvement. (Standards I.B.3, I.B1, II.A.1.c, II.A.2a,e,f, II.B.1, II.B.3.a, and II.B.4, I.B.1, I.B.4, I.B.6)

UHCC Strategic Planning Process

University of Hawai‘i Community Colleges (UHCC) codified the strategic planning process in UHCC Policy #4.101 Strategic Academic Planning.

The UHCC system has regularly monitored progress toward meeting established outcomes, updated assessment of the internal and external environments, and modified priorities as necessary to reflect changing conditions prior to the development of each biennial budget request. The UHCC System under the leadership of the vice president for community colleges (VPCC) has used the strategic planning process to set budget priorities as well as to establish a focus on critical issues affecting the colleges and the State.

Per UHCC Policy #4.101 Strategic Academic Planning, the VPCC convenes the full UHCC Strategic Planning Council (SPC) in the spring and fall of each year. The membership of the SPC consists of the chancellor, faculty senate chair, and student government chair from each college, and the vice president and associate vice presidents for community colleges. Meeting notes and materials are posted to the public website.

The annual spring meeting is used to review UHCC strategic outcomes and performance measures. The SPC monitors and advises on progress toward the UHCC strategic planning goals. The VPCC uses the meeting to gather impressions and reactions to progress to date and to emphasize and maintain the focus on the things UHCC has identified as important. The VPCC follows this meeting with visits to each college to present college-level detailed data. During the open meetings for the college community
at each campus the VPCC leads discussions on progress and encourages feedback, e.g., new ideas, process improvement, and college innovations.

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

The UHCC System began the process of updating the current UHCC Strategic Plan in fall 2012 using the SPC meeting to review and discuss system data products, their status, and how the UHCC System puts data in front of people. The fall 2012 meeting also began the dialog about how to organize the UHCC System for the update of the strategic plan beyond 2015. More specifically, addressing what the system wants to accomplish at the system level and individual colleges and what the system wants to see measured or measured differently keeping in mind the UHCC System plan’s link to the University of Hawai‘i (UH) System plan and direction. The UH System plan is grounded in the UH Second Decade Project which identifies the state’s higher education needs by geographic region and develops a set of statewide priorities.

At the fall 2012 meeting, the SPC established a process to identify additional areas of emphasis to be grouped under the current UHCC strategic plan’s goals. In the spring 2013 meeting working groups, chaired by a chancellor with faculty senate chair (not of the same college), and a student leader supplemented by members knowledgeable and appropriate for the work, were formed. The organization and process for updating the plan beyond 2015 was part of the VPCC’s spring visit to each of the institutions. The working group goals or focus from UHCC Strategic Plan are:

- **Goal A (part 1): Educational Effectiveness and Student Success.**
  - Special Emphasis on Part-Time Student Access and Success and Adult Learners
- **Goal A (part 2): Native Hawaiian educational Attainment.**
  - Including review of other underserved populations.
- **Goal B: Functioning as a Seamless State System.**
  - Transfers and Articulation
- **Goal C: Promote Workforce and Economic Development**
  - Special emphasis on STEM, Workforce – Energizing Areas, and Reviving the global curriculum
- **Goal D: Hawai‘i’s Educational Capital/Resources and Stewardship**
  - What it means to be a Native Hawaiian Serving Institution
  - Government/non-profit partnerships
  - Entrepreneurship, commercialization, resource base
- **Goal E: Develop Sustainable Infrastructure for Student Learning**
  - Clean Energy, Sustainability
- **Focus Area 1: Distance Education**
  - Infrastructure for Student Learning, ADA Delivery, Rigor, Student Success
The working groups will review current performance measures, identify which should stay and/or be revised, and identify potential new members during spring and summer 2013 meetings. The full SPC will discuss and compile measures at its fall 2013 meeting followed by visits by the VPCC to each college for open, systemwide dialogue. Based on the results of those meetings, the measures will be refined and the full SPC will finalize outcomes and performance measures for the 2015 and beyond update. Results, progress, and next steps will be chronicled in the SPC proceedings or as an attachment.

The BOR Standing Committee on Community Colleges met on August 30, 2013. The VPCC gave an update relating to the progress in meeting the goals in the current strategic plan and reviewed the process for updating the plan including the seven working group areas of focus. The UHCC BOR CC Committee Briefing presentation and the direction of the plan were well-received by the BOR CC Committee. VPCC stated that he would provide another update to the BOR CC Committee in spring 2014.

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

UHCC System tools to support on-going improvement and effectiveness:

In addition to the UHCC Strategic Planning process with its strategic outcomes and performance measures, the UHCC system uses the following tools to support on-going improvement and effectiveness:

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

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

The UHCC System uses the *Community College Inventory: Focus on Student Persistence, Learning, and Attainment* – a research based tool developed by the Community College Leadership Program, University of Texas Austin to evaluate UHCC system effectiveness. The inventory assesses eleven institutional characteristics that are strongly focused on student success. The Office of the Vice President for Community Colleges (OVPCC) administers the inventory online in odd-numbered years (complementing the Community College Survey Student Engagement (CCSSE) that is administered in even-numbered years-- benchmark measurements included in Strategic Plan). The SPC affirmed that the eleven institutional characteristics are important to the system and incorporating selected outcomes in the UHCC Strategic Plan supports the regular assessment and review for on-going improvement and effectiveness of planning. As required in the policy, and evidenced in proceedings of the SPC, the inventory results
are reviewed and discussed by the full Council. Additionally, the 2006 comprehensive visit recommended the UHCC system evaluate the effectiveness of the dual reporting structure for chancellors and the Strategic Planning Process. Overwhelming consensus continues that both reporting and planning are working well and the 2015+ update planning process should also prove to be effective.

The chancellors reviewed the results of the 2013 survey at their August 30, 2013 executive meeting. “The UHCC system has a strategic plan that clearly and succinctly states its goals for future development” continues to receive the highest ranking within the category while “The UHCC system demonstrates its ability to stop doing things that are off mission, low-priority, and/or ineffective in promoting student persistence, learning, and attainment” continues to be scored the lowest. The full SPC will continue the review and discussion at the fall 2013 meeting.

2. Performance (Outcomes) Funding

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

The outcomes incorporated into the formula include the following:

a. degrees and certificates awarded;
b. degrees and certificates awarded to Native Hawaiian students;
c. degrees and certificates awarded to students in Science, Technology, Engineering, and Math (STEM) fields;
d. number of low-income students participating the Federal Pell program;
e. number of transfers from the community colleges to the baccalaureate campuses.

For each outcome, the baseline is the value set by the strategic outcomes for FY 2010 and the target is the value set for FY2011 (for FY 2012 funding). The outcomes funding model has the following characteristics:

a. For each outcome, the baseline is the value set by the strategic outcomes for FY 2010 and the target is the value set for FY 2011 (for FY 2012 funding).
b. The outcomes are independent of each other. Campuses can only achieve their full outcomes funding if they meet or exceed the targeted outcomes for each of the measures.
c. If a campus does not meet the targeted outcome, then any unused funds would be used for other UHCC initiatives.

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

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

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

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

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

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

Commitment to the Assessment of the UHCC Culture of Evidence

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

UHCC Budget Allocation Process

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

Despite the budget flux and the enrollment increases, the UHCC System and campuses were able to manage the finances and still maintain a healthy cash positions. However, in order to make the budget allocation process more transparent, the budget allocation model was put into a formal policy, UHCCP #8.000 General Fund and Tuition and Fees Special Fund Allocation, that was promulgated in September 2013. Key elements of the budget allocation policy include
• In accordance with State budget policy, State general funds are allocated based on a current service base with enhancements based on specific program change requests as approved by the Legislature.
• Approximately 5 percent of the operating budget is allocated based on five performance metrics – student graduation, Native Hawaiian student graduation, STEM graduation, Pell financial aid recipients, and UH transfers to baccalaureate institutions. In order to receive the outcomes funding portion of the budget allocation, campuses must meet numeric targets for each of these metrics.
• An additional pool of funds is allocated to campuses to meet enrollment growth and to fund need based financial aid.
• Campuses retain tuition and fee income.
• Campuses retain and manage non-credit and auxiliary services income.

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

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

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

The budget allocation model will undergo a continuous review, including an assessment of efficiency metrics, to determine whether further adjustments to the current service base will need to be made.
UHCC Recommendation 2: Student Learning Programs and Services

In order to meet the Standards, degrees offered by the colleges must be consistent with the general education philosophy as outlined in the college catalog and the rigor of the English and math courses needed to fulfill the degree requirements must be appropriate to higher education. (Eligibility Requirement 11, Standards II.A.3, II.A.3.b)

In spring 2012, ACCJC identified an issue that longstanding general education requirements within some Associate in Applied Science Degrees (AAS) did not appear to meet accreditation eligibility requirements and standards. The historical practice of allowing English and Math general education requirements to be met through developmental courses or to allow other general education courses to have extremely low reading or math levels did not meet the standards and therefore, required curriculum and program modifications.

The University of Hawai‘i Community Colleges (UHCC) immediately revised the policy on general education to bring the policy framework for general education into alignment with the standards and promulgated the new policy UHCCP #5.200 General Education in All Degree Programs. Colleges then began the curriculum processes for making the necessary change in program requirements, including consultation with program advisory committees, faculty and program departmental review, curriculum committee and faculty governance review, and administrative approval of the required changes. The evaluation report of the visiting teams reaffirmed the importance of making these general education modifications.

The approach has been similar on all affected campuses. The English requirement has been raised to English 100, the basic expository writing class, and the math requirement to Math 100, the basic non-algebra sequence college math class. Remedial/developmental classes no longer can be used to satisfy general education requirements.

At the same time, curriculum work has begun on the development of college-level applied writing and applied mathematics classes that could better meet the needs of the AAS degree programs while meeting the general education standards. Once these courses are developed, additional program modifications may be made to incorporate these courses either as the recommended or an optional means to satisfy the general education requirement.

In summary, all AAS degree programs at Hawai‘i Community College, Honolulu Community College, Kaua‘i Community College, and Leeward Community College are now in compliance with the standards. The program by program details of the changes and the processes leading to those changes are described in the college responses to this recommendation.
Kapiʻolani Community College and Windward Community College were not impacted by this recommendation as they do not have AAS degree programs.

As a result of this change in degree requirements, an issue emerged related to the certificate level programs within the AAS degree programs. UHCCP #5.203 Program Credentials: Degrees and Certificates had an upper limit of 30 on the number of credits allowable for a technical certificate of achievement. Several programs expressed a desire to increase that number to enable a student who earned credit for all of the technical courses within an AAS field of study, but did not complete all of the general education, could be recognized through a certificate of achievement. Accordingly, UHCCP #5.203 Program Credentials: Degrees and Certificates was modified to raise the allowable number of credits in a certificate program within the AAS fields of study to 51. This policy was promulgated on September 2013.
UHCC Recommendation 3: Student Learning Programs and Services and Resources

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

Regular Faculty Evaluation

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

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

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

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

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

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

After consultation with the faculty collective bargaining organization, the UHCC plans to adopt a policy on evaluation (sometimes referred to as post-tenure evaluation) that establishes a process requiring all faculty members to undergo evaluation at least once every five years. Because the evaluation process for contract renewal, tenure, and promotion were already comprehensive in scope, these evaluations are considered by policy to satisfy the five-year evaluation criteria. For faculty members who have not undergone a comprehensive evaluation, the policy will define a department-based process whereby the faculty member submits an abbreviated documentation of his or her contributions to their department and addresses their effectiveness as a faculty member. The assessment is based on the faculty member’s rank and the related duties in the classification system. Under the current policy, the evaluation is entirely within the department unless there is a disagreement between the department chair and faculty member.

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

In accordance with the collective bargaining law, this collective bargaining organization must be formally consulted on the policy change. The revised draft policy was submitted to the University of Hawai‘i Professional Assembly (UHPA) on September 13, 2013. After consideration of the comments from the collective bargaining organization, the revised policy will be promulgated and will guide future evaluations.

As a part of the revised policy, campuses will also be required to maintain and submit records certifying that all faculty members subject to the five-year evaluation have actually completed the evaluation process.

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

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

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

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

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

In accordance with the collective bargaining law, lecturers who are half-time or more are included in the faculty collective bargaining unit and the collective bargaining organization must be formally consulted on the new policy. Plans are to submit the proposed policy to UHPA before the end of September 2013. After consideration of the comments from the collective bargaining organization, the new policy will be promulgated and will guide future evaluations.

Additionally, a joint task group from the collective bargaining organization and the community colleges plans to be proposed to consider whether lecturer pay advancement should be merit based rather than credit based and the criteria to be used in such a merit based system. Should such a system be developed and implemented after proper consultation, the evaluation criteria would need to also be adjusted to reflect the policy change.
Pilot Project for ePortfolio Evaluation of Faculty

The current faculty evaluation system is conceived as representing a continuum across the faculty member’s professional career. The faculty expectations as defined in the classification system, rising expectations associated with the ranks, merit basis for promotion, importance of peer involvement as well as administrative oversight in the evaluation, and required periodic evaluation of all faculty are key principles in the evaluation system.

While guidelines are currently published on the different phases of the evaluation (contract renewal, tenure, promotion, post-tenure evaluation) the documents are paper documents created by and submitted by the applicant. This process results in the faculty member often having to find historic information as they create the application and creates inconsistencies in the information and materials that they may include and make available to the reviewers. The paper submittals are often very cumbersome and create problems in moving them from reviewing body to reviewing body.

To address these issues a pilot project is underway to consider whether an electronic portfolio approach would work to help faculty members build their evaluation portfolio in real time for use when the application period occurs. The ePortfolio could incorporate direct electronic feeds of information like the results of student evaluations, peer evaluations, student outcome and assessment results, historical teaching and non-teaching assignments, and other components of the evaluation process. The ePortfolio would also allow faculty members to introduce curriculum materials, professional development experiences, evidence of college or community service, and other documents into the process. Finally, the system would capture online the faculty member’s assessment of the evidence as well as the reviewers’ assessment and/or suggestions for improvement. The initial pilot project will involve faculty members from the campuses as well as UHPA-recommended members.

Other Modifications to Evaluation Policy

The guidelines for contract renewal, tenure, and promotion are reviewed each year for possible modifications. After consultation with the collective bargaining organization, these are then promulgated to eligible faculty.

The vice chancellors for academic affairs at the colleges have focused this year’s review on the language in those guidelines related to learning outcomes and assessment and suggested modifications to ensure the applicant understands the expectations related to outcomes. These revised guidelines were submitted to the collective bargaining organization for consultation as required by law.
UH Recommendation 4: Resources

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

In considering this recommendation and in discussions with the University chief information officer (CIO), it was determined that the primary issue was not that the various components of technology infrastructure and its relationship to teaching and learning were not planned. Rather, the issue is there was no source that provided a comprehensive view of the system approaches to technology and the resulting impacts on those approaches to college level planning and resource allocation. Similarly, there existed significant information on the impact and assessment of various technologies but this information was not necessarily reported in the context of the planning initiatives.

After further conversation, the solution did not appear to be developing a “Plan” in the traditional sense of a paper-based document focusing on intended changes over a period of time. Instead, a decision was made to develop a dynamic, online resource that would capture and make available to colleges information on the current state of various aspects of technology within the University, the current state of development projects underway, planned future development projects, and longer term trends under consideration. As projects proceed through their development or new projects are added, the online plan would be updated to reflect those changes.

The online resource would also include links to policies, governance and development groups, budget and resource allocation information, assessment and outcomes information, delineation of college responsibilities for technology, and recommendations to colleges in implementing those responsibilities.

The online resource would cover the full-range of technology-related concerns including infrastructure, enterprise application, business process improvements, teaching and learning, distance education, information security, and other impacts of technology.

Finally, the online resource would document systemwide academic plans for degrees and courses that would be distributed online or through hybrid instruction to extend the degree and course offerings to rural populations and the neighbor islands. This section would also identify necessary infrastructure, training, and support for distance-delivered programs, as well as links to the results and outcomes of distance education.

The outline of the online resource includes:

I. Overview of the UH Commitment to and Planned Use of Technology

II. Infrastructure

   A. Intercampus and other external networks
B. Intracampus networks  
C. Internet I and II connections  
D. Wireless connectivity  
E. Central IT servers and support services  
F. Campus-based IT servers and support services  
G. Data security  
H. Other  

III. Enterprise Business Applications  
A. Financial Management Systems (Kuali)  
B. Student Systems (Banner)  
C. Financial Aid Systems (Banner Financial Aid)  
D. Degree Audit and Advising Systems (STAR)  
E. Research and Grant Management Systems (myGrant)  
F. Human Resource Systems (PeopleSoft)  

IV. Business Process Improvements  
A. Workflow applications (eTravel, eLeave, etc.)  
B. Document management  
C. Data reporting and analysis  
D. Other  

V. Academic Applications  
A. Supported distance learning technologies, including training  
B. Distance education program delivery  
C. Supported classroom-based technologies, simulation technologies, classroom design, etc.  
D. Supported computer and other teaching-related technology equipment  

VI. Policies  
A. Data governance  
B. Data security  
C. User responsibilities  
D. Social media  

The online resource/plan is currently under development through the University of Hawaiʻi Information Technology Services (ITS). During development, the site is being reviewed and critiqued by both the ITS personnel responsible for the functional area but also by campus- and system-level personnel who have responsibilities that are dependent on the use or understanding of the University’s technology plans and directions. The site is expected to be released to the general UH community and the public in fall 2013. The development version of the site can be viewed at www.hawaii.edu/itplan.
UH Recommendation 5: Board and Administrative Organization

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

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

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

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

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

Report 1 included the results of interviews with the BOR members on the individual regents’ views on the operational and governance. This report was presented to the BOR Audit Committee on May 16, 2013 and to the full BOR at its May 16, 2013 meeting.
Report 2 included an assessment of then pending legislation on University governance and whether such legislation reflected best practices in higher education governance.

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

Report 3 made several recommendations for BOR governance, including:

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

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

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

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

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

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

7. The BOR orientation content should be reviewed and updated and that annual training updates be made part of its annual schedule. The BOR should also ensure that its members annually sign a statement affirming their responsibilities and commitment to meeting the expectations placed upon them as regents.
8. The BOR improve its accountability and financial oversight of University operations by additional involvement by the BOR Committee on Budget and Finance and improved periodic financial reporting mechanisms (the exact nature of the financial reports should be developed collaboratively by the Committee on Budget and Finance and University Administration but should also include reports comparing budgeted expenditures against actual expenditures).

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

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

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

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

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

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

In addition to the self-assessment and related actions outlined above and on the recommendation of the ATG, the University of Hawai‘i System is developing an online policy management system that allows for development and approval of policies,
distribution of policies, and tracks the policy history for UH policies, including BOR policies. The system will include a tracking mechanism to ensure that all policies are reviewed periodically and replaces a manual system kept in the BOR and other system offices. A system committee has been established to select and guide the implementation of the software.