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CERTIFICATION OF THE PROGRESS REPORT

To: Accrediting Commission for Community and Junior Colleges
   Western Association of Schools and Colleges
From: Honolulu Community College

This Progress Report provides a summary of institutional responses to recommendations cited in the WASC-ACCJC January 2004 letter accepting the College’s Midterm Report. We certify that there was broad participation by the campus community, and that the Progress Report accurately reflects the nature and substance of this institution in relation to the issues addressed.

_____________________________________________________________  ______________
Ramsey R. Pedersen       Chancellor, Honolulu Community College       Date

_____________________________________________________________  ______________
David McClain             Acting President, University of Hawai‘i        Date

_____________________________________________________________  ______________
Patricia Y. Lee           Chair, University of Hawai‘i                    Date
               Board of Regents
Part I. Statement on Report Preparation

BACKGROUND

On January 23, 2004, Honolulu Community College was informed by WASC-ACCJC that the Commission had accepted the Focused Midterm Report (submitted in Fall 2003). The Commission required the College to submit a Progress Report. The report is to document progress the College has made instituting comprehensive and integrated planning, solidifying administrative structure, and undertaking program review.

PREPARATION OF THE REPORT

Drafting of the College Progress Report began in Spring 2004. Creation of the report was initiated in February 2004 when the Dean of Academic Affairs, the Chief Academic Officer (CAO) of the College, informed the campus community via e-mail of the WASC-ACCJC action letter, the key recommendations, and the timeline for the creation of a progress report. The letter from WASC-ACCJC was placed on reserve in the library and posted on the campus intranet (internal website) to ensure dissemination.


Under the leadership of the Accreditation Co-Coordinators and CAO, the campus community identified actions already taken in response to recommendations and compiled a list of needed activities and future goals. This fact-finding and compilation was accomplished through targeted meetings with administrators, faculty and staff leaders, and members of the Assessment Committee. There was also ongoing solicitation from the campus community for input and revisions through e-mail. The initial draft of the Progress Report based on this input was created in March and shared with the campus. Corrections, amendments, and deletions were solicited and incorporated in drafts that followed in July and throughout August.


As the College prepared to start the Fall semester in August, the Accreditation Liaison Officer and Accreditation Co-Coordinator shared the emerging draft and actively sought feedback from the:

- Student Senate
- Campus Leadership Team
- Faculty Senate Executive Committee
- Staff Advisory Council
- Administration

The College community as a whole was sent multiple e-mails to review the posted drafts. Finally, three open campus meetings were held from August 27 to September 3 to provide members of the campus community the opportunity to provide final input, raise questions, and achieve clarification.

Information regarding University of Hawai‘i Community Colleges (UHCC) system activities in response to WASC-ACCJC recommendations was provided by the Office of the Vice President of Academic Affairs (VPAA). That information was included in its entirety as the last section of this report (see pages 20-23).

The final draft was edited in early September. The report was submitted on September 10 to VPAA for system review.

COLLEGE MISSION

Honolulu Community College measures success and identifies areas needing improvement based on the College mission. As part of preparing the Progress Report, the mission statement was posted and publicized for the campus community.
The mission of Honolulu Community College is to:

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

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


PARTICIPANTS

Key participants in the writing and review of this document include:

Accreditation Leaders:
Sharon Ota  Dean of Academic Affairs
Cynthia Smith  ALO and Accreditation Co-Coordinator
Beng Poh Yoshikawa  Accreditation Co-Coordinator, Director of International Programs
Earl Nakahara  Editor

Administration:
Ramsey Pedersen  Chancellor of Honolulu Community College
Ken Kato  Director of Administrative Affairs
Harriet Miyasaki  Director of Management, Information and Research
Jon Blumhardt  Dean of Trades and Transportation
Dennis Kawaharada  Dean of University College
Chad Taniguchi  Dean of Communication and Services
Theron Craig  Dean of Student Services
Ralph Hiatt  Director of Pacific Aerospace Training Center
Lorry Suehiro  UH Personnel Officer
Kyle Chock  Assistant to Senior Executive

Members of the Campus Leadership Team:
Diane Caulfield  Division Chair, Communication and Services
Marcia Roberts-Deutsch  Division Chair, Humanities and Social Sciences
Jerry Saviano  Division Chair, Language Arts
Bert Shimabukuro  Division Chair, Trades and Transportation
Jerry Cerny  Faculty Development Coordinator
Irene Mesina  Head Librarian
Lianne Nagano  Coordinator of College Skills Center
Charlie Anderson  Coordinator of Counseling Services
James Poole  Campus Chair, FSEC
James Niino  Apprenticeship Coordinator
Emily Kukulies  Director of Student Life and Development
Sheryl Settle Legaspi  Chair, Staff Advisory Council

Major Campus Committees:
FSEC Members (2004-2005)
Student Senate (2004-2005)
Assessment Committee (2003-2004)
Faculty who actively participated:
David Cleveland  Sociology
Sally Dunan   Computing, Electronic, Networking Technology
Grace Ihara   Speech
Gary James   English as a Second Language
Nadine Kurio-Leong  Librarian
Chris Ann Moore  Philosophy
Patrick Patterson  History
Ron Pine   Philosophy
Samuel Rhoads  Information and Computer Services
Judy Sokei-Bhanot  Philosophy
Rosemary Sumajit  Information Technology Center
Gordon Talbo  Automotive Technology
Robert Vericker  Administration of Justice

Staff who actively participated:
Nida Chock   Secretary, Trades and Transportation
Todd Kobayashi  Webmaster
Steven Shigemoto  Institutional Researcher
Renette Sonomura  Secretary, Student Services
June Zakimi   Secretary, Academic Affairs

____________________________________  __________________
Ramsey Pedersen, Chancellor                          Date
Honolulu Community College
University of Hawai`i
Part II. Responses to the Request of the Commission in the Action Letter

The following recommendations were made to Honolulu Community College in response to the Midterm Report, October 2003.

Recommendation 1: The team recommends that the College develop and institutionalize a comprehensive planning process that is systemic and inclusive.

Recommendation 4: The team recommends that the College ensure an effective administrative structure that optimizes the College’s ability to serve students and achieve its mission.

Recommendation 3: The team recommends that the College engage in systematic and integrated educational and financial review of all programs and services.

In addition, the University of Hawai‘i Community College (UHCC) system received recommendations related to system planning. Honolulu Community College was advised that in preparation for the College Progress Report, it should review the following recommendations to the UHCC system made in January 2004:

The Team recommends that the UH Community Colleges develop policies and procedures to ensure:

that the community colleges engage in regular assessment of institutional effectiveness, including program review;

that the community college system as well as each college sets priorities for implementing plans for improvement that are based in analysis of research data;

that the college and the UHCC system incorporate these priorities into resource distribution process and decisions;

that the colleges and the UHCC system develop and employ a methodology for assessing overall institutional effectiveness and progress toward meeting goals expressed through plans for improvements; and

that the colleges and the UHCC system report regularly to internal constituencies and the Board on this progress.

The following are the actions taken and goals established by Honolulu Community College and the UHCC system in response to these recommendations. This progress report will first address responses to WASC-ACCJC recommendations for Honolulu Community College. The latter part of this document will include the system-level report in response to WASC-ACCJC recommendations to the UHCC system.
RESPONSES – HONOLULU COMMUNITY COLLEGE

RECOMMENDATION 1: Develop and Institutionalize a Comprehensive Planning Process That Is Systematic and Inclusive

The College took steps to create explicit planning cycles in the areas of assessment and decision-making. Implementation of planning cycles will increase opportunities for campus members to meaningfully participate in planning. Explicit planning cycles will also ensure visible and systemic linkages between campus processes. Planning cycles will reflect external pressures (i.e., system timing and imperatives, legislative timelines) as well as internal College needs and priorities. Effective communication, critical to meaningful inclusion, remains a continued goal for campus leaders.

Planning Process: Participation in System Activities

A. Current participation in system planning efforts reflects standard University practices. Campus planning and activities take place under the umbrella and structure of system-wide plans and priorities. Honolulu Community College Strategic Plans are cross-referenced to system-wide documents in terms of strategic goals and budgeting priorities.


B. In January 2004, UH Community Colleges held a two-day focused retreat titled Community Colleges Evaluation, Planning, and Assessment Workshop. Honolulu Community College sent nineteen representatives from administration, faculty, and staff to this retreat. Retreat participants established goals to improve the Community College (CC) system-level planning and coordination of institutional assessment activities. A follow-up meeting took place in May. At this second meeting, campus representatives from all the Community Colleges reported on and documented ongoing assessment and planning activities and progress in implementing established objectives. One critical system effort is to create standardized definitions of data measures, identify data to be gathered, and create reporting templates. Campus representatives from the Institutional Researcher Cadre (IRC) discussed progress in this effort. The goal is to create a common data portfolio for CC and individual campus reporting to enable improved use of data in support of educational improvement and, in particular, for accreditation self-study.

C. The Council of Chancellors established a process of information sharing, problem-solving, and consensus-building in support of system-planning. The CC Chancellors meet regularly regarding issues such as budgetary priorities, system policies and other topics such as articulation. As an example, in preparation for the current biennium, the creation of a coordinated Community College biennium budget included the following planning steps:

- The Council of Chancellors participated in an extensive stock-taking exercise in which each campus and major interest group or program with system-wide implications, (e.g., Native Hawaiian Studies, Nursing, Information Technology Services) presented its issues and perceived needs.
- Collective sessions were held jointly with the Chancellor and the Faculty Senate Chair representing each college.
- Community Colleges created different scenarios based upon budget increases of 10%, 5%, and 0%. Any program change requests under the “no increase in general-funded revenue” scenario would have to be funded through partnerships with business and industry, grants, and fund-development campaigns. The funding approach would have to be identified. The Community Colleges then worked as a system to reach consensus on what items to include in each category.

D. The College is directly involved in the formulation and implementation of system articulation policies. Honolulu Community College is represented by two members on the University Council on Articulation. Honolulu Community College faculty have taken a significant leadership role in negotiations with the
University of Hawai‘i at Manoa. UH Manoa, Honolulu Community College, and Kapi‘olani Community College negotiated bilateral and trilateral agreements to adopt the UH-Manoa general education requirements as part of their Associate in Arts degrees. This agreement was signed on June 9, 2004. While there are still major hurdles, the College has become a vocal champion of seamless system articulation through its faculty leadership and Administration’s support.

Planning Process: Campus-Level Activities

A. In Fall 2003, the College completed revision of the 2003-2010 Strategic Plan. UH Board of Regents approved this plan in February 2004. The revision included several opportunities for constituents to provide input into the campus strategic plan. Faculty and staff were encouraged to provide input through campus-wide town meetings, the Faculty Senate (FSEC), the Staff Advisory Council (SAC), and the Campus Leadership Team (CLT). Student Senate leaders were explicitly asked to provide input.


This strategic plan is the basis for identifying budgeting priorities for the biennium budget requests of the College. In the last budgeting cycle, as biennium requests and justifications were formulated prior to submission to the system, campus leadership was consulted to establish priorities based on goals and strategies outlined in the College Strategic Plan. The FSEC and CLT sent a list of priorities to the Chancellor. The CLT had a focused discussion to make recommendations regarding the final priority list from the campus. This priority list was based on a proposed 10% increase of the current general funded base, in addition to tuition and fees. Priorities were directly linked to the Strategic Plan.

B. During August 5-6, 2004, College administrators and invited faculty and staff representatives held a retreat. This retreat included program-by-program stock-taking, discussion of budgeting priorities, and the identification of planning goals and activities. The retreat included administrators, the Accreditation Liaison Officer (ALO), the FSEC Chair, and the SAC Chair. An important goal at this retreat was to begin the creation of a planning document that would make explicit the relationships between planning cycles such as those for strategic-planning, accreditation, budgeting, and assessment. The goal of this master planning document will be to clarify, through visual and narrative means, the inter-relationship between these cycles so they are no longer perceived as separate activities. This planning chart will better enable campus leaders to identify structural and procedural ways to ensure linkage between these processes. This kind of documentation and outline will help to ensure that day-to-day decision-making is done with clear reference to, and understanding of, overarching College goals and objectives. Once compiled, this information will be presented in the form of a flow chart that maps out how decisions are made, how they are impacted by other considerations (i.e., strategic-planning cycle, accreditation cycle, legislative-appropriation cycle) and will make clear where individuals, programs, and governance bodies have input.

An important achievement at this August administration retreat was the creation of a budgeting plan. The Director of Administrative Services outlined the framework for an annual budgeting timeline for the campus. This timeline indicates internal campus deadlines, as well as deadlines and requirements based on external pressures, including UH-system budget requirements and legislative budgeting requirements. This budgeting timeline will be posted and publicized and be the basis for establishing internal deadlines. Deadlines were also established to delineate the timelines for:

- Creation of biennium and supplemental budgets
- Annual College budget decisions regarding student assistants, operating costs, and equipment purchases.

Another planning cycle identified at this retreat was the creation of an annual timeline for review and revision of the College Strategic Plan. Target dates were established, and the role of different groups and committees on campus in providing input was made explicit. This Strategic Plan cycle complements the budgeting cycle in the creation of biennium and supplemental budgets; the identification of budget priorities must reflect what is in the College Strategic Plan. Thus, this retreat produced two linked planning cycles as a start. These plans will be shared with the campus. The goal of educating the campus on how to utilize these plans and participate in these processes is a priority for the coming year.
A third important outcome of this retreat was the outlining of a planning cycle for Capital Improvement Projects (CIP) requests. The deadlines as determined by the system and the resulting timeline for internal campus activities were identified. This cycle will be written up and publicized to the campus to increase awareness of opportunities for input into this area of planning and decision-making.

C. The Campus Assessment Committee began the creation of assessment cycles by drafting a preliminary assessment plan for the campus as a whole. This plan includes a timeline for the creation, use, and revision of course and program student learning outcomes, as well as a projected cycle for program review.


D. The FSEC created a new campus-wide committee, the Accreditation Oversight Committee (AOC). The mission of this standing committee is to provide continuity in the implementation of campus initiatives, to promote inclusion of campus members in formulating and directing campus activities, and to provide broad oversight of campus activities. This committee will ensure consciousness of and ongoing responses to accreditation recommendations. The AOC will also serve as an institutional link between campus leadership groups and efforts of the Accreditation Standard Committees, the Assessment Committee, the CLT, and strategic-planning activities. The AOC will cultivate campus consciousness of strategic goals and promote links and coordination between campus activities. In addition, the committee will serve the campus by documenting and archiving campus activities related to accreditation standards and recommendations. This kind of oversight, coordination, and archiving will help the campus integrate planning and implementation cycles.

Reference – Committee Descriptions: http://honolulu.hawaii.edu/intranet/committees/index.html

Planning Process: Future Goals

1. The College will disseminate information and educate the campus community regarding planning cycles and documents related to budget-planning, and review and revision of the strategic plan. The pilot assessment project to be carried out by Administration is to evaluate the success of this communication of the budgeting process and planning cycle to the campus community.

2. The College will create and publicize an overarching planning cycle chart followed by discussion on campus of this document.

3. The College will create follow-up planning cycles by specific leadership groups that build on and are linked to campus-level and system-level planning cycles. An example would be the creation of planning cycles by campus departments or programs that identify when input into the budgeting cycle needs to be accomplished. This next level of planning will be led by the CLT.

4. The College will formulate assessment plans at the program level.

5. The College will establish processes that link information resulting from assessment activities to planning and decision-making.

6. The College will clarify the role of faculty and staff in decision-making and planning, including a review of existing committee structures and duties.
Recommendation 4: Ensure an Effective Administrative Structure That Optimizes the College’s Ability to Serve Students and Achieve Its Mission

Administrative leadership changes at Honolulu Community College are in response to campus needs and are also directly linked to ongoing reorganization activities at the University of Hawai‘i system level. As stated in the Report on the Substantive Change Request Related to the System Reorganization and Other Commission Recommendations submitted by the UH system on March 30, 2004, coordination and oversight formerly provided by the Office of the Chancellor of the Community Colleges is now provided by UH system administrators. This change has resulted in expanded system roles for Community College Chancellors and Chief Academic Officers (CAO). Final administrative-level decision-making for the College is at the level of the Office of the Vice President for Academic Affairs (VPAA), who is directly accountable to the President of the University of Hawai‘i.


Administrative Structure: System Level

The Chancellor of Honolulu Community College is a member of the system Council of Chancellors, and also the Council of Community College Chancellors. These councils work directly with the President of the University of Hawai‘i and the VPAA. These Councils are forums for consultation and discussion of system issues. Honolulu Community College's Dean of Academic Affairs sits on the Council of Chief Academic Officers, which provides system CAO a voice regarding system issues. UH system reorganization has resulted in increased authority and responsibilities for Honolulu Community College's Chancellor and CAO in areas such as College budget and personnel decisions, the creation of external partnerships, and program revisions and expansion.

Reference – Meeting Minutes: http://www.hawaii.edu/vpaa/#ccao

The College is also represented in system discussions by campus representatives on the All Campus Council of Faculty Senate Chairs and by College Student Senate representatives on the Student Caucus.

Administrative Structure: College Level

A. To meet the expanded responsibilities for College leadership, the College has continued to make strides to solidify its administrative structure. Attempts to permanently fill all administrative positions have been hindered by failed efforts to find qualified candidates and the extensive time required by the BOR for approval. Despite these constraints, the campus has achieved progress. The position of Dean of Transportation and Trades Programs has been filled on a permanent basis. It is anticipated that the third round of advertising and screening will lead to the permanent hiring of the Dean of Communications and Services Programs by January 2005. The hiring process in Spring 2004 for the Dean of University College was unsuccessful. An experienced faculty member from Kap‘olani Community College was chosen to serve as Interim Dean with Board of Regents approval. The position will be advertised for permanent hire in one year. The recent resignation of the Dean of Student Services has required the campus to fill this position on an interim basis for a year. This position will be filled on a permanent basis as quickly as possible.

B. The College has also made modifications to the administrative structure. To assist the Chancellor in representing the College and the system in areas such as developing community outreach and partnerships, fund-raising and entrepreneurial activities, the College created a new position of Assistant to Senior Executive (ASE) which was filled in April 2004. The ASE acts as liaison between the Chancellor and external community partners and constituencies. The ASE directly contributes to the College’s ability to fulfill its mission by expanding funding sources, increasing the College’s participation and visibility in community projects, and creating the support necessary for expansion and/or modification of educational programs required to meet the needs of students, the community, and the state. Activities undertaken or planned by the ASE include increasing the visibility and number of scholarships available to students and the creation of a Chancellor’s website for public information and updates. Ambitious
plans for fund-raising are also underway. These efforts will help the College in its efforts to expand alternative funding opportunities.

C. To clarify decision-making at the College and the UH-system level following system reorganization, the Administration has committed to creating an annotated organizational chart, which clarifies lines of authority and decision-making for the campus. Parallel to this goal of clarifying the administrative organizational chart, College faculty will review and clarify as necessary existing committee responsibilities and authority in decision-making.

In addition, the College will create a series of Process Charts to visually represent and narratively explain decision-making on campus. These flow charts will address decision-making processes in key areas such as curriculum, personnel decisions, and budgeting. These documents will describe through flow charts and annotated description the individuals or groups involved in discussions and decisions and their level of authority in decision-making (i.e., advisory or eligible to vote). These flow charts will also make clear the role and authority of outside parties and mediating documents such as union contracts, BOR policies, and UH-system leadership and imperatives.

Faculty leadership supports this critical goal of creating a clear and accurate set of organization charts that specify the roles of individual positions in faculty and administrative hierarchies, as well as the roles, responsibilities, and authority of committees within the college structure. Such charts should be annotated to specifically draw the lines of authority on campus and in the system so that stability and integrity of leadership and governance can be maintained.

The Chancellor will create an ad-hoc committee in the fall to lead this task of creating decision-making process flow charts.  

Administrative Structure: Future Plans

1. Fill the positions of Dean of University College, Dean of Communications and Services Programs, and Dean of Student Services on a permanent basis.

2. Complete and publicize an extensive and annotated campus organizational chart.

3. Create a series of process charts that outline how decisions are made in key areas of campus functioning. This will include outlining lines of authority, the degree of power in final decisions, and the interplay between campus groups and outside influences and mandates.

RECOMMENDATION 3: Systematic and Integrated Educational and Financial Review of All Programs and Services

To meet standards of accountability and assessment, and to better link campus assessment activities to meaningful and relevant planning activities, the College has undertaken the following activities.

Assessment: Participation in System Activities

A. The Institutional Research Cadre (a CC system group), by request of the Council of Chancellors, has been meeting regularly to create system-level standardized definitions and to identify standardized system-data collection and measures, as well as reporting formats. This group has created a draft of a UHCC Data Portfolio for use in identifying data and reporting. Use of this CC-system data profile by individual campuses and the system will enhance the development of a campus culture of assessment as well as increase use of institutional research information on the campus. Both of these outcomes will
better enable Honolulu Community College to provide consistent evidence in support of accreditation standards and undertake informed program-improvement activities.

B. Discussions undertaken by the Council of Chancellors related to system roles, missions, and future campus interrelationships are guided by system-assessment information regarding current activities. Discussions of issues such as potential funding formulas and evolving campus missions are based in part on analysis of historical data and assessment-based projections. Planning for program or campus expansion and resource-sharing discussions reflect market analysis and the need to demonstrably improve measures of retention and program effectiveness.

C. Representatives from departments and programs are directly engaged in system-wide discussions regarding standard use and measurement of student learning outcomes (SLO).

The Honolulu Community College Library, as a member of the University of Hawai'i Library Council, is developing system-wide guidelines for standards and assessment. Libraries are using two resources: *Standards and Assessment for Academic Libraries* by William Neal Nelson and Robert W. Fernekes, and *The Department Head's Guide to Assessment Implementation in Administrative and Educational Support Units* by Karen Nichols and James O. Nichols.

In addition, the College's faculty representative from the Information and Computer Science (ICS) department is taking an active role on the system Program Coordinating Council (PCC) to revise student learning outcomes for all UH system ICS classes. Similar efforts to systematize course SLO are being led by the head of the Administration of Justice program working with colleagues on other campuses.

**Assessment: Campus-Level Activities**

The College has devoted resources and personnel to increase the necessary infrastructure, training, and education of the College community to enable sustainable institutional research and ongoing improvement.

A. **Training and Education**

Conferences and Workshops:

- Honolulu Community College hosted a presentation by Dr. Mary Allen, Director of the Institute for Teaching and Learning, CSU Office of the Chancellor. Dr. Allen is a nationally-recognized expert on assessment issues. She was invited to teach the campus community about assessment methodologies. Dr. Allen conducted a one-day workshop attended by faculty and staff of Honolulu College and visitors from other campuses on Oahu. The morning session targeted assessment methods and models for non-instructional departments. Thirty-four staff and administrators from the College attended. The afternoon session presented information on assessment and, in particular, techniques and models for program review for the 25 Honolulu Community College instructional faculty in attendance. Feedback from those who attended was very positive with regard to the practical “how-to” information and examples imparted. Materials from the workshop are being duplicated and disseminated. Follow-up activities are being planned to build on the ideas, models, and insights gained from this day. August 31, 2004

- Representatives from Administration, Student Services and Faculty attended a workshop coordinated by the UHCC system to help in system and campus use and interpretation of the Community College Survey of Student Engagement (CCSSE) data. August 10, 2004

- The College sent a five-person team to the recent American Association for Higher Education (AAHE) conference "Building Learner-Centered Institutions: Developing Institutional Strategies for Assessing and Improving Student Learning." The focus of this conference was assessment. March 24-26, 2004
The College held a campus professional development day, the Wo Innovation Learning Day (WILD); morning and afternoon sessions were attended by staff, faculty, and administrators. Much of this day was devoted to sharing and discussion of assessment projects and activities in programs and units. March 5, 2004


Five campus representatives attended the 2004 PacPAIR Conference in Honolulu; the focus was on assessment techniques and applications. June 4-7, 2004

Two Faculty Development workshops on Student Learning Outcomes were held. A large number of faculty representing every academic division attended and participated in these workshops. April 20, 2004 and May 6, 2004

The College dedicated funding for a one-day focused training of non-instructional faculty and staff on assessment methods and approaches. This workshop was attended by representatives from non-instructional offices, units, and divisions across the campus and represented a substantive commitment by the campus in terms of money, personnel time, and administrative support. Outside expertise was brought in, and supervisors, staff, and faculty were freed from their duties to attend. The goal was to provide training for all areas of the campus about the uses of assessment, as well as methods for identifying and assessing outcomes. A timeline has been established for College units to identify pilot projects, attend follow-up meetings, and present their projects to the campus. June 4, 2004


The Dean of Student Services, the Coordinator of Admissions and Counseling, and the Director of Student Life and Development attended a two-day National Association of Student Personnel Administrators conference regarding assessment. June 4-5, 2003

Two librarians attended a workshop on conducting focus groups; it was sponsored by the University of Hawai'i Library Council. Questions for the focus groups were developed and will be used by the UH Libraries. February 13-14, 2003

Website: The College expanded use of intranet websites to post resources in support of campus assessment efforts, including:

- minutes of the Assessment Committee and summaries of campus workshops, http://honolulu.hawaii.edu/assessment/committee.html;
- examples of surveys undertaken by College members, http://honolulu.hawaii.edu/assessment/surveys.html;
- examples of assessment projects (including instruments, results, and interpretations) undertaken by educational programs and College support services, http://honolulu.hawaii.edu/assessment/projects.html;
• data reports from College Institutional Researcher and UH system,  
  http://honolulu.hawaii.edu/assessment/facts.html,  
  http://honolulu.hawaii.edu/assessment/links.html,  
  http://honolulu.hawaii.edu/assessment/library.html;

• e-mail list-serve announcements were used to update and inform, share information, and highlight these website resources.

B. Infrastructure

Assessment leaders on campus identified the goal of increasing campus resources to strengthen the infrastructure necessary to carry out meaningful and sustainable assessment activities. In response, the College Administration identified the creation and funding of an Assessment Officer as a budget and planning priority. It will be the responsibility of this Assessment Officer to coordinate and implement campus assessment activities.

In response to a recommendation from the 2003-2004 Assessment Committee and other campus assessment leaders, the FSEC revised the membership of the Assessment Committee to include standing membership of those with established authority to ensure implementation of committee recommendations and decisions. Those who make assessment decisions for the campus will be in a position to effectively carry out and complete agreed-upon initiatives.

C. Assessment: Campus Activities 2003-2004

The College community carried out a number of assessment projects in 2003-2004; below is a partial summary:

1. Assessment Planning:
   • The Assessment Committee created a Campus Assessment Plan, which lays out timelines for creation of Student Learning Outcomes and for carrying out Program Review.  

2. SLO Identification:
   • The Assessment Committee created a suggested template for writing SLO to standardize communication to students about course goals, objectives and SLO.  
   • Instructors spent spring and summer developing SLO for all courses. The College intends to collect these in electronic form and post them in Fall 2004.
   • Departments began to establish standardized SLO for core classes that have multiple sections and instructors. For example, World Civilizations 151 and 152 have established common SLO for all sections of these classes. Other classes such as English 22 and 100 are working on similar standardization.
   • The College Committee on Programs and Curriculum (CPC) revised requirements for new class proposals. All course proposals submitted must have stated SLO, effective Fall 2004.

3. SLO Measurement:

   Discussions are ongoing regarding methods for measuring student achievement of stated outcomes.

   • Some technical programs, (e.g., AMT, AERO, MARR) have in place student logbooks -  
• Some departments (e.g., Speech, Logic) have adopted standardized grading systems or rubrics. 

• In Spring 2004, some faculty piloted use of student responses on class evaluations to measure 
  student perception of SLO achievement.  
  Reference – Session Notes:  
  http://honolulu.hawaii.edu/intranet/assessment/wild04/notes_am_session.html

• Individual faculty have focused attention on mid-semester classroom assessment and responded 
  with curriculum revisions.  One such activity was shared with the campus during the WILD 
  professional-development day assessment panel.  
  Reference – Session Notes:  
  http://honolulu.hawaii.edu/intranet/assessment/wild04/notes_am_session.html

4. Program-Level Assessment: Academic Programs

Program Health Indicators: Technical Programs and the Liberal Arts Program generated program-
health data in areas such as efficiency, fit, demand, and outcomes. Data for 2003-2004 were shared with 
program faculty in the spring prior to posting of the program-health indicator (PHI) reports. Program 
faculty and administration will work during Fall 2004 to review and possibly revise identified measures 
and utilization of indicator data.  

Automotive Maintenance Technology (AMT): AMT has developed SLO at the course and program 
level. Creation of SLO involved input from its advisory board and certification bodies. The program has 
identified measures of student achievement of these SLO and documents student achievements, 
including student performance on certification exams. The program also tracks job placement and 
student employment success, a process that includes soliciting input from employers. AMT is an 
excellent model of a program that uses links with employers and professional certification bodies to 
identify program goals and undertake ongoing program assessment of how well these goals are met. 
This program will be an important model for other programs to emulate in the coming semesters.

Liberal Arts Program: The goal for 2004-2005 is to develop a qualitative assessment plan for the Liberal 
Arts Program to complement the data indicators developed for “Liberal Arts Program Health Indicators” in 
2003. This assessment will be based on the General Education Learning Outcomes for Written 
Communication, Mathematical/Logical Reasoning, Global/Multicultural Perspectives, Humanities and 
Arts, Social Science, Oral Communications, and Natural Sciences, as presented in the 
Associate in Arts Task Force Report, produced by the Office of the Chancellor of the Community Colleges 
in Fall 2002. Learning outcomes for Liberal Arts courses will be reviewed based on these General 
Education Outcomes. A variety of direct and indirect assessment approaches will be integrated into the 
program.

English as a Second Language (ESL): This critical program is a gateway for many Honolulu Community 
College students into other College programs. ESL has completed the process of identifying SLO for all 
courses and levels of the program, as well as identifying a combination of measures to assess student 
achievement in meeting these stated outcomes. This has been done for all individual courses, as well as 
at the program level.  

Writing Intensive Program (WI): For the Liberal Arts Program, evaluation of WI classes is central to 
measuring student skills and outcomes that reflect program goals in written communication. The WI 
faculty carried out a third-round evaluation of student work based on standardized measures of writing
outcomes and skills. Review of assessment results by WI faculty led to agreed-upon steps for program improvement.

Reference – WI Assessment Rubric: http://honolulu.hawaii.edu/assessment/rubric_spr03.html

A similar process of establishing program outcomes and evaluations is underway by instructors teaching classes with the Contemporary Ethical Focus (E) focus. A pilot evaluation of instructors teaching E focus classes was conducted in Spring 2004.


5. Program-Level Assessment: Student Services and Academic Support Programs

Student Services created an instrument to evaluate student engagement on the campus. This survey was modified based on input from the assessment committee and the CLT. The survey was conducted with a cross section of students including those attending graduation (class of 2004), as well as summer-session students. Results will be compiled and shared during the fall semester.

Counseling conducted or is developing evaluation methods for a number of initiatives in areas such as:

Counseling:
- A Student Contact Log for all student contacts is being used by Counselors to help evaluate trends in how time is spent on various duties of counselors.
- Counselors are having walk-in students fill out an evaluation of counseling services; a common evaluation form was created and piloted in the spring.

Recruitment:
- There is ongoing analysis of admissions “yield” and “go to” rates broken down by high school and district.
- The College is conducting ongoing evaluation of the Running Start program, including looking at data such as enrollment, demographics, revenues, and student satisfaction.
- Surveys were conducted by Counseling for the Occupational Environmental Safety Management Program and Communication Arts program to improve recruitment. Results were shared with program faculty for use in planning future recruitment methods and approaches. This kind of targeted assessment of enrollment trends for identified programs will continue.
- Student Services is monitoring the effectiveness of the High School to HCC (HS2HCC) recruitment fair by tracing enrollment history of students who participate in this career-exploration activity.

Retention:
- To evaluate the success of the faculty advising program, Counseling conducted a focus-group session to assess faculty perceptions of success.
- Counseling is creating a survey to better identify student educational goals and needs and to more effectively assess success of College programs in meeting these needs.
- An assessment plan for the Career Counseling program is being planned.
- Currently under development are Student Development courses based on SLO and measurement of these intended outcomes.
Insights and knowledge gained from this information will be used to direct planning for future allocation of personnel and program resources in Counseling and Student Services as a whole.

**Services for Students with Disabilities** conducted the third iteration of a survey of students with documented disabilities requesting accommodations and services. Analysis of results was shared as the College's model project at the spring AAHE conference. The report was posted and presented to the campus through e-mail and website posting and shared with key committees.

There are plans to assess its website, including number of hits and scope of information on the site. Reference — Disabilities Project Report: [http://honolulu.hawaii.edu/disability/pdf/fall2003/results.htm](http://honolulu.hawaii.edu/disability/pdf/fall2003/results.htm)

The **Library** conducted an assessment of student information literacy. Based on findings, library staff have revised the orientation program conducted for students. This project was reported at the campus Professional Development Day morning session. Reference — Library Project Report: [http://honolulu.hawaii.edu/assessment/pdf/librept.pdf](http://honolulu.hawaii.edu/assessment/pdf/librept.pdf)

The **Job Placement Office** tracked the use, audience, and interests of those linking to the new website.

6. **Program Level Assessment: College Functions**

In the area of committees and governance, the FSEC initiated a pilot program to survey meeting effectiveness and focus. Several leadership committees conducted evaluation of effectiveness of campus committee meetings.

Resulting from the June workshop for non-instructional faculty and staff, several pilot projects are planned or are underway in Fall 2004. Some examples of ongoing assessment activities include:

- Business Office – evaluating response time and referrals from the switchboard;
- Records – evaluating response time for transcript requisition processing;
- Human Resources – evaluating the performance evaluation process for civil servants;
- Off-Campus Program – surveying student satisfaction with program services and support;
- Educational Media Center – evaluating customer satisfaction;
- Information Technology Center – evaluating meeting of technical needs and institutional capacity;
- Administration – evaluating effectiveness of communication regarding budgeting plan.

These and other pilot projects will be shared with the campus during the months of September and October 2004.

**Assessment: Future Goals**

**System Level**

A. The College will participate with the UHCC system in the conducting of the CCSSE survey in Spring 2005. Campus use of this survey will be enhanced by focused efforts to educate the campus community on the information available through this survey and use of the results.

B. College members will continue to participate in creation of a standardized system Data Portfolio. The College will also undertake activities to educate the campus community regarding how to interpret this data for use in program review and for accreditation self-study.

**Campus Level**

A. Training and Education

1. The College will continue campus gatherings at department, division, and campus levels to share assessment activities and results.
2. The Faculty Development Committee will prioritize assessment topics as the focus of campus development activities and as criteria for distribution of professional development funds.

3. The College will increase the flow of program and institutional assessment information that is posted and shared with the community.

4. The Assessment Committee will create an assessment “glossary” for the campus.

5. The College will continue to direct money and personnel time to train faculty, staff, and administration on the creation and use of assessment strategies, formulation and use of SLO, ways to approach program review, and other topics. Training is also needed on using applicable software, interpreting findings, and finding meaning in raw data and information being generated.

B. Infrastructure

1. The College will ensure the increased role and authority of the Assessment Committee to ensure implementation of campus-wide efforts.

2. The College has included as a biennium budget priority item the creation and funding of an Assessment Officer.

C. Activities

1. The College will publicize all course SLO on the Web by the end of Fall 2004.

2. The College will carry out identification and publication of SLO at the program level.

3. The College will carry out pilot projects to measure student achievement of SLO at the department and program level.

4. The College will create a detailed campus-wide plan for ongoing program review, including a timeline, identified measures, methods for sharing results with the public, and processes to ensure improvement.

5. The College will use the increased student information made available through the new student-information system, in particular to improvement in recruitment and retention efforts.

6. The College will intensify efforts to track leavers and graduates and to include evaluation of student employment performance and success, as well as gathering feedback from employers.

7. The College will continue to participate in planned system efforts to evaluate academic support services for students in the Distance Learning program.
University of Hawaiʻi Community Colleges System
Assessment, Planning, and Budget Development Activities

In January 2004 and June 2004, the Accrediting Commission for Community and Junior Colleges (ACCJC) made the following recommendation as part of its acceptance of the progress reports submitted by the University as part of the implementation of the new system organization:

The Team recommends that the UH Community Colleges develop policies and procedures to ensure:

a. that the community colleges engage in regular assessment of institutional effectiveness, including program review;
b. that the community college system as well as each college sets priorities for implementing plans for improvement that are based in an analysis of research data;
c. that the colleges and the UHCC system incorporates these priorities into resource distribution processes and decisions;
d. that the colleges and the UHCC system develop and employ a methodology for assessing overall institutional effectiveness and progress toward meeting goals expressed through plans for improvements; and
e. that the colleges and the UHCC system report regularly to internal constituencies and the Board on this progress.

Assessment of Institutional Effectiveness

Leadership for implementing the recommended changes comes from the Council of Community College Chancellors (CCCC) with appropriate staff support provided by the community college support offices assigned to University system Vice Presidents.

Ongoing programs and current activities that support assessment of institutional effectiveness include the community colleges’ annual Program Health Indicator (PHI) reports and UHCC Community Colleges Fact Book, participation in the national Community College Survey of Student Engagement (CCSSE), and the analysis of the current course placement process and placement testing procedures.

- **Program Health Indicators** reports provide a comprehensive, yet succinct, review of the activities of instructional programs, incorporating current year information which is comparable across programs and campuses. Major sections of the resulting program report provide descriptive information about the development and history of a program, program goals, faculty and advisory committee of the program, admission and degree requirements, courses offered in the most recent academic year and course enrollments, program performance indicators, including graphic representations of program performance on selected indicators relative to pre-established norms, and, finally, an analysis of the program outcomes. Three major clusters of program performance indicators are utilized, reflecting program demand, program efficiency, and program outcomes. The PHI reports are used by the campuses to provide an annual report to the Board of Regents on the status of academic program actions and satisfy reporting requirements under the Carl D. Perkins Vocational and Technical Education Act.

- **Fact Book** provides a snapshot of student, faculty, degree, and enrollment data for the UHCC System and the seven individual campuses. The report is designed to provide quick and easy access to relevant facts and current information.
• **CCSSE** – Campuses have administered the Community College Survey of Student Engagement (CCSSE) to enhance assessment of the quality in community college education, of good educational practices and of programs and services for students. The survey is research-based and a project of the Community College Leadership Program at The University of Texas at Austin. The 2002 CCSSE survey was administered to over 3,000 students at the seven community colleges. The 2004 survey was administered at Hawai’i CC, Kapi‘olani CC, Kaua‘i CC, Maui CC, and Windward CC. The 2004 UH System Institutional Effectiveness Report (IER) is using CCSSE (NSSE for upper division campuses) in over 20 percent of the measures.

• **Community Colleges Placement Testing (ACT COMPASS)** - The Community College Chancellors confirmed their colleges’ commitment to the continued practice of using the same student placement testing instrument and common placement scores. Working with ACT, an assessment, analysis, and review of the accuracy of student placement testing cutoff scores results were conducted in 2002 and 2003. The analysis provides UHCC data on which to base revision recommendations to maximize students’ probability of success and placement accuracy. The results were provided to the Deans of Instruction for review and recommendation as appropriate. Additionally, system wide testing coordinators met to review and make recommendations for standard testing procedures.

On January 6 and 7, 2004, the community colleges conducted a workshop at Windward Community College attended by approximately 140 faculty, staff, and administrators. The purpose of the workshop was to start a systemwide dialog designed to develop a better understanding of the new ACCJC standards, assess existing policies and practices and develop an action plan to meet the new ACCJC standards. From that workshop, a number of actions were initiated including:

• A charge by the Council of Community College Chancellors to the community colleges Institutional Research Cadre to develop a data portfolio/template for each campus to be used to support assessment for institutional effectiveness. The IR Cadre, composed of IR staff representatives from all campuses, has been meeting regularly under the leadership of the community college Director of Academic Planning, Assessment, and Policy Analysis to respond to the charge.
  
  o Using the UH System Data Portfolio prepared for the WASC Senior Commission visit as a model, the IR Cadre developed a portfolio/template that lists required data elements, data element definitions, data source references, and how the data will be presented and stored. IR Cadre portfolio/template recommendations were to be the subject of inter-campus discussions. A draft data portfolio/template was presented to CC Deans of Instruction and Assistant Deans of Instructions (DOI/ADOI) July 15, 2004 for review, suggest modifications, approval of recommendations, and provide more information and/or develop procedures to resolve the operational, administrative, and policy issues.

• Review of campus policies and practices relating to assessment, planning, budgeting, and evaluation to determine congruence with ACCJC standards, and making changes as required. This process is being led by the Chancellor of each campus;

• Implementation of new practices on each campus during the 2004-05 Academic Year (AY) in preparation for the development of campus self-studies during the 2005-06 AY. The implementation process is the responsibility of the Chancellor of each campus.

On May 18, 2004, the CCCC conducted a systemwide interactive TV discussion on the progress made to date by the individual campuses on the development and implementation of campus assessment policies and procedures. More than 50 faculty, staff, and students participated in the four-hour workshop. As part of the workshop, the Institutional Research Cadre members reported the status of their portion of the data portfolio/template project.
Evaluation, Planning, and Improvement - Linked to Budget Development

Existing Board of Regents Policy (BORP Chapter 4, Section 4-3) calls for both the development of a community college statewide academic plan that includes an evaluation of State workforce requirements, and individual campus educational development plans. These plans are central to the operation of the University and its campuses.

Over the years, the community colleges have developed a systemwide planning process in response to the University BOR policy. This process has incorporated a number of elements that link processes of evaluation, planning, operational improvement, and budget development. The UH Community Colleges Strategic Planning Outline highlighted the following elements:

- Mission and Philosophy
- Planning Context
- Assessment
- Priorities
- Resource Requirements


The resulting Community College System Strategic Plan, along with the seven individual campus strategic plans, serves as the basis for the development and improvement of programs and services, the development and renewal of physical facilities, and setting priorities for resource reallocations and State General Fund budget requests. The linkage of the Planning with Budget Development is particularly important considering that the University is still required to utilize the State Budgeting process for the State appropriated portion of the University's revenue and more than 80% of the community colleges revenues are derived from State appropriated funds.

Each of the seven UH community colleges is a separately accredited institution with a separate faculty and administration and they can and do identify individual campus budget requirements. However, they are part of single State appropriation made to the University of Hawai’i system. Accordingly, a community college budget request consolidating the requirements for all seven campuses is required to be submitted for consideration by the Board of Regents and State.

In fall 2001, the community colleges formed Strategic Planning Council composed of the campus Chancellors (then Provosts), the Chairs of the Faculty Senates, and representatives of the Student Government Associations. This Council, under the leadership of the Associate Vice President for Academic Affairs, Michael Rota (then Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs), examined external data related to the statewide environment and internal data related to campus functioning (e.g. student demand, program efficiency, and campus outcomes), and analyzed assumptions. This analytical effort lead to setting community college system goals and priorities, and the development of a comprehensive financial plan that incorporated anticipated revenues and expenditures needed to accomplish the plan goals by the year 2010.


This analysis has proven to be of considerable value to other State entities. Substantial pieces of the evaluation and analysis have been used by the State Workforce Development Council in its annual plan, the Office of the State Director for Career and Technical Education in its annual plan, and the Governor’s Office in its submission of a grant application to the National Governors Association (NGA) dealing with workforce preparation and the role of postsecondary education. The NGA provided Hawai’i and seven other states funding to design and implement comprehensive state plans to deal with the need to get more adults into and successfully complete postsecondary education.

Following campus reviews of the Community College Strategic Plan and appropriate modifications, the Plan was submitted to the Board of Regents and approved in November 2002. Subsequently, six of the individual campus academic plans have been approved by the BOR as required by ACCJC policy (the
Hawai’i CC plan was deferred pending the appointment of a permanent Chancellor. The additional State General Fund requirements identified in the Financial Plan became the basis for the community colleges 2003-05 Biennial Budget request.


Following the reorganization of the University system in December 2002 (the Substantive Change request was approved by the ACCJC in April 2003), the community college Chancellors decided to maintain the integrated planning process used to develop the current comprehensive Community Colleges Strategic Plan, and to continue the Strategic Planning Council.

In September 2003, the Strategic Planning Council convened to work on the development of the 2006-07 Biennial General Fund Budget request. The Council examined the progress made in accomplishing the priorities established in the BOR approved Plan and examined the external and internal issues that helped guide the development of the current plan.

In January 2004, the Council conducted a workshop designed to update participants on the progress made toward implementing the priorities contained in the plan, to re-assess external and internal factors, to modify priorities if necessary, and to develop a process for the development of a financial plan for the next fiscal biennium. The Council reviewed the status and progress of 25 Key Performance Outcomes of the UHCC Strategic Plan.

The Council concluded that while community colleges have made progress over the past two years, the critical operational issues are still the highest priorities and should still serve as priorities in the development of the campuses’ resource base and the community colleges’ consolidated financial planning.

Following the agreement on community college priorities and goals for the 2006-07 Biennium, each campus developed a specific listing of its individual General Fund Budget request within a two year planning target of a 10% increase in our current service base. The requests were grouped into three clusters:

- Workforce and Economic Development
- Operational Improvements
- University System Initiatives

Periodic status and progress reports on the community colleges planning and budget development process are being provided to the University system through a process called “Stock-Taking.” This process allows detailed outcomes from the CC planning and budget process to be fed into the University process at appropriate intervals. The University Stock-Taking process currently involves two Chancellors, one Faculty Senate Chair, and the Associate VP for Academic Affairs. The Stocktaking Process has led to the examination of important issues such as including future tuition strategies, financing of major deferred repairs and maintenance requirements, and development of a differential strategy for State General Fund support.

The University-wide General Fund budget request is being developed and the Board of Regents has scheduled a separate workshop on budget issues September 2, 2004. It is expected that the BOR will be asked to approve the community college’s proposed budget request as part of the overall University of Hawai’i system budget at its regularly scheduled meeting in October 2004.