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EXECUTIVE SUMMARY - LEARNING INFRASTRUCTURE - Students - SP '05

As part of HCC's ongoing assessment effort and as part of the current WASC Accreditation Self-Study, a survey of HCC students was conducted in April and May of 2005 to gauge their sentiments about the quality of campus physical resources.

RESEARCH DESIGN

The survey was developed by the Standard III: Resources: Physical Resources Subcommittee: Co-Chairs: Sharon Isa & Renette Sonomura; and members: Gaynel Buxton, Owen Miyamoto, Jacqueline Scudder, Guy Shibayama, and Allen Tateishi in cooperation with David Cleveland (HCC social science faculty) and his student assistant Leslie Miner who created the hard copy and online versions of the instrument.

The size of the sample coupled with the fact that responding students represented the wide range of HCC programs and enrollments patterns suggests that the findings are quite representative of the HCC student population.

FINDINGS

An array of physical resources were evaluated by employing a scale ranging from Poor to Excellent. The data were then used to calculate mean (average) rating scores for all physical resource items - resulting in the bar chart below that sorts physical resources from most favorably to least favorably reviewed. Overall, respondents gave a reasonably favorable review of most HCC physical resources.

Areas with high/satisfactory ratings:

Classrooms/shops/labs; study areas; classroom/lab/shop safety; classroom/lab/shop furnishings/equipment; accessibility (ADA) of buildings; cafeteria; restrooms; stairways; leisure areas.

Areas with low ratings:

Student parking; elevators; safety/security in parking lots; campus signs/maps; desks/tables; video presentation equipment; computers/software.

ACTION PLAN: Open the new parking lot as soon as possible; update Building 7's elevators; improve campus signs/maps; and improve security in campus parking lots.
# TABLE OF CONTENTS (Learning Infrastructure - Students)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Topic</th>
<th>Page #</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Research Design</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sample</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Demographics</td>
<td>2 - 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall Rank Ordered Findings</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOP RATED ITEMS</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Classrooms/Labs/Shops</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Study Areas</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Classroom &amp; Lab/Shop Safety</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>MID RATED ITEMS</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>BOTTOM RATED ITEMS</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Campus Signs/Maps</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Safety/Security in Parking Lots</td>
<td>8 - 9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elevators</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Parking</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>STUDENT COMMENTS/SUGGESTIONS</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Classroom/Lab/Shop Physical Resources that Need Improvement</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Desk &amp; Chairs</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Classroom Video Presentation Devices</td>
<td>12 - 13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Updated &amp; More Computers/Software</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Campus Facilities that Need Improvement</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Parking</td>
<td>13 - 15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parking Lot Security</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stall Size, Tree Debris, Permit Policies</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cleanliness/Maintenance</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>CONCLUSION</strong></td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
HCC PHYSICAL RESOURCES - IN SUPPORT OF STUDENT LEARNING

Unless someone like you cares a whole awful lot, nothing is going to get better. It's not. - Dr. Seuss (The Lorax)

In the Spring of 2005, as part of HCC’s ongoing assessment effort and the current WASC Accreditation Self Study, students, faculty, and staff were surveyed to gauge their perspectives about the college’s physical resources.

RESEARCH DESIGN

Questionnaire development and administration

Two separate survey instruments (one for students/one for faculty and staff) were designed by the Standard III Accreditation Self Study Physical Resources Subcommittee after examining earlier HCC surveys and similar evaluations conducted at other community colleges. David Cleveland (Sociology Professor) and Leslie Miner (work study employee) assisted in the instrument design and created the ultimate hard copy and online versions of the questionnaires (hard copy versions are attached to this report). The questionnaires contained about two dozen fixed response items and a few comment items.

Co-Chairs of the Physical Resources Subcommittee, Sharon Isa and Renette Sonomura then requested technical program instructors to administer and return the student questionnaire (online or hard copy) while faculty/staff were asked to complete online or hard copy versions of the faculty/staff questionnaire. To increase sample size, a number of students enrolled in Sociology classes administered the student questionnaire in an array of HCC classrooms.

PHYSICAL RESOURCES - STUDENT ASSESSMENT SURVEY

Adequacy of the sample

The sample was not scientifically randomized; however, 428 (about 10% of HCC students) surveys were completed and the sampling design assured that students from almost every HCC Program responded to the survey - though the number of respondents from many technical programs was so small that separate statistical analysis for these programs is not warranted. For the macro analysis (HCC student sentiment), the sampling technique and size should provide findings with a 95% confidence level (sample size of 350 required for +/- 5% accuracy).

Data Input, Data Analysis, & Report Generation

Data were input automatically for the online version (Survey Pro 2.0 - Net Collect) and manually by HCC Sociology students into Survey Pro 2.0 in April and May of 2005.

Survey Pro data reports were created and distributed to the Subcommittee in early May. This report was then drafted in late June (2005) by David Cleveland in consultation with Co-Chairs Sharon Isa and Renette Sonomura. The draft of the report will be distributed to the subcommittee for their review so it can be revised after the resumption of classes in the Fall of 2005.
STUDENT RESPONDENT DEMOGRAPHICS

Enrollment Patterns

As a typical urban, comprehensive community college with a large liberal arts program, numerous occupational/technical programs, and a large evening/weekend apprenticeship program, enrollment patterns vary considerably. The pie chart below demonstrates that the sample included respondents from all of these enrollment pattern categories:

Figure #1 Student Enrollment Patterns (N = 409)

Gender

Most of HCC's occupational/technical programs have traditionally drawn largely male students. 59% of the HCC student population is male while only 41% is female - the sample closely approximates the population parameters.

Figure #2 Student Gender (N = 420)
STUDENT AGE DISTRIBUTION

The HCC student population has been defined as Age Non-Traditional since the opening of the college. Compared to a traditional, residential, four-year campus, this remains true; however, given the fact that students at urban, commuting, comprehensive community colleges across the country have a similar age distribution pattern, we should (as we approach our fifth decade) begin defining this age distribution pattern as CC Traditional.

The mean age of HCC students has hovered at about 26 while the median age is quite steady at about 23. The three year difference between the mean and median results from the high proportion (2/3) of students who are 25 and under (lowering the median age) and the presence of a smaller older population (raising the mean age).

In any case, the age distribution of the sample approximates the age distribution of the HCC student population.
RESPONDENT ACADEMIC PROGRAMS

As demonstrated by the table below, a wide array of HCC students from almost all of our programs completed the evaluation.

TABLE #1 - RESPONDENT PROGRAMS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ACADEMIC PROGRAM</th>
<th># OF RESPONDENTS</th>
<th>% OF SAMPLE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Liberal Arts</td>
<td>133</td>
<td>31.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Auto Body Repair/Painting</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>2.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Architectural, Engineering/CAD</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aeronautics</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administration of Justice</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>3.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Automotive Technology</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apprenticeship</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>14.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Applied Trades</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commercial Aviation</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carpentry</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>5.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communication Arts</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Computer, Electronics, Networking Tech</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>6.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cosmetology</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>4.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diesel Mechanics</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>3.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Electrical Installation/Maintenance</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>5.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Human Services</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>2.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fire/Environmental Emergency Response</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fashion Technology</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Industrial Education</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marine Technologies</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sheet Metal/Plastic Technologies</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Early Childhood Education</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>12.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>418</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
STUDY FINDINGS - RATINGS OF CAMPUS PHYSICAL RESOURCES

Respondents were asked to rate the quality of an array of HCC physical resources (26 items) in terms of the ability of each resource to support the educational mission.

Most evaluation items shared a common response scale (Don’t Know/Don’t Use, Poor, Fair, Good, Excellent).

In the bar chart below, the Don’t Know/Don’t Use responses were removed from the data set, making it possible to compute mean values for these items and thereby rank order levels of perceived quality. The mean values were calculated by assigning the following scores to responses: Poor = 1; Fair = 2; Good = 3; Excellent = 4.

For example, if a physical resource had received all excellent ratings, the resource would have a mean value score of 4.0. On the other hand, had the area received all poor ratings, the mean value score would be 1.0.

Campus Resources

Adequate number of classrooms: 3.02
Adequate location of classrooms: 3.01
Adequate size of classrooms: 3.00
Lab/shop location: 2.96
Study areas (Library, Skills Ctr, Native Hawaiian Ctr): 2.97
Safety of campus classrooms: 2.95
Lab/shop size: 2.94
Lab/shop safety/security: 2.89
Shop/lab availability (# of shops/labs): 2.87
Classroom availability (# of classrooms): 2.83
Lab/shop furnishings: 2.79
Accessibility HCC buildings for persons with disabilities: 2.78
Lab/shop equipment: 2.77
Cafeteria: 2.74
Sidewalks: 2.72
Restrooms: 2.72
Stairways: 2.71
Classroom furniture for persons with disabilities: 2.69
Classroom equipment: 2.66
Leisure areas (benches, picnic tables, etc.): 2.65
Adequate furnishings of classrooms: 2.63
Campus signs/maps: 2.61
Safety/security in parking lots: 2.47
Elevators: 2.46
Location of student parking: 2.09
Availability of student parking: 1.85

FIGURE #4 - RANK ORDERED RATINGS OF HCC PHYSICAL RESOURCES
FROM BEST TO WORST BY MEAN VALUE - ALL RESPONDENTS
TOP RATED ITEMS

CLASSROOMS/LABS/SHOPS

Students gave very high quality ratings to the number, location, and size of their classrooms and lab/shops. All of these items scored near or higher than 3.0 (average ranking Good).

Given the fact that commuting students spend most of their hours on campus within the confines of their classrooms/labs/shops, this is an important and encouraging finding.

An item may be well rated in an evaluation, however, if it is well rated but not very important to respondents, the favorable rating may not have much value in assessing student satisfaction with the physical environment of the campus. Students are obviously quite concerned about the quality of their classrooms/labs/shops and are favorably impressed by HCC classrooms/labs/shops.

STUDY AREAS

Just below classrooms/labs/shops in the mean rankings, are campus study areas (mean = 2.97) - identified in the study as the Library, College Skills Center, and Native Hawaiian Center.

Besides classrooms, labs, and shops, our commuting students need quality study areas - the relatively high rating of these areas suggests that basic student physical resource needs are being met.
CLASSROOM AND LAB/SHOP SAFETY

As an urban campus with numerous occupational programs and a campus located in a business/industrial area, some members of the community wonder about security/safety at HCC.

HCC students seem, however, to feel quite secure/safe on the campus as evidenced by their responses to questions focusing upon safety/security:

![Figure #7 Classroom Safety (N=410)](image1)

![Figure #8 Lab/Shop Safety/Security (N=31)](image2)

PHYSICAL RESOURCES THAT RECEIVED MID-LEVEL MARKS

Lab/shop furnishings, accessibility of HCC buildings for persons with disabilities, lab/shop equipment, cafeteria, sidewalks, restrooms, stairways, adequacy of classroom furniture for persons with disabilities, classroom equipment, leisure areas, and adequate classroom furnishings received mid-level ratings from respondents (Mean value range = 2.63 to 2.79).

PHYSICAL RESOURCES SEEN AS NEEDING IMPROVEMENT - THE BOTTOM QUARTER

The bottom fourth of ranked items is discussed below. The items are arrayed from the “best” (campus signs and maps) of the bottom quarter to the “worst” of the bottom quarter (student parking).
CAMPUS SIGNS/MAPS

While previous studies of physical resources have consistently revealed dissatisfaction with campus signs/maps, despite the fact that some improvements have been made in campus signage, students remain relatively dissatisfied in this area.

* Action Note: The dissemination of the draft of this report has already resulted in the printing and posting of campus maps.

Student comments: the signs for buildings need to be made visible: more signs for the buildings

![Figure #9 Campus Signs & Maps (N=374)](image)

SAFETY/SECURITY IN PARKING LOTS

While classroom and lab/shop safety and security get high marks (mean value = 2.95) from student respondents, safety/security in HCC parking lots (mean value 2.47) is not nearly as well reviewed.

![Figure #10 Safety/Security in Parking Lots (N=384)](image)

There are several student parking lots, and the sense of safety in the lots may vary significantly by the lot in...
which the student parks; however, the existing survey data do not permit such elaboration analysis.

**WOMEN FEEL SLIGHTLY LESS SAFE IN PARKING LOTS THAN DO MEN**

The table below shows that female students feel slightly less safe in HCC parking lots than do male students. Previous studies of student perceptions of parking lot safety have revealed that evening students (particularly female evening students) felt significantly less safe/secure in HCC parking lots than did day students. As a result of previous findings, the college installed new lighting in major parking lots and beefed up evening security services. The data below suggest that while safety/security in parking lots can still be improved, evening students no longer feel significantly less safe/secure than do day students.

Table #2 Parking Lot Safety/Security by Gender - DAY STUDENTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Safety/security in parking lots</th>
<th>Female</th>
<th>Male</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>11.4%</td>
<td>10.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fair</td>
<td>38.4%</td>
<td>47.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good</td>
<td>41.7%</td>
<td>35.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Excellent</td>
<td>8.5%</td>
<td>7.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>2.47</td>
<td>2.40</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table #3 Parking Lot Safety/Security by Gender - EVENING STUDENTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Safety/security in parking lots</th>
<th>Female</th>
<th>Male</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>8.2%</td>
<td>12.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fair</td>
<td>45.9%</td>
<td>41.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good</td>
<td>35.1%</td>
<td>37.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Excellent</td>
<td>9.8%</td>
<td>6.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
ELEVATORS

While not nearly as negatively reviewed as Student Parking, campus elevators received low marks as well. With the exception of the Fire Station, Building 28, each building with more than one floor is equipped with an elevator.

The source of most of the complaints comes from the poorly designed elevator system serving the Library Building (Building 7). Three elevators are boarded from a covered open area just outside the building and have only two stops - one at Floor 3 ½ and one at Floor 5 ½. This system was designed to decrease the number of stops for the three main elevators and, thereby, speed the flow of passengers by having elevator users walk half a flight up or down to get to an elevator landing. Not only is the configuration confusing to first time users, it cannot meet the accessibility requirements of the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA). To comply with ADA, a fourth elevator, located at the rear of the building, stops at every floor and is available with card key access control. Persons with disabilities must register for the card key and this system could be challenged since it denies access to the general public. Furthermore, the walkway leading to the elevator is not marked for persons with disabilities.

The ADA accessible elevator was recently upgraded to meet accessibility requirements and mechanically upgraded. Upgrading of the mechanical equipment for the three outside elevators is pending the award of a maintenance contract. The heavy usage pattern coupled with the age of the elevators translates to frequent elevator breakdowns and occasional reports of "trapped" students/faculty who have to await the appearance of repair technicians to be "freed."

In short, as seen in the pie chart below, there is considerable student dissatisfaction with HCC elevators (Mean = 2.46).

![Figure #11 Elevators (N=396)]
STUDENT PARKING

The perennial, major complaint about HCC physical resources has been student parking. As enrollments climbed and the number of students driving to the campus increased, the campus has been unable to meet ever increasing student parking demand.

A large number of additional parking stalls were added a couple of decades ago when the college built the new Automotive Technology and Diesel Mechanics facilities and a large adjacent parking lot; however, that lot is an eight minute walk from the main campus.

The lowest ranked items on the evaluation were (not surprisingly): Availability and Location of Student Parking.

The mean value of Availability of Student Parking was 1.85 compared to the top rated physical resource item Adequate Number of Classrooms that had a mean value of 3.02.

![Figure 12 Availability of Student Parking (N=379)](image)

![Figure 13 Location of Student Parking (N=383)](image)

PARKING RELIEF IN SIGHT

While student parking remains the least favorably reviewed aspect of campus physical resources, relief is finally in sight. The campus has awaited the transfer of 3.44 acres of adjoining land that once was the Kalihi Incinerator site for municipal waste and closed in 1977. The transfer has been slowed, in part, by the efforts of the City and County to remove hazardous materials left from the incinerator operation. Return of the property to State must be approved by the State Department of Land and Natural Resources and the Department of Health on the condition that remediation has been completed satisfactorily.

At this writing, the site has been cleared of its contaminated soil, leveled, compacted, and “paved” with a top layer of crushed, recycled asphalt. When the transfer between the City & County and the State of Hawaii is accomplished, campus parking capacity will be increased. The campus Long Range Development Plan envisions use of a part of this area for a new science building and a human services/child care facility. The LDRP includes a multi-story parking structure to replace the current student parking lot #1.
STUDENT COMMENTS & SUGGESTIONS

While survey research reports tend to focus upon the presentation of statistics computed from quantitative data, some of the most important insights gained from assessment surveys are gleaned from reading and analyzing the comments and suggestions in the open answer responses.

Repetitive comments about a desired service or satisfaction/dissatisfaction with a service or activity can be as valid an assessment barometer as the quantitative data gathered in the fixed response sections of the survey. Comments far more effectively pinpoint a problem and sometimes provide valuable insights as to how the problem can be reduced or resolved.

Respondents were asked to provide their comments and suggestions about physical resources that needed improvement (and needed modifications) in the following four areas:

Classrooms  Labs/Shops  Campus Parking  Additional Comments

CLASSROOM/LAB/SHOP PHYSICAL RESOURCES THAT NEED IMPROVEMENT

Desks & Chairs

Dozens of respondents cited various problems with classroom desks, suggesting the desks are: too small, uncomfortable, dirty, old, broken, lack of left handed desks, squeaky, and riddled with graffiti.

Sample student comments about desks:

- Desks are too small and very uncomfortable.
- Chairs w/tables need to be more equipped for larger people.
- Chairs are in poor condition (very dirty).
- More left-handed chairs.
- Tables to provide for left-handed people: we need new chairs and desks, the doors in the desks for our books are broken and missing: new padded seats for class rooms: desks squeak: chairs with desks that fit your books (bigger and wider desks): need bigger desks: Chairs need to be improved. Why are there no desks for left handed students?:
- Desks are broken.
- Desks are broken and tables have been marked or tagged: classes have ugly desks: Chairs and desk are too small. We are not elementary sized students: Many of the chairs in classroom are missing bottom pieces making them "wobbly" Upholstery is ripped too.

Given the number of student complaints about desk/chair units, a mini study that compares students in classrooms equipped with traditional desks with students in classrooms with larger tables with chairs might be conducted to discover whether replacing aging desk/chair units with tables and chairs might improve student satisfaction with classroom furniture.

Improve Classroom Video Presentation Devices

While increasing numbers of HCC classrooms are being converted to "high tech, multi-media" rooms, the majority of our classrooms are traditional blackboard/whiteboard rooms with television monitors, VCRs, and overhead projectors available for use. Students who have taken classes in the transformed multi-media classrooms experience relative deprivation when they take other classes in traditional classrooms. The dozens of comments calling for improved electronic learning devices in their classrooms demonstrate the high priority that students place upon this physical resource. Sample comments are included below:
Updated and More Computers/Software

Over a dozen students wrote comments calling for more, newer, and upgraded computers and computer software:

new computers are needed for the CENT program, many exiting systems are too slow and do not have enough memory: newer updated computer and equipment; computer for each student; We have some outdated things. Example: Projectors, some computers; Better computers for CAD applications; Projector display with computer; Need up to date computers and a better internet system; Not enough computers; More computers and printers; Computer labs: software licenses sometimes a problem (costs and usage restrictions). Availability & cost for full time students to obtain software for home study use; Equipment available to everyone such as computer programs; Every software installed to all PCs.

CAMPUS FACILITIES THAT NEED IMPROVEMENT

STUDENT PARKING

As the area with the lowest marks, it is not surprising that this physical resource attracted as many comments as all other areas combined - almost half of the student respondents commented (overwhelmingly negatively) about the various aspects of HCC student parking - inadequate numbers of spaces, location of parking lots, parking lot security, the parking sticker process, size of parking stalls, cost of a parking permit, leaves from parking lot trees, parking lot signs, and parking lot management.

More Parking!

While students had plenty to say about parking, their major need in this area is quite simple - more parking.

As discussed earlier in this report, if the City and Country can effect the transfer of the old incinerator site immediately behind the library building, student parking complaints will decrease significantly as there will be hundreds of new parking spaces directly on the campus. Below are a few sample student comments about the availability of student parking:

more space! more parking! ; parking horrible! ; parking is horrendous for evening and on Saturdays even w/a parking pass; It seems that there isn't enough parking areas for the students here. It's made obvious every morning when you see cars parked dangerously along the canal; So many students and not
enough parking plus, you gotta walk far if you have a mid morning class: we just need more!!! please, so there is no lottery, need more parking before adding more classes; not enough parking, Zone 8 is ridiculous, build a parking structure; they should build a three story parking structure: Make it more available for students to find parking/ will reduce chances of limited learning- better in time management if they don't have to worry about parking; Not enough, in result students can't attend class on time or at all; The parking lots are not big enough forcing many students to park on the street which is full by 10:00am. The building at a tower parking structure would improve this; Especially at the beginning of the semester there is a problem finding parking at night & on Saturdays. Often, it requires more than two passes & sometimes you still can't find on-campus parking even with a permit.

Students Want Parking Closer to Main Campus

When the new Automotive and Diesel Program facilities were constructed about a quarter of a mile from the main campus at the end of Kokea Street, a large student parking lot (#8) was included in the project. This lot is not usually full; however, many students consider the lot to be too far from the campus - too long a walk to the campus, concerns about personal security on the walk, and concerns about the security of their vehicles at Lot #8.

A student lottery is, therefore, conducted for parking permits in the main on-campus lots adjacent to classrooms, shops, labs, and campus facilities; however, only a fraction of those who enter the lottery "win" the right to purchase $15 per semester parking permits. Students without permits have to find parking in the community by arriving very early (before 07:30 AM), by searching for an open spot, or by parking in a metered spot on a nearby street (with a good chance of getting a parking ticket because the metered stalls have a two hour maximum). Many students without permits find parking along the Kapalama canal; however, these unmarked, unpaved parking stalls are often potholed and some students have returned to find that their cars have slipped into the canal.

In short, not only do students want more parking - they want parking closer to the main campus. Representative comments are provided below:

we should get physical credit for walking from the parking to the class; Campus parking sucks. Everyone doesn't have a chance to park in lot 1. Lot 8 is a bitch, especially when it's raining. Parking near the canal is a risk, due to unexpected tickets. Car might be towed or even just dived in a canal; more parking closer to campus, maybe a good parking structure would be good; need closer parking; lot 8 is too far; need alternative for people not majoring in Automotive; Lot 8 is not so great... Need to have more and near the campus; Parking should be near campus grounds so security guards can walk around the lot to check cars. More parking offered to students that are closer to campus. Lot 8 (at the end of Kokea) is too far - of a walk; Campus parking is too far from HCC; Lot #8 is too far, offer more parking closer to school. Even if it is more expensive; Lot is too far; Need more parking stalls that are easy to access instead of walking for away; Lot 8, very far, not everyone has a chance to park in lot 1 of 5. They leave is no choice but to park next to the canal; Lot 8 should be closer to campus; I am attending HCC since 1997, you still not finishing parking lot at a lot adjacent to school & Kokea.

Other Parking Lot Concerns - Cost, Security, Permit Process

There are four UH community colleges on Oahu - HCC is the only one of the four that charges students and faculty for parking. While the cost is nominal ($20 a semester) compared to parking fees in downtown Honolulu or at the University of Hawaii Manoa, many students are aware that parking is free at the other community
college campuses.

Fees at HCC are necessary to provide the security to control access to the parking lots (permits are required) because of limited parking availability and to provide security services which may not be as much of a problem (given their locations) at the other Oahu community colleges. Samples of students comments are provided below:

more parking for free; Parking should be free. KCC parking is free.; KCC has free parking. And it is first come first serve basis. I am now thinking about transferring ever. Please do something about that if enrollment in HCC is important to you. Need parking structure/free parking like LCC.; need more parking for students and the parking should be free; more parking. free for evening classes; free campus parking; Parking should be free like other community colleges;

Increased Parking Lot Security

On the one hand, students complain about paying $20 a semester for parking; on the other hand, many respondents want more and tighter security. Selected student comments concerning parking lot security are included below:

I do worry sometimes because my car is in lot 8 and it is possible that my car can get vandalized; things getting stolen off of peoples cars; security and availability; Maybe stricter security (one my car was attempted broken into-scratches on the door and the alarm was set off... student parking too far, need more security;) lighting is bad; Security needs to check the parking sticker numbers everyday because there is a lot of theft. Making parking closer, security needs to patrol every 5 minutes... Security needs to keep patrolling. My friends car got broken into - 15 min at a time.; Better lighting, for evening students or those here late until closing-allow to park any area near hldgs; They need to watch the cars and persons more so than write tickets; Safety of parking is a concern due to location and lack of enforcement.

OTHER MISCELLANEOUS CONCERNS ABOUT STUDENT PARKING:
STALL SIZE, TREE DEBRIS, PERMIT POLICIES

The stalls need to be larger for all the work trucks or there should be a separate parking lot for them. They take up so many stall and something go over the line because they're so big; less debris from the trees. Bigger space for parking; Good shade trees in lot 3 but trees made lots of rubbish that is not cleaned regularly.

On campus parking, passes should be made easier for students who have been attending school longer; you need to allow the parking lot to be on a first come first serve basis instead of permitting students. It is not fair because the parking lot are sometimes empty while we are driving back and forth to find parking. The lottery system needs to be easier to use. Spent lots of time just trying to figure it out; Lot 8 should be for low GPA and new students. Lots on campus should be for returning and higher GPA students. Should issue more permits; each student should be able to get passes and parking should be first come first serve; There should be designated parking for Auto/Diesel students in Lot 8. These programs should have first access.
CLEANLINESS/MAINTENANCE OF CAMPUS PHYSICAL RESOURCES

Students made a number of negative comments about the cleanliness and maintenance of some campus facilities:

Broken windows, dirty desks, and dusty classrooms; Chairs are in poor condition (very dirty); Floor tiles are dirty and some are missing; Building 5 classrooms have a hodgepodge of furniture & the insides are relatively rundown in the bathroom. Also, the bathrooms in the cafeteria are usually always dirty & give you the feeling parts of the walls will fall off if you touch them; Good shade trees in lot 3 but trees need lots of rubbish that is not cleaned regularly, elevator need to be cleaned it smell funny; clean the bathrooms; Building 4 is in good shape, but building 5 needs internal/external renovations. A lot of the bathrooms need to be cleaned, etc.... School needs some up keeping renovate restrooms; Cleaner restrooms; the cafeteria bathroom is extremely unkempt building five need to be rebuilt.

MISCELLANEOUS

A few students commented on problem/requests regarding: graffiti, elevators, vending and ATM machines, gym/fitness facilities, lighting, and campus restrooms.

FINDINGS FOR PARTICULAR PROGRAMS

The survey was designed to provide a sample of the overall HCC student population, not to provide representative samples for each college program (which would have required a much larger sample); however, the number of students responding from a few programs make it possible to provide program heads separate, representative statistical reports. After reviewing the overall findings, other programs may choose to survey their students to ensure representative samples which will enable individual programs to assess the adequacy of program physical resources.

CONCLUSION - PHYSICAL RESOURCES ARE ADEQUATE, BUT CAN BE IMPROVED

The budgetary limitations of the last decade have strained the ability of the campus to add, upgrade, and maintain its physical resources. The college has, however, endeavored to prioritize the resources necessary to ensure high quality educational experiences.

The college is on the verge of resolving the long standing shortage of on-campus student parking and, simultaneously, the State of Hawaii is recovering from a lean fiscal decade. As a consequence, the campus expects to make considerable progress in improving its physical resources during the next few years.

The deficiencies and student needs revealed in this student survey will be reviewed by various campus bodies to prompt the development of action plans to address identified physical resource needs.

A late Fall 2005 survey focusing upon resulting short term fixes is planned to assess the degree to which student satisfaction levels are affected by these efforts.