

**HONOLULU COMMUNITY COLLEGE  
ACCREDITATION STEERING COMMITTEE  
For the  
INSTITUTIONAL SELF-EVALUATION REPORT (ISER)**

**NOTES  
November 21, 2016**

---

**Members Present:** Standard I: Keala Chock, David Panisnick; Standard II: Katy Ho, Jolene Suda; Standard III: Steven Auerbach, Jeff Stearns; Standard IV: Erika Lacro, Cynthia Smith; IR Liaison: Jeffery Arbuckle; ISER Chair: Marcia Roberts-Deutsch

**Defining Roles of Standard Co-Chairs:** The Standard Co-Chairs are members of the Steering Committee, which is tasked with the overall monitoring and management of the process of preparing the College's Institutional Self Evaluation Report, or ISER. (This is new nomenclature adopted by ACCJC.) The Co-Chairs are responsible for overseeing the work of the parts of the Standard (e.g., Standard IA, IB, IC, etc.) to which they are assigned, providing status reports back to the Steering Committee and ensuring that they adhere to the timetable for report preparation.

**Working with liaisons:** Standard Co-Chairs will work with the individuals designated as Chairs/Liaisons for the individual parts of the Standard either individually or as small groups. This will ensure better coordination across each Standard.

**Updating the Timeline:** While the College's initial timeline called for a focus on and (ideally) completion of identifying and gathering evidence during Fall 2016, the Steering Committee is aware that each part of Standard team is working at a different pace. At its December meeting, the Steering Committee will review and update the timeline, with the understanding that we are committed to have a good working draft ready for initial campus review by April 10, 2017.

**Meeting schedule for the Steering Committee:** The Committee will meet again on December 14 at 1:00 pm. Agenda items will include a) reviewing/updating the timeline for report preparation; b) planning for an Accreditation-focused event during Duty Week in January; and c) identifying gap items (either in the evidence itself, or in things that need to be addressed now.)

**Interface with the Accreditation Task Force:** At this point in the accreditation cycle, the Steering Committee and the Accreditation Task Force need to clarify their roles and an effective division of labor. Two specific items that can be delegated to the Task Force are a) Coordination and administration of surveys; and b) final review of the last cycle's AIP (Actionable Improvement Plan.)

**Action Items:** Several items were identified for immediate action, as follows:

- a) Workshop for writers: Marcia has contacted the people on each team identified as lead writers, and will provide a brief workshop for them on some recommended techniques for facilitating the task of writing to the standards.

- b) Coordination of Surveys: As noted, this will be delegated to the Accreditation Task Force.
- c) Last review of AIP: As noted, this will also be delegated to the Accreditation Task Force.
- d) Coordination of Interviews (with Admin et al.): The Steering Committee will coordinate interviews where appropriate with key people, including the Administrative team. The Steering Committee will also coordinate focus groups and other aspects of evidence-gathering, especially where multiple parts of Standards may be affected.
- e) Identifying and acting on gap items: As noted, Standard Co-Chairs will work with team liaisons to identify gap items for immediate action.
- f) Planning for January Duty Week event: As noted, this will be handled at the December meeting of the Steering Committee.
- g) Examples of good reports, best practices: Marcia will follow up with consultant Bob Pacheco, who had indicated he would make these available to us.

**Documenting the process:** Since the ISER is a process of broad-based and collaborative dialog that culminates in a comprehensive report, it is important to document that process at all levels, from individual team meetings, interview sessions, and data gathering, on up to the writing of the final report, which does include a section on report preparation. The College will utilize SharePoint as one means of gathering and organizing information and evidence—more information forthcoming. The campus will also be kept informed via a monthly newsletter.

In this context, it was suggested that we prepare a “Fact Book” with some basic data and other information about the College that could be presented to the visiting team prior to their arrival. This could help address in part the “California bias” that is of concern to Hawaii colleges. Sources of good information include the Data Briefs from our IR staff, the UH website, and VP Morton’s presentations. Our ISER will also include a section on campus demographics.

There was further discussion about the possibility of inter-collegiate collaboration on the writing of some parts of Standards that are common or consistent among all campuses. It was noted that the Functional Map from the OVPCC does identify whether the system office or individual campuses were responsible for specific items.

In the context of report writing and documenting the process, it was stressed again that teams need to work in a collegial, collaborative and respectful manner, understanding that if concerns are raised about situations or issues that the College needs to address, it should be done with constructive criticism, and grounded in good evidence. This is not the occasion to air old grievances, but to frame a vision of what the College can become as it continues to grow and improve. It is also important to remember that the writing of the report needs to be based on taking a fresh look at the College, even if some of the evidence cited parallels what was presented earlier. Our 2012 comprehensive report, follow-up reports from 2013 and 2014, and especially our 2015 Midterm Report can all serve as useful references to gauge the progress we have made, but by no means should we take a “cut and paste” approach in writing our 2018 report, which should be forward-thinking in tone and perspective.