

**HONOLULU COMMUNITY COLLEGE
ACCREDITATION STEERING COMMITTEE**

**NOTES
April 19, 2017**

Members Present: Standard I: David Panisnick; Standard II: Jolene Suda; Standard III: Steven Auerbach, Jeff Stearns; Standard IV: Cynthia Smith; Mike Meyer (IT Liaison); Jeffery Arbuckle (IR Liaison); Marcia Roberts-Deutsch (ISER Chair)

First Draft Status Report: All teams have submitted a working draft, though in somewhat different formats. Marcia prepared a summary report of the current status of each section, appended to these notes. Two sections in particular (IIC and IIC) need to provide some form of narrative based on the information provided.

Next Steps for teams: Co-Chairs and team representatives were asked to consider next steps in two contexts: a) what should be done before the end of the current academic year (2016-2017); and b) what will position the team well as we begin the new academic year (2017-2018)? Marcia will send a reminder to the teams to identify those things as they finalize their current work.

Immediate Action Items: In addition to the tasks noted above, the committee identified some additional items, as follows:

1. Campus surveys: It is now most likely that the Faculty/Staff Survey will be administered in Fall 2017; the Student Survey is planned for Spring 2017. Both surveys are being coordinated through the Accreditation Task Force.
2. Timeline: Marcia will review and update the ISER timeline, based on progress to date.
3. Clarification of Roles – Steering Committee and Accreditation Task Force: Marcia will check with Katy on this; the comparison that Marcia prepared was presented to the AcTF at an earlier meeting.
4. Standard IVC and IVD: These sections should be forthcoming from the system office, but there haven't been any meetings.

Wrap-up: This was the last formal meeting of the Steering Committee, and committee members were thanked for their service this year. Marcia and others will continue to work through the summer to further review the current working drafts, identify areas where more evidence can or should be gathered, and plan for the next phase of report preparation beginning in Fall 2017.

Appended to this set of notes: Working Draft Status Report, April 2017

**HONOLULU COMMUNITY COLLEGE
INSTITUTIONAL SELF EVALUATION REPORT (ISER)
ACCREDITATION 2018**

**WORKING DRAFT STATUS REPORT
April 2017**

IA: Mission:

14 pp; Section I.A.3 in tabular form—needs conversion to narrative, but rich with evidence. Need for some additional evidence already cited.

IB: Academic Quality and Institutional Effectiveness:

13 pp; substantial evidence cited, linked to each section narrative. I.B.3 (institution-set standards) and I.B.6 (disaggregation of data) will likely have system-level content to incorporate.

IC: Institutional Integrity:

8 pp; Sections I.C.1 to I.C.4 have beginning of narrative, with place-holders for evidence to come. Remaining sections (I.C.5 to I.C.14) still to be worked on.

IIA: Instructional Programs:

25 pp; comprehensive draft; in some cases evidence cited, but need specific locations (URLs, etc.)

IIB: Academic Support Services:

5 pp; good use of guiding questions on evidence, which still needs to be gathered. Sections on Analysis and Evaluation for all parts of Standard need to be completed.

IIC: Student Support Services:

10 pp; prepared in spreadsheet format, with very organized approach to identifying and locating evidence. Team has also identified some important next steps. Most important next step: writing to the Standard in narrative form.

IIIA: Human Resources:

14 pp; very good basic format and identification of key items of evidence; some items still to be found are also identified. Some sections of Analysis and Evaluation may need to be amplified.

IIIB: Physical Resources:

19 pp; very good basic format; identifies places where additional evidence is needed; acknowledges need for some system-level coordination.

IIIC: Technology Resources:

6 pp; prepared in outline form with bulleted identification of key items of evidence, cross-linked to itemized list. Most important next step: writing to the Standard in narrative form.

IIID: Financial Resources:

31 pp; very comprehensive report, driven by system-level input; in general, sections on Analysis and Evaluation need to be completed and/or amplified.

IV: Leadership and Governance:

23 pp; treats sections A (Decision-Making Roles and Processes) and B (Chief Executive Officer) only; Sections C and D to come from system level. Narrative very detailed, though often in outline form; identifies a number of key follow-up items—topics to be addressed, evidence to be gathered. In some cases, Analysis and Evaluation sections could be amplified.