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Statement on Report Preparation

Background:

In an action letter dated January 31, 2007, The Accrediting Commission for Community and Junior Colleges (ACCJC) notified Chancellor Rockne Freitas that the Commission had reaffirmed the accreditation status of Hawaii Community College (see Document #1: http://www.hawaii.edu/offices/app/memo/Haw013106.pdf). In doing so, the Commission identified six formal recommendations and required the College to complete a “Progress Report” by October 15, 2008 to explain the actions taken to address the recommendations. In a letter from President Barbara Beno of ACCJC to Chancellor Freitas dated April 15, 2008, Progress Reports were re-named Follow-Up Reports to clarify the intent of the Commission that institutions be held accountable to correct deficiencies rather than simply make progress within a two-year period from the point of notification (see Document #2).

After receipt of the January, 2007 letter from ACCJC reaffirming the college’s accreditation, Chancellor Freitas congratulated the campus, the members of the Accreditation Committee, and the Accreditation Liaison Officer for the successful completion of the self study accreditation process (see Document #3). The Report of the Comprehensive Evaluation Visit Team, (see Document #4) chaired by Dr. Jan Kehoe has been posted on the Accreditation Web Page to provide easy access for the campus and the public.

The preparation of the Follow-Up Report was assigned to the Accreditation Liaison Officer, Dr. Trina Nahm-Mijo working in conjunction with Vice-Chancellor for Academic Affairs, Douglas Dykstra.

Process of Report Preparation:

The actions taken to address recommendations reported hereafter have involved a broad cross section of the campus personnel, who concomitantly have been requested to pay particular attention to the review of the applicable portions of this Follow-up Report. Additionally, the entire campus has been given access to a draft of the Progress Report made available as of the beginning of the 2008-09 duty period for faculty on August 19.
The official reviewing bodies asked for feedback have been the College Council, the Academic Senate and the Student Government with faculty, staff and students having been directed to send their comments to these bodies for consideration.

The college response to Recommendation #1 produced a totally updated Strategic Plan (name changed from the Academic Development Plan to assure system-wide consistency of terminology). The initial drafts of the updated Strategic Plan were written by the Chair of the College Council with major contributions from the Chair of the Academic Senate in addition to all members of the College’s administrative team before being released to the faculty/staff as a draft for review. Additionally the inaugural members of a totally re-structured (19 members) College Effectiveness Review Committee are of particular importance as reviewers of this portion of the Follow-up Report given their role in providing the structural linkage among program review, budget formation and the strategic plan. These two constituencies have paid particular attention to the description of the college’s response to this recommendation.

Members of the Branch Campus Task Force for West Hawaii along with the Division Chair leadership have contributed to the efforts to address Recommendation #2 with its emphasis upon the reconciliation of the college’s departmental level planning with the mission of West Hawaii. Moreover these same constituencies have been central to addressing the concerns reflected in Recommendation #4 along with Academic Support and Student Services personnel from both campuses. These constituencies have reviewed the report on the foregoing recommendations with appropriate attention.

A sub-committee of the Assessment Committee was responsible for the prototype templates for a process for program learning outcome assessment. The template is applicable to all 27 instructional programs as well as non-credit programs that are comparable to the instructional degree/certificate programs. The select sub-committee which included the chairpersons of both the College Council & Academic Senate along with the chair of the Assessment Committee, chair of the Social Science Division and Director of OCET have paid appropriate attention to the review of this section.

Planning for campus development to address Recommendation #5 has been sufficiently fluid and unpredictable that it has been difficult to involve a broad base of faculty and staff in the process without raising false expectations. Certainly the Interim Director in West Hawaii has involved the faculty/staff in review of drawings for an initial 20,000 square foot building in West Hawaii. However as many as two additional buildings may well be a part of the initial development of the west campus and this opened a surfeit of possibilities difficult to anticipate much less plan in detail at this stage. Additionally, planning for the campus development in East Hawaii is fraught with greater uncertainty given the sequestering of appropriated planning funds. Consequently this portion of the Follow-up report is largely a reflection of the efforts of the Chancellor, Vice Chancellor for Administrative Affairs and the Interim Director of West Hawaii. However, given the angst about these matters, this portion of the Follow-up Report may well have been read with more interest by more faculty/staff/students than any other portion.
Campus governance, the focus of Recommendation #6 takes many forms from the informal meetings of colleagues, to academic divisions under the leadership of division chairs, to staff meetings between campus administrators and supervised faculty/staff, to the deliberations of the fixed governance bodies; College Council, Academic Senate, and Student Government. Of the fixed governance bodies, College Council lacked a formal organization in the absence of a ratified charter, and Student Government has recently re-written its by-laws to reflect changes mandated by recent evaluations of its operations conducted by the Dean of Student Services Office. Actions taken to address this recommendation are bound to stimulate a broad range of interest and input from the reviewing public as well.

**Review and Approval of Report:**

Prior to submittal to the Commission by October 15, 2008, the Follow-up Report was circulated in draft form by August 19 to allow general campus review by providing the document as an attachment to a mass e-mail to the faculty/staff at the beginning of duty period for the 2008-09 academic year. Simultaneously the report was reviewed and approved without editorial amendment by the College Council on August 22; by the Academic Senate Executive Committee on August 29; by the Student Government on August 25. General faculty/staff/student input was directed to the respective representative governance bodies for final consideration and transmittal to the writing team to be taken into consideration for possible inclusion in the final report which was submitted on August 26 via the Vice President for Community Colleges to the University President for submission to the Board of Regents for their meeting on September 18, 2008.

Chancellor Rockne Freitas certifies this Statement on Report Preparation by means of his signature on the Cover Sheet of this Follow-Up Report.

**II. Response to Team Recommendations and the Commission Action Letter**

**Recommendation #1:**

*(Part A)* The college needs to renew its attention to institutional long-term planning, and the Academic Development Plan, including revising, as appropriate, and systematically implementing its goals, and evaluating progress toward implementation of the goals. Such a plan should be comprehensive and include integrated plans and a vision for educational programs, facilities, staffing, technology, support and infrastructure for technology and student services. *(I.A, II.A.1.c, II.A.1.f, III.A.6, III.B.2.b, III.C.1.a.)* *(Part B)* The college should also identify measures of institutional effectiveness, integrated with institutional-level plans, communicate those measures, and evaluate progress on a regular basis. *(I.B.1, I.B.2, I.B.3, I.B.4)*
In June 2002, the Board of Regents adopted the *University of Hawaii System Strategic Plan: Entering the University’s Second Century, 2002-2010*. During AY (academic year) 2007-08, the University community revisited the strategic plan. Participants broadly affirmed the plan’s strategic goals and the values underlying them. Hawaii Community College (HawCC) has participated in the system led update of the Strategic Plan by identifying its college-specific action strategies pursuant to the system priority action outcomes and by including measurable outcomes to assess performance and progress up to 2015 (see Document #5: [http://hawaii.hawaii.edu/employeeservices/strategicplan.doc](http://hawaii.hawaii.edu/employeeservices/strategicplan.doc)). This process involved the efforts of the Chancellor, College Council Chair and Academic Senate Chair helping to write the system level Strategic Plan update. Additionally this group and the entire Administrative Team adapted a college edition of the Strategic Plan update with the College Council Chair writing the first draft. The update has been presented to the campus during April 2008 for input and will be presented to the College Council and Academic Senate for approval and adoption during the fall 2008 semester. With the foregoing approval the Academic Development Plan, 2002-2010 (see Document #6 [http://hawaii.hawaii.edu/accreditation/hawccadp.htm](http://hawaii.hawaii.edu/accreditation/hawccadp.htm)) will have been superseded by the substantially more extensive Strategic Plan update which now is designed to carry the college and the system through the next three biennia with a terminal date of 2015.

Concurrent with the preparation of a Strategic Plan update the college also produced a completely revamped structure and process for the College Effectiveness Review Committee (CERC) to make this body more representative of the whole college. To this end, during early fall 2007 semester, the Assessment Committee recommended to Chancellor Rockne Freitas changes to the process, function, and membership of the College Effectiveness Review Committee (CERC) which is the reviewing body for Comprehensive Program and Unit Reviews (see Document #7, [http://hawaii.hawaii.edu/assessment/Program%20Reviews/2007%20Program%20Review/General%20Documentation/CERC%20Operating%20Guidelines_2007-08R.doc](http://hawaii.hawaii.edu/assessment/Program%20Reviews/2007%20Program%20Review/General%20Documentation/CERC%20Operating%20Guidelines_2007-08R.doc)). A significant change in the function of the CERC was the enlargement of its role from a technical review to an in-depth evaluation of P/U reviews which made recommendations about campus planning and budget priorities to the Chancellor. Because of the expanded role of the CERC as a budget prioritization body and as a gauge of progress implementing strategic planning targets, its membership was increased to 19 members representing all Units and constituencies of the college. By enlarging its membership and role, the new CERC process was streamlined to 8 steps, rather than 12 steps removing two redundant steps with separate reviews by the College Council and Academic Senate (See Document #8, [http://hawaii.hawaii.edu/assessment/Program%20Reviews/2007%20Program%20Review/Comprehensive/Comprehensive%20PR%20Flow%20Chart_2007%20Final.doc](http://hawaii.hawaii.edu/assessment/Program%20Reviews/2007%20Program%20Review/Comprehensive/Comprehensive%20PR%20Flow%20Chart_2007%20Final.doc)). Campus Council and Academic Senate participate by reviewing the end product of the process; the biennium budget itself. By making these significant changes to the program review process, the college has forged a stronger commitment to utilizing a shared governance approach in which a re-structured review body and a renovated Strategic Plan, including baseline data and target measures, have been integrated into the process.
CERC now consists of seven *ex officio* members and twelve representatives of governance bodies, programs, units and a student government representative. The expansion of CERC has streamlined the evaluation of the program/unit reviews preparatory to budget formulation. It does so by removing parallel and redundant reviews by the Academic Senate and College Council. The Senate and the Council review and ratify the budget that is developed by the Administrative Team based upon the CERC report of its prioritization of program/unit budget requests. The CERC provides the structural link melding together the program/unit reviews with the Strategic Plan (formerly Academic Development Plan) priorities, as well as learning outcome assessment results and college biennium budget prioritization.

The CERC program/unit review evaluation templates must be completed by each of the 19 committee members as a means of framing the discussion of budget prioritization in context with overall college planning priorities (see Document #9: [http://hawaii.hawaii.edu/assessment/Program%20Reviews/2007%20Program%20Review/General%20Documentation/CERC%20Eval%20Tool%20for%20Instruction%20rev12-21.doc](http://hawaii.hawaii.edu/assessment/Program%20Reviews/2007%20Program%20Review/General%20Documentation/CERC%20Eval%20Tool%20for%20Instruction%20rev12-21.doc)) (see Document #10: [http://hawaii.hawaii.edu/assessment/Program%20Reviews/2007%20Program%20Review/General%20Documentation/Program-Unit%20Review%20Process%20rev%2010-11-07.doc](http://hawaii.hawaii.edu/assessment/Program%20Reviews/2007%20Program%20Review/General%20Documentation/Program-Unit%20Review%20Process%20rev%2010-11-07.doc)). For AY 2007-08 the Academic Development Plan was still the operative planning document and the CERC templates specifically reference planning goals from that document (i.e., Goals A through E). Although the CERC provides structural linkage among program review, strategic plan implementation and budget formation, it does not evaluate and report college progress with Strategic Plan implementation. This is best accomplished by the College Council as part of its functions as it has in the past. With the final ratification of the Strategic Plan Update at the system level, the college will send the 58 page Hawai‘i Community College version of the document to the campus governance committees; Academic Senate, College Council and Student Government for ratification.

Once ratified the HawCC version of the plan will provide multiple HawCC action strategies for each Strategic Plan priority goal. Moreover, baseline data, benchmarks and goals have been identified at both the community college system level as well as at the HawCC level whenever possible. This new structure to the Strategic Plan provides a contextual framework for the annual review of college progress in the implementation of its action strategies as well as the impact that the action strategies may be having on the attainment of Strategic Plan priorities. In many ways it is an improvement over the Academic Development Plan that it is scheduled to update.

### III. Recommendation #2:

Along with a focus on institutional planning, the college should align its departmental-level planning and program review, and student learning outcomes on course, program and institutional levels, with the mission statement, including the mission of the West Campus. (I.A.4)
The West Hawaii Campus does not operate under a separate mission statement, although there is certainly a separate and additional purpose for that site. In addition to its function as the site for selected Hawaii Community College academic programs, it also provides the services of a University Center to area residents. This purpose gives West Hawaii residents access to baccalaureate and master’s programs from other campuses of the University of Hawaii system (see Document #11: http://hawaii.hawaii.edu/ucwh/about.html).

The college has taken steps to assure the structural linkage of planning commitments with the mission statement. The previously cited thorough updating of the former Academic Development Plan now referred to as Strategic Plan places the Mission of Hawaii Community College in the introduction to the document in support of the special mission of the University of Hawaii Community Colleges system also cited in the introduction to the plan (see Document #5: http://hawaii.hawaii.edu/employeeservices/strategicplan.doc). Program review, assessment and budgeting decisions at both institutional as well as departmental levels are expected to be carried out consistent with the Strategic Plan in all its aspects including its dedication to the mission of the system and this college.

The previously cited re-constitution of the CERC with its expanded membership of 19 representatives brings the process of program review; student learning outcomes assessment; strategic planning and budgeting directly under the purview of a more broadly representative campus body. This integrates departmental level representation and input at the advisory level with direct lines of communication to the Chancellor during the key period when the results of program review are integrated into a biennium budget request that conforms to planning requirements and learning outcomes advancement (see Document #8: http://hawaii.hawaii.edu/assessment/Program Reviews/2007 Program Review/Comprehensive/Comprehensive PR Flow Chart_2007 Final.doc). In light of recent discussions with the West Hawaii Campus the College will consider expanding its 19 person CERC to an even 20 members by adding a representative from West Hawaii in addition to the ex officio membership on CERC by the Director of UH Center at West Hawaii. In the first rendition of the re-constituted CERC two representatives of UHCWH were actively involved in the deliberations with one of the West Hawaii members acting as the Assessment Committee designee (see Document #12).

Another development in the improvement of lines of communication between East Hawaii and the West Hawaii campus has been the convening of the Branch Campus Task Force during the summer 2008. The task force is broadly representative of both the East and the West campuses. The notes of the first meeting of this body reflect the fundamental need for such a body with observations such as “…West Hawaii needs greater autonomy, not separate accreditation…” or “...(I)t is difficult for East Hawaii to know the needs of West Hawaii and vice versa; the two have identifiable differences.” The Task Force will formulate targets for the expansion of autonomy in West Hawaii that is compatible with the existing organizational supervisory structure (see Document #13, Branch Campus Notes June 4, 2008).
Efforts to assure better coordination between academic divisions and the needs of the West Hawaii campus have included the allocation of four new tenure-leading faculty positions to that campus. Two of the positions have been in the Nursing and Allied Health Division pursuant to statewide goals of doubling the graduation of Nursing students by 2012. By adding Nursing faculty members the West Hawaii campus will be able to accommodate twice the size of its Nursing classes during AY 2008-09. Moreover, funds for the construction of a Nursing Learning Lab to be placed on the hospital grounds of the Kona Community Hospital have been appropriated and the construction should be executed in time for the beginning of the fall 2009 (see Document #14: Funds for Nursing Lab). However the existing facilities in West Hawaii can accommodate the needs of the expanded nursing enrollment for the time being although it will require scheduling deftness and the possible use of an underused computer lab facility for classroom space. Additionally, the college has successfully recruited individuals to fill the two new faculty positions in the west by inducing a tenured Nursing faculty member from East Hawaii to re-locate and by successfully recruiting a fully qualified new Nursing faculty member to oversee the Learning Lab facility (see Document #15). These additions will join with an existing tenured Nursing faculty member to give this program very strong prospects for operating smoothly and seamlessly between east and west to achieve statewide goals for the expansion of Nursing graduates well ahead of schedule.

Additional tenure-leading faculty positions have been added to the English Division and to the Social Sciences Division respectively in West Hawaii thereby bringing tenure leading positions to three of the four Liberal Arts Divisions in West Hawaii (see Document #16). The other major academic division represented in the west is the Culinary Arts Division where three tenure track positions have been in place and two of the faculty members have already achieved tenure. Only the Math/Science Division is without a tenure leading faculty position although two .5 fte Math professors and one .8 fte Biological Sciences professor have been providing continuity in the connections between east and west in this division. Altogether, these appointments assure more than continuity, they also assure that each of the major instructional divisions represented in West Hawaii will have Board of Regents appointed faculty who may be expected as part of the their service to campus to participate in Divisional Meetings and planning activities.

The University Center at West Hawaii continues to function as a major campus unit, one of eighteen units for program/unit review purposes. Data on the operations of this unit have not been easy to disaggregate from the overall data of the college, however this is a targeted goal of the campus as discussed in the Branch Campus Task Force. As a distinct unit, the University Center has the same access to requesting positions and budgetary support as any of the academic programs and college units through a process of program/unit review and assessment by the CERC where every effort is made to assure that assessment of budget requests takes place within the context of an objective, strategic plan driven and data informed deliberative process.
IV. **Recommendation #3:**

*Building upon current student learning outcomes efforts, the college should create a plan, with timelines for implementation for the complete student learning outcomes framework which includes identifying SLOs at the college, program and course levels, implementing those outcomes across the college, assessing the outcomes, and using the results for improvement. (I.B, II.A.1.c, II.A.1.f)*

As outlined in the 2006 Self-Study, the ad hoc Assessment Committee (AC) continues to be the driving force behind implementing this recommendation. This committee’s work since the Comprehensive Team Visit of October 2006, has continued to be twofold: 1) to refine the Comprehensive Program Review process now in the last year of its first four-year cycle; and 2) to engineer and refine a college-wide Assessment Plan which maps out timelines, assessment strategies, and external review validation for each of its 27 instructional programs which can lead to continuous institutional quality improvement.

Following up on important campus SLO and Assessment benchmarks outlined by the AC at their Feb.7, 2007 meeting (see Document #17: [http://hawaii.hawaii.edu/assessment/Minutes/minutespage.htm](http://hawaii.hawaii.edu/assessment/Minutes/minutespage.htm)), the AC revisited and edited them and added timelines to the benchmarks throughout their spring semester meetings. These recommendations and timelines in collaboration with VCAA Doug Dykstra have become the core infrastructure for a campus Assessment Plan. These timelines were subsequently communicated to Department Heads and the campus community:

1. All programs will have Student Learning Outcomes by fall 2007;
2. Each Program will identify at least 1 learning outcome to be assessed by Fall 2008 and map out a timeline for assessing all program learning outcomes at the rate of one per semester.
3. These assessment plans will be due to the VCAA by April 30, 2008 following a template created by the AC;
4. Assessment of the effectiveness of annual and comprehensive program/unit review process and templates will take place every fall semester.

During the fall semester 2007 the AC established an ad hoc sub-committee including the Chair of the Assessment Committee, Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs, Division Chair of the Social Science Division, Chair of the Academic Senate, Chair of the College Council, Interim Assistant Dean of Liberal Arts & Public Services and Interim Assistant Dean for Career and Technical Education. The mandate for the sub-committee was to establish a template to schedule and to organize the systematic assessment of student learning outcomes by all instructional programs (see Document #18: [http://hawaii.hawaii.edu/assessment/Resources/AssessmentPlanTemplate_3-20-08_3(kdeo).doc](http://hawaii.hawaii.edu/assessment/Resources/AssessmentPlanTemplate_3-20-08_3(kdeo).doc)). The template developed calls for the assessment of one student learning outcome per semester from the fall semester 2008 onward and the college has developed templates that identify learning outcomes at the program level and the course level simultaneously. Although the template ambitiously called for assessment of two SLO per semester after the current academic year, it is very likely that the first meeting of
the AC during the fall semester 2008 will ratify a change to the one per semester rate for AY 2009-10 and thereafter.

The components of the process call for:

- the identification of student artifacts that represent achievement of the learning outcome;
- a plan to gather the artifacts specifying the course/courses that will contribute during the semester targeted for the assessment exercise;
- a rubric to identify the component elements of acceptable and unacceptable levels of achievement (exceptional levels may also be identified, and most programs have done so) to be used by examiners who will evaluate the artifacts;
- a sampling method to randomly select a statistically significant sample of student artifacts;
- a performance rate of acceptable/exceptional artifacts that the program considers to be healthy;
- a roster of at least three evaluators to include one from the program and two outside evaluators preferably from the advisory board membership or from another campus or academic department;
- analysis of the results to be completed by the program faculty.

92% of the credit instructional programs have posted templates acceptable to the VCAA office with schedules included for the permanent ongoing assessment of all student learning outcomes over time (see Document #19: http://hawaii.hawaii.edu/assessment/Resources/Assessment%20Rubrics/AY%202008%20Assessment%20Rubrics.doc).

To summarize, the concept of program review based on the assessment of student learning outcomes has been widely accepted and the first level of identification of SLO at the course and program level have been almost completely accomplished. The plans for assessing SLO at the program level have been completed and during fall 2008, the programs will implement their assessment plans. During the summer 2008 the college sought funding from the Perkins Vocational Education Funding to provide stipends to external examiners for all the Career/Technical Education program SLO evaluation teams. This request has been funded with a $7,000 mini-grant (see Document #20) and the college will provide stipend funding from its own funds for external examiners for the A.A. liberal arts program. Finally, it is the intent of the programs to simultaneously assess course SLO along with the program SLO using all collected artifacts rather than the random sample used at the program level. The adjusted process would employ collegial “quality review” circles instead of the external examiners being used for program SLO to generate dialog at the level of the professors teaching the courses. This plan will require additional AC discussion to determine the logistics of such a process.

**Course Level:**
According to the 2007-08 Annual Report submitted to ACCJC on May 16, 2008, 89% of all courses (571/641) have defined student learning outcomes. The remaining 11% mostly includes courses which have not been taught for an extended period of time and will be
considered for deletion this academic year as well as those primarily taught by adjunct faculty. (Thirty-seven per cent of all courses have identified appropriate assessment methodologies; and 13% of all courses have completed assessing their results (see Document #21: ACCJC Annual Report, 2007-08)

Program Level:
The college has made significant progress in instituting Student Learning Outcomes at the program level with 100% of programs reporting that they have identified expected student learning outcomes (see Document #21: http://hawaii.hawaii.edu/accreditation/sloupdate.doc) All instructional programs have also completed a program map which maps all courses and learning experiences required to complete their certificate(s)/degree(s) to expected student learning outcomes.

Ninety-two per cent of credit instructional programs have submitted an Assessment Plan which maps out strategies and a timeline for assessing all their Program level SLOs at the rate of one SLO assessed per semester. These are posted on the college Assessment website (see Document #19: http://hawaii.hawaii.edu/assessment/Resources/Assessment%20Rubrics/AY%202008%20Assessment%20Rubrics.doc).

Since the release of the Assessment Plan prototype for instructional programs in Spring 2008, the Units have discussed how best to adapt the prototype to assessing their SLO. Student Services has completed student learning outcomes which will be assessed by their nine subunits: Information Center; Admissions and Registration; Records and Data Management; Financial Aid; Counseling and Support Services; Career Center; Ha`awi Kokua (students with disabilities); Student Life; and Job Placement. (see Document #22). To date, assessment strategies for each sub-unit are being discussed and Student Services has already surveyed students to allow self-assessment of their accomplishment of the SLO’s. (see Document #23).

Instructional Support Units such as The Learning Center (TLC), the Hale Kea Advancement and Testing Center (HKATC) and the Library have also identified Student Learning Outcomes. TLC/HKATC has used both faculty and student satisfaction surveys to assess their SLOs and based on these the TLC has extended hours; added services; expanded staff training to include online services including a new online tutor application and training process.

The Office of Continuing Education and Training (OCET) has a multi-level approach to its SLO assessment strategy reflecting the complexity of its many services. The short-term non-credit courses and workshops utilize audience evaluations of the experience as they have for years. The satisfaction survey is the prime indicator of student satisfaction with the experience and the sine qua non to the continuation of the course/workshop offering. Most of the public classes are short-term and non-credit. The majority of classes fall into the categories of workforce training and personal interests. Some of the workforce training classes are customized for particular businesses/industries and designed specifically for their needs.
Because these classes are generally for business application or for personal interests and because most of these classes are very short term, the assessment tool that is used is a student evaluation form. This form rates the students’ responses about the value of the course and information that they receive, the quality of the instructor/instruction they receive, and the expectations of this course based on the course description. Open-ended responses are also solicited about what students like about the course, improvements that they would recommend, and other kinds of courses they are interested in attending. These evaluations provide immediate feedback about customer satisfaction and are the basis for improving course content, outcomes, and instruction/instructors (see Document #24: Non-credit course evaluation summary).

Some credit classes are offered as non-credit offerings as well. Since these classes are developed through the credit programs, the assessment of these courses is tied in with the program assessment plans. PACE is one such program in which a credit class is broken down into smaller non-credit workshops. These non-credit workshops can be converted into credit through the completion of a capstone unit. These non-credit workshops follow the same credit course requirements and assessment strategies and are therefore linked to the program’s assessment plan (see Document #25: Credit classes offered as Non-credit Workshops convertible to credit).

Some non-credit offerings are certification programs which are regulated by outside agencies. One such program is the Certified Nurse’s Aide which is regulated by the State Department of Human Services. Each state CNA program is required to have instructors, curriculum, and instructional and clinical sites approved by the state regulatory agency. Any changes to the curriculum or rules, regulations, or procedures are directed by the regulatory agency and the CNA testing is done by authorized organizations. Records are also kept in compliance with the requirements of the regulatory agencies (see Document #26: Non-credit Certification programs).

Some OCET classes require more extensive assessment strategies such as the college’s two-week summer exploration classes. A variety of assessment tools are employed including pre-post self evaluations, portfolios, hands on activities, and final oral class presentations. Student Learning Outcomes and measurable goals and outcomes are determined before the classes begin (see Document #27: Summer Exploration Assessment).

The Apprenticeship Program has uniquely determined learning outcomes through independently established Apprenticeship Standards that are also governed by Rules and Regulations and registered with the State Department of Labor and Industrial Relations (DLIR). Apprenticeships are based on a system of training in which a person learns through on-the-job experience and related classroom instruction. Each established apprenticeship program is aligned with a certain trade or craft-skill and either sponsored by labor unions or employer organizations. These programs are registered with the DLIR, the regulatory agency responsible for ensuring that each program operates in compliance with established standards that safeguard the welfare of apprentices. By law, the
community college division of the University of Hawaii is assigned the responsibility of coordinating the related classroom instruction aspect of such apprenticeship programs (see Document #28: Apprenticeship Standards)

Finally, the Intensive English Program provides the closest model to the instructional credit programs and it will use a method of SLO assessment following the model established for those programs (see Document #29 Intensive English Program SLO Assessment Plan).

**College Level:**
The identification of college level SLO has proven the most challenging phase for the college. Since the identification of the new mission/vision and imperative statements that occurred in 2006, campus conversations through the Assessment Committee have considered shaping college SLO around the 8 imperatives. Another conversation has involved considering General Education SLO as a basis for college SLOs (see Document #30 4/17/08 AC Minutes: http://hawaii.hawaii.edu/assessment/Minutes/minutespage.htm). Recently, discussion around the adoption of Student Services SLO as college SLO has emerged. It is the intent of the college to structure a campus-wide discussion in fall 2008 similar to the mission/vision/imperative activity to align course, program, and college SLO.

V. **Recommendation #4:**

*Academic planning should include dialogue on classes offered, library and student services and scheduling decisions should include all affected areas or locations (centers) before being implemented. (II.B.1.a, b)*

Academic planning for class schedules is carried out by Division Chairs (one of whom, the Culinary Arts and Hospitality/Tourism Chair, is located in West Hawaii) who begin the planning process one-year in advance to assure the availability of facilities for the video-conference and HITS courses to be offered. Moreover, planning for course offerings in West Hawaii has followed a course schedule that outlines projected course offerings five semesters in advance in the Associate of Arts program. This schedule is printed in the Registration Booklet made available to students and it provides advance notification to West Hawaii students of guaranteed course offerings in an A.A. program that constitutes the single largest segment of the student body at the college (See Document #31).

The Director at UHCWH is the voice for scheduling for West Hawaii, as well as acting as the chair for the previously cited Branch Campus Task Force. Possible steps to improve the scheduling autonomy of West Hawaii are under consideration pursuant to the charge given to the Branch Campus Task Force. In fulfillment of its University Center purpose, West Hawaii scheduling priorities in some ways take precedence over the scheduling needs of the community college programs insofar as access to the HITS (Hawaii
Interactive Television System) rooms is concerned. HITS has been the primary distance education technology used by the University Center courses and programs. Because of space considerations in West Hawaii the HITS rooms have doubled up with the videoconferencing technology that is primarily used by the community college programs. Heretofore, HITS courses have been exclusively evening hour course offerings after 4 p.m. and on weekends. Recently the University Centers have expanded the hours of operation to include time periods from 2 pm onward and the community college programs have been obliged to adjust to these scheduling changes. This obligation adheres to the University Center requirements and is not subject to discussion. Finally, HawCC course scheduling in concert with departmental/divisional planning is likely to see new voices contributing to the dialogue in West Hawaii by virtue of the recent 33% increase in the number of Board of Regents appointed faculty members in the West.

The organizational structure of West Hawaii reflects the central role played by the Director as the spokesperson for Student Services and Academic Support operations. Faculty and Staff positions in these two areas report directly to the Director (see Document #32). However the Dean of Student Services and the Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs both have included West Hawaii faculty from these two areas in their respective staff meetings to facilitate direct communication with Academic Support and Student Services faculty members in East Hawaii during staff meetings. For matters requiring a more direct line to the Chancellor the UHCWH Director can take those messages from the direct reports of Student Services and/or Academic Support personnel in the west to the Administrative Staff meetings.

Finally, the college operates within a system that is funded on a biennial basis and the program review process operates annually. Under this system a program or a unit hoping to situate its requests in the biennium budget must complete a comprehensive program review in the year prior to the formulation of the biennium budget requests. The system at HawCC is sufficiently flexible to allow any of the programs or units to move forward (never backward) in the program/unit review schedule to accommodate urgent needs requiring biennium budgetary support (see Document #33: http://hawaii.hawaii.edu/assessment/Program%20Reviews/2007%20Program%20Review/General%20Documentation/Program-Unit%20Review%20Schedule%20rev%2010-16-07.xls). The nexus between program review/learning outcomes assessment, budget requests & broad based campus assessment of the consistency of budget requests with the strategic planning document is continually being refined, and it has made significant progress in the past 18 months. The campus hopes that any of the program/units will participate in the review process during a biennium budget year to address the needs that they have. The next one will be coming up again during the fall semester 2009…always in the odd numbered years.

This in no way means that needs can not be addressed in the interim prior to the biennium budget year because they have been addressed by using carry over and/or grant funds. For instance, a new flat screen computer lab has been provided to the West in 2006, this was the first of the replacement computer labs which was purchased by the college before the campus had been allocated biennium funds in July 2007 for ongoing computer and
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technology replacement; faculty positions have been added to West Hawaii during the summer 2008 as previously cited; Rural Development Program funding has been secured to improve videoconferencing and HITS technology to high definition standards for the entire college during the 2008-09 academic year. Finally, the Branch Campus Task Force shows promise as a forum for broadening the base of the discussion and setting targets for improving the sense of engagement by faculty and staff on issues of scheduling, student services and academic support.

**Recommendation #5:**

The college update their transition plan for facilities maintenance and improvement for the East campus at Hawaii CC and the leased facilities at West Hawaii and collaborate with the U of H system to secures funding for this plan so the students attending Hawaii CC in the next 5-10 years can be adequately served with appropriate facilities while the new campus is under construction. (II.B.1.a,b.)

Planning for a permanent campus site in West Hawaii dates back to before West Hawaii was a branch of the community college. In 1988 the state legislature called upon the University of Hawaii at Hilo to complete a needs assessment. In 1991, the Board of Regents authorized the administration to enter into negotiations for approximately 500 acres identified as the Kalaoa site in Kona. In 1993, the legislature appropriated $300,000 for a Long Range Development Plan for facilities in West Hawaii. This plan was completed in 1996 and followed by a 1997-99 biennium appropriation of $730,000 for plans and design of a permanent new facility to be located at Kalaoa.

Planning has gone through three separate iterations since 1999 without coming to fruition for sundry reasons. The Hawaii State Legislature appropriated $18.2 million for the fiscal biennium 2005-2007 for planning and infrastructure for new campuses in both East and West Hawaii. In 2005, the University of Hawaii issued a privatization RFP to build an east campus in Hilo and a west campus in Kona and to commercially develop remaining UH designated land at both sites. The UH Board of Regents selected Hawaii Campus Developers, LLC for exclusive negotiations and signed a contract, but the appropriated planning funds were not fully released.

In 2006, Palamanui Development submitted a re-zoning application to the Hawaii County Council agreeing to construct infrastructure and a $5 million classroom/office building for the West Campus on state land at the Kalaoa site. The Governor subsequently released $2 million for planning and design of the West Hawaii campus at the site identified in 1991. The balance of the funds ($16.2 million) would have lapsed had the UH not sought legislative re-authorization of the planning funds until 2011. However, only $11.2 million was re-appropriated for this purpose. Of that amount $3 million may be earmarked to provide connecting roads and infrastructure to the campus site now planned to include a total of four buildings in West Hawaii. In 2008 and in conjunction with its earlier privatization solicitation, UH initiated a contract with Hawaii Campus
Developers LLC to update educational specifications, the Long Range Development Plan and the design of the first three buildings.

Hawaii Campus Developers has produced a project schedule timeline for the period from July 31, 2008 to the same date in 2009 that sets target dates for:

- educational specifications;
- long range development planning;
- environmental impact statement;
- design of a Health Services Building, a Library/Learning Resource Center Building, and two Classroom Buildings;
- completion of all Governmental Entitlements for a land footprint of up to 125 acres on the identified site (see Document #34: Sheldon Zane document pdf).

All of the foregoing assumes that the executive branch will release at least the $3 million dollars of the re-authorized $11.2 million, as well as turn over entitlement to the land footprint needed for the four buildings at this time. In the interim the college continues to lease approximately 13,000 square feet in Kealakekua for its Community College/University Center programs where major maintenance and repair is the responsibility of four different landlords. Security, as well as custodial maintenance continues as the responsibility of the college at the leased site.

Given the diminishment of planning and infrastructure funds over time ($18.2 million has become $8.2 million that may or may not be released), prospects of establishing a new east side campus on property adjacent to Komohana Avenue as initially desired have evaporated. If the $8.2 million is released planning can proceed for the eventual exchange of all HawCC programs currently at the UH Hilo Upper Campus with the exception of the four Applied Technical Education Programs that occupy four shops at the Upper Campus (Diesel, Auto Body, Automotive Technology, and Machine, Welding, Industrial Mechanics). The plan would call for the eventual exchange of all UHH programs located at the lower Manono Campus to the Upper Campus and vice versa.

If released, approximately $2 million of the $8.2 million would be used for a LRDP to plan and design facilities on the Manono Campus sufficient to accommodate 3,000 fte students. The remaining $6.2 million would be used to renovate the Hale Aloha building on the Manono Campus currently occupied by UH Hilo programs. These funds would be used to remodel the inside of the building to accommodate classrooms, learning lab space and offices. The LRDP would phase the planning of relocation, renovations and new construction for the other college programs and provide the foundation for seeking the necessary funding.

HawCC now has complete responsibility for the maintenance and upkeep of all facilities on the Manono Campus including both UH Hilo and HawCC programs currently occupying the campus. Moreover, HawCC has maintenance and upkeep responsibilities for all four shops amounting to 56,350 sq. ft. on the Upper Campus, although the land footprint for these structures continues to be held by UH Hilo. A staff of 19 positions has been allocated to HawCC to carry out these responsibilities. These positions have been
filled to provide for eleven janitors, four grounds crew, two building maintenance, one clerical and one supervisory Auxiliary Services Officer (see Document #35).

Additionally Security officers provide 24-7 coverage for the Manono Campus with up to two officers at peak times.

A repair and maintenance schedule for the existing campus at the Manono site has been coordinated by the UHCC system. Allocations of more than $1.5 million dollars have been made through fiscal year 2008. Funding requests for over $25.5 million have been scheduled for the period through the fiscal year 2015. these planned expenditures are specific to projects through the fiscal year 2012, and specific to categories of expenditures for the remaining period through the fiscal year 2015 (see Document #36).

Recommendation #6:

The college should memorialize governance practices by establishing, publishing, and implementing a comprehensive written policy that defines and delineates the specific roles of faculty, staff, administration, and students in the college’s decision-making processes. In order to ensure the integrity and effectiveness of the College’s governance and decision-making processes, roles of governance groups, such as College Council and Academic Senate, should be regularly evaluated and results communicated with college constituent groups. (IV.A.2, IV.A.5)

The college has three major governance bodies to include Academic Senate, College Council and Associated Students of Hawaii Community College each of which is guided by approved charters/by-laws. Until AY 2007-08 the College Council had no official charter and it had existed as a forum appointed by the Chancellor as a source of feedback from the campus constituencies including APT, Clerical, Student and Faculty representation. With the approval of a Charter in May 2008 forwarded to the Chancellor, the Council has taken on a formal function as an advisory body to the Chancellor concerning issues of college-wide concern (see Document #37).

The Academic Senate has long operated under a charter that identifies it as a recommending and governing body with its “…primary purpose to ensure academic integrity.” The Senate membership consists of all instructional and non-instructional faculty, and the Senate Chair is in regular communication with the Chancellor. Moreover the Chancellor or appropriate administrator may be requested to respond in writing to Senate resolutions or to communicate same to the Vice President for Community Colleges. Administrative decisions contrary to Senate recommendations are expected to provide a written rationale to the Academic Senate for the decision (see Document #38: http://www.hawcc.hawaii.edu/senate/charter.htm).

The Associated Students of Hawaii Community College has re-structured its bylaws to create two chartered student organizations sanctioned by the Board of Regents. The Associated Students of Hawaii Community College (ASUH-HawCC) will be the student governance organization. The Hawaii Community College Association for Student
Activities (HawCC-AFSA) will focus on cultural and social activities. The new bylaws for ASUH-HawCC (student government) were ratified at the end of the Spring 2008 semester. The bylaws for HawCC-AFSA are being finalized for ratification early in the Fall 2008 semester (see Document #39).

The respective charters/bylaws of each of the three bodies are sufficient to identify responsibilities that may overlap, however there is clearly a representational mandate for each body that assures clarity of function. Each of the bodies is recommending in nature with the Academic Senate clearly acting as the chief formal voice of the faculty vis a vis college and system level administrative officials. The interactive communications with administrative officials is far more formally defined by the Academic Senate charter compared to either of the other two representative bodies. This in no way reflects a hierarchy among the bodies, and the statement on governance participation at the college seeks to emphasize the tripartite sources of advisory input that the Chancellor seeks from the campus.

Hawaii Community College has had a policy on campus governance since 1996 (see Document #40) which is now in the process of revision to take into account the development of a separate student government for the community college which previously shared the student government structure with the neighboring UH Hilo campus. Although some sharing of student activities fees continues, the two institutions have developed separate student government structures. A Task Force of Detail is producing a draft of a policy on campus governance based upon the existing policy Haw 3.301 which had been misleadingly titled “College Committee Structure.” When completed, the policy will include the mandate for annual evaluative surveys of the constituencies of the Senate and Council including a proposed model of the survey instruments as an appendix to expedite amendments to the survey instrument as events may require. The policy statement is to be reviewed by the existing campus recommending bodies before publication as part of the completely updated HawCC Policy Manual. The target for the update on the governance policy is the end of the fall 2008 semester.