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SECTION I

Background

In an action letter dated June 28, 2005, the Accrediting Commission for Community and Junior Colleges (ACCJC) of the Western Association of Schools and Colleges issued a formal Warning and requested Hawai‘i Community College (HawCC) to submit a Progress Report by October 15, 2005. The concern expressed by the Commission was entitled Program Review and it was elucidated as follows:

Hawai‘i Community College needs to provide evidence that demonstrates that a conscious effort to improve student learning is occurring at the institution and that the college organizes its key processes and allocates its resources to support student learning. Furthermore, the institution needs to demonstrate its effectiveness by providing evidence of the achievement of student learning outcomes and evidence of institution and program performance through ongoing and systematic evaluation and planning and improvement (1996 Standards III.A. all, III.B. all, III.C.all).
Additionally Hawai‘i Community College has worked collaboratively within the University of Hawai‘i Community College System to respond to three recommendations related to the reorganization of the community college system as it impacts each of the seven College’s abilities to meet accreditation standards.

See UHCC System responses to Recommendations 2, 6 & 7 attached to the end of this report.

**Statement on Report Preparation**

**Background:**

Upon receipt of the Commission’s June 2005 action letter, Chancellor Rockne Freitas informed the campus community via mass e-mail about the Commission’s decisions. The message to the campus carefully differentiated between the praise meted out to the College by the ACCJC visitors (e.g., “…Hawai‘i Community College has made an excellent and substantial start to implementing an ongoing process for college assessment of institutional effectiveness.”) and the constructive challenge posed by the Commission’s formal action to issue a Warning. The Chancellor’s message provided the opportunity to emphasize the importance of follow-through on an “excellent and substantial start” to produce finished program and unit reviews that present evidence of the achievement of intended (SLO) student learning outcomes (*appendix #2*). The preparation of the Progress Report was assigned to the Accreditation Liaison Officer (ALO), Dr. Trina Nahm-Mijo working in conjunction with Vice-Chancellor for Academic Affairs, Douglas Dykstra.

**Process of Report Preparation:**

The timing of the Commission’s action letter dated June 28 had an impact upon the preparation of the Progress Report. Since faculty on 9-month contracts were not present for active duty the College’s focus was initially upon making progress with the six non-instructional units due to present their unit review documents on November 14, 2005. The records of the Institutional Researcher (IR), Shawn Flood provide one primary source for reconstruction of the College’s progress with these reviews during the summer months. Additionally, a task force held multiple meetings through the summer months to complete a unit review for the crisis-beset Technology Support Services to contribute another primary source of information for this progress report. With the return of the instructional faculty to on-duty status in mid-August the division and department chairs were tasked with the responsibility to deploy efforts to identify and define SLO while simultaneously strategizing with their faculty colleagues on assessment strategies. Consequently the reports of division and department chairs have provided other primary sources for the preparation of this report. Finally, the chair of the Assessment Committee working in conjunction with the chairs of the Academic Senate and the College Council to coordinate the consideration of program/unit reviews by campus governance bodies provides evidence of progress.
Hawai‘i Community College Progress Report, 10/15/05

The Vice-Chancellor for Academic Affairs has been the chief writer of this Progress Report with substantial editorial assistance from the Accreditation Liaison Officer. The portion of the report that addresses system reorganization and its impact upon individual campuses has been provided by the Office of the Interim Vice President for Community Colleges and has been collectively reviewed by the Chancellors and their administrative teams before being distributed as an integral part of the individual campus reports.

Review and Approval of Report:

Prior to submittal to the Commission by October 15, 2005, the Progress Report in its entirety had to be rendered in draft form by September 22, 2005 to facilitate general campus review by providing the document as an attachment to a mass e-mail to the faculty/staff. The report has been reviewed and approved by the College Council and the Faculty Senate Executive Committee respectively. Input from this review process was incorporated into the final report which was submitted on September 26th to the University of Hawai‘i President for review by the Board of Regents at the October 21st, 2005 BOR meeting.

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

SECTION II

Response to the Request of the Commission in the Action Letter:

The Recommendation:

None.

The Commission’s Concern:

Program Review:

Hawai‘i Community College needs to provide evidence that demonstrates that a conscious effort to improve student learning is occurring at the institution and that the college organizes its key processes and allocates its resources to support student learning. Furthermore, the institution needs to demonstrate its effectiveness by providing evidence of the achievement of student learning outcomes and evidence of institution and program performance through ongoing and systematic evaluation and planning and improvement (1996 Standards III.A. all, III.B. all, III.C.all)

ACCJC Action Letter dated 06/28/05

Action Taken on the Concern:
The Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs cooperated during the spring semester and into the summer months with instructional services administrative colleagues system-wide to agree upon an instructional program review template of data elements to be used commonly across the UHCC system. The template of 27 items that the Deans agreed upon requires a degree of development work before full implementation is possible. Consequently the College has taken thirteen of the student achievement data elements from this template that are readily accessible as the core of data trends that instructional programs will track over a three-year period in the program reviews that are submitted at HawCC during the current ’05 fall semester (appendix #3).

Institutional Research Office Contributions:

The Institutional Researcher (IR) working together with the campus’ student information services technical support personnel have developed a data inquiry routine to draw the required 13 data elements from the student information system. They are completing the data validation for the routine as this report is being written, and the target date for supplying the instructional programs with these thirteen data elements is September 30th. Instructional programs will have more than a month to analyze the data and incorporate this feature into their program reviews which are due on the second Monday in November as the standard due date at the College for program/unit reviews. Admittedly, student achievement data by itself does not constitute a student learning outcome however, by combining this with a variety of other SLO artifacts the College will be able to create a clear picture of student learning.

One of the most important tools for enabling SLO development on the HawCC campus has been the website designed by the IR for the Assessment Committee. The link for the Assessment website is conveniently found directly on the Hawai‘i Community College main webpage so that it is easy to find. It has a very professional appearance, is easy to navigate, and is THE go-to place for documentation, the schedule of meetings, meeting minutes, membership information, upcoming program/unit review documentation, links to both the Accreditation website and the ACCJC, as well as providing an information packed link to resources (see http://www.hawcc.hawaii.edu/assessment/).

The “Resources” page on the Assessment website is the crown jewel for information relating to assessment of SLO. Starting with the “Survey Library” the page provides a collection of all of the CCSSE student and faculty surveys, the Graduate and Leaver Survey for HawCC, the results of our annual Factory/Staff/Administrators Survey, articles on how to design a survey, and finally a link to a free on-line survey tool called “Zoomerang.”

The Resources page has a link to the “Program Map Template”, which was leveraged with permission from Ruth Stiehl’s Outcomes Primer, which is largely centered on development of student learning outcomes. This template is part of the website so that all College programs have a common look and feel when the maps are posted to the website. Moreover, the creation of program maps help faculty to visually represent the relationship of curricula to one another and
to program exit expectations. Program maps make an excellent student advising tool and may be deployed to academic counselors as well as adjunct faculty.

The website also has a variety of resources to help faculty and staff in their pursuit of program review and accreditation data such as links to: the UH Institutional Research Office, the UH Measuring our Progress Report, the Fact Book, links to a multitude of Research websites, IPED, NCES, as well as links to the University of Hawai‘i’s Map’s (Management and Planning Support) Reports. (The Institutional Researcher has also hard copied and cataloged these reports and has made them available through his office for added convenience).

Other sources of documentation that have been created in support of student learning outcomes include:

- Hawai‘i Community College Program Review Process
- Program Review Schedule (for both instructional and unit reviews)
- Hawai‘i Community College Program Review Template (from DOI)
- SLO Assessment Templates (for both program and course level)

To assure that the campus always has a copy of the most current version of the above documentation the IR has assumed “ownership” of each. This means that only one person is doing the updates and there is always the most current version posted on the website. This approach eliminates the guessing as to who has the latest copy. This is an example of one of the many process improvement ideas the campus has come up with in support of this important work.

The IR has recognized the need to provide a single place to find the information that is currently available. One of the first deliverables he created for HawCC faculty and staff was a presentation on “Data Resources”. He made this presentation at the May 3rd Division Chair meeting and had it posted to the website as well. The presentation provided information on Banner for the student registration system, IRO/MAPS Reports, UH Budget Office, CCSSE, and STAR, which is a tool designed to help faculty and staff with advising and counseling. This presentation has also been published to the HawCC website for easy access.

The Institutional Researcher recently attended a two-day workshop on O‘ahu, at Honolulu Community College on Fractal Learning and the Knowledge Survey. He has posted his summary presentation made to the Assessment Committee on the website along with links to additional resources. Through the summary he identified numerous tools and techniques that HawCC faculty and staff could use in the classroom for the development of student learning outcomes.

Additionally, throughout the Summer HawCC has been busy meeting with non-instructional Unit staff members to assure progress during the months when instructional faculty is by contract off duty. The IR requested the six units scheduled for November due dates to schedule meetings called, “Unit Review Preparedness Meetings,” and the purpose of holding these meetings was to
help the units begin to think in terms of defining the measures that they would need in order to perform their unit reviews.

The IR requested that each unit first meet with their staff members and create a mission statement before the first Unit Review Preparedness Meeting. The units that had completed their mission statements were tracked on the Program/Unit Review Schedule along with their meeting dates. Over the course of the Summer the IR held meetings with 11 of 13 units that were notified, and the Admissions and Records unit met on four different occasions. These meetings were critical in helping our units understand the review process, the components of the program/unit review template, the definition of demand and efficiency measures, and to just allow an open, collaborative forum to ask questions. Each unit was asked to visualize its mission in relation to its customers as a step toward defining the demand and efficiency measures of effective and efficient service to customers. Throughout the course of these meetings we also helped our units to understand how their services help to support student learning outcomes in their own sometimes indirect way.

**Technology Support Services Task Force:**

On a much larger scale, a task force of more than a dozen faculty, staff and administrators appointed by the College Council produced the fundaments of a unit review for the Technology Support Services at the College. By November 14, this task force will have completed the unit review for this severely challenged service group. The task force divided into three sub-committees on mission/scope of services, demand/efficiency measures and staffing/facilities needs. In addition to understaffing and overwork, the problem bedeviling technology support services is to be found in the unclear lines of responsibility.

The task force recommended a binary structure to the department to consist of Media Services and Computer Services with interstitial services and responsibilities shared by these two wings. Additionally, the task force advised the campus to place a Director of Technology Support Services at the executive/managerial level to reflect the relationship of the department to the core mission and cornerstone values of HawCC. The Director of Technology Support Services would directly report to the Chancellor and bear responsibility for academic and administrative computing, as well as all forms of media services/distance education technologies and DE training. The Director would be supported by three direct reports serving as Coordinators of Media Services and Information Technology Services respectively, as well as an Education Specialist for the interstitial services (**appendix #4**).

The task force will complete a unit review report for the disparate elements of Technology Support Services as it is currently composed. This will require reform of current practices since the personnel in these areas have been so understaffed that data collection has been a non-existent luxury item jettisoned during triage to assure that necessary work is completed. In the short term, the Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs (the current supervisory official) is taking steps to provide additional staffing along with adjustments to the work order request process to assure that rudimentary data collection will occur. In the longer term, the task force is on track
to strongly recommend a major biennium budget request to produce the funding and staffing necessary to resolve the challenges confronting Technology Support Services.

Learner Centered Instructional Program Practices:

A particularly strong example of SLO identification at program and course level has been set by the Business Education and Technology Division. The development and assessment of SLO within the Business Education and Technology Division is developing at a fast pace. The four programs that comprise the Division have adopted program level outcomes and agreed to common division level outcomes. For fall semester 2005, 19 (40%) of the 48 courses offered by the division had course level outcomes listed on syllabi. Many more courses listed program and/or division SLO. Eight (8) of the 19 course level outcomes were articulated with the UH community college system (appendix #5).

The division supports the use of capstone projects and practicum as avenues for promoting and assessing student learning. Curriculum was recently revised to include two practicum for the Accounting Program and on-the-job-training for the Business Technology (OAT) Program. The IT Program requires a culminating activity and the Marketing Program requires substantial on-the-job training. Selective courses offered within the division prepare students for external certifications and another uses a nationally recognized examination.

The current focus of the division’s assessment plan is assessing SLO in courses required by multiple programs and developing common assessment tools for oral/written presentations, computer applications, and case studies. Faculty members receive instruction in the use of grading rubrics and other assessment techniques at regularly scheduled division meetings. Upcoming projects for 2005-2006 include a pilot ePortfolio project and an online program review process which has been successfully implemented in other ACCJC accredited colleges. These two projects are funded by a Perkins mini-grant.

The Food Service A.A.S. program received accreditation from the American Culinary Federation (ACF) in July of this year. The three-year accreditation for both the Hilo and the Kona campuses places the program together with 173 other community colleges nationwide. The program has developed separate Mission, Vision and Culture statements that provide strong examples of the power of shared goals and values as a motivating force for faculty, staff and students in a program. Every course in the program is provided a detailed check list of intended learning outcomes and the constituent skills, concepts and issues to those outcomes. Assessment tasks and strategies are also provided as part of the check off lists (appendix #6).

Other programs that have undergone national accreditation review are particularly well situated to provide examples of program SLO. The A.S. Nursing Degree Program has held accreditation from the National League for Nursing Accrediting Commission since 1998, renewed for eight years in 2003. Nursing’s program SLO are buttressed by extensive work in identifying course competencies and unit objectives in accord with national accrediting standards (appendix #7). Moreover, the Nursing and Allied Health Division has completed program maps for all three of
its programs. The Intensive English Program has also recently received accreditation from the Commission on English Language Program Accreditation. Finally, the Early Childhood Education program is a candidate for national accreditation and will be submitting its program review in November.

The English Department provides another significant example to the campus through its use of departmental final examinations in all developmental writing courses for both native and non-native speakers: English 20W (College Writing & Grammar), English 22 (Introduction to Expository Writing), ESL 11 (Basic Grammar & Writing), ESL 13 (Grammar & Writing), and ESL 15 (Introduction to Expository Writing for ESL Students). Sample final exams from English 20W and English 22 from Spring 2005 may be found attached (appendix #8).

These exams are carefully constructed by English faculty members working together. Students have a choice of writing topics, selected to match modes of development taught in each course. Faculty members working as a group also set procedures and policies for the final exams which are graded in accord with standardized rubrics. The current procedures and policies, revised in Spring 2003, may also be found attached (appendix #9). Departmental faculty follow the grading criteria collectively developed for each course. Writing instructors use these criteria throughout each course so that students are completely familiar with the level of writing skills they are expected to achieve.

Writing faculty members and adjunct faculty grade the exams in a group grading session. They start each grading session by grade-norming at least one sample paper to remind all the readers of the criteria. Thereafter they read the exams without knowing the name of the student or teacher (the Registrar prepares a master list of students enrolled in each course, and faculty identify exams by number from this list). As the reading progresses, faculty members discuss areas of possible disagreement so that they are applying the same criteria. They validate these exams by determining whether the writing topics do in fact test the skills learned in each course. They also monitor the progress of students as they move to the next level.

The Tropical Forestry A.S. (TEAM) program completed a program review following Board of Regents (BOR) guidelines to convert its provisional program to permanent status. Since the document had to be finished during the summer months the menu of 13 data elements was not yet ready for implementation and TEAM followed BOR guidelines which are somewhat dated. Curricula for the program had been developed as part of a formal DACUM (developing a curriculum) process that incorporated substantial input from one of the most extensively representative Advisory Boards to be found on the HawCC campus. As a result, the TEAM faculty coordinator was able to incorporate a very detailed program map and well conceived program SLO along with examples of the capstone achievement of students to demonstrate learning outcomes as part of the program review (appendix #10). TEAM will also complete a program review utilizing the 13 data elements to be provided by the IR as of September 30.

The College has a particularly fascinating A.A.S. degree with three different concentrations in Hawaiian Lifestyles. This provisional program is currently completing its review preparatory to
The Hawaiian Studies Program has developed the Program SLO, which focuses on: 1) Leadership in the Local and Broader Community, 2) Thinking Creatively through a Critical Process, 3) Respecting Life Systems 4) Becoming a Practitioner. This is the first semester we have used the Program SLO. This is followed by the course SLO which were developed at the onset of this semester for many classes to coordinate with the Program SLO. SLO will be completed and in place by the Spring of 2006 semester for all classes.

The Math/Sciences Department is holding regular meetings to deploy SLO collectively developed for both developmental and baccalaureate level general education courses offered by the department. Nine of the more frequently taught departmental courses in both Math and Sciences have drafts currently before the MS Department for finalization.

The Construction Programs including carpentry, electricity, agriculture and AEC technology all have completed program maps and program SLO are completed for carpentry and in progress for the other programs. The Model Home provides a particularly prominent capstone project that enables the department to demonstrate learning outcomes for program students in all four programs. HawCC has become quite prominently recognized for its longstanding commitment to this Model Home project for almost four decades. Finally, among the Transportation programs, only the Diesel Mechanics program has completed program SLO, however the Electronics program is transitioning from A.A.S. to an A.S. degree program for which it will be undergoing a DACUM process with a new advisory board.

Finally, the Social Science Department has completed program SLO for two out of five programs and is in process with a third program. Two of the programs from this department will be submitting program reviews for the November 2005 due date consequently work is progressing rapidly on SLO at the course level. The Early Childhood Education (ECE) program is one of the programs about to submit its program review and it is a candidate for national accreditation. As such ECE has completed strategies for assessment of SLO achievement among its students.

Unit Review Exemplary Practices:

The Apprenticeship Unit is producing exemplary work as its coordinator prepares for a November submittal date for the unit review. The extensive program map demonstrates the entry expectations, relationship of the program to unions and regulatory agencies, as well as providing a visual representation of the many features of the program that are either active or inactive at the College. Finally, a well conceived listing of intended learning outcomes is
provided within five general categories. The coordinator has taken this method of mapping and SLO identification to the Apprenticeship and Training Coordinators Association of Hawai‘i (ATCAH) with positive and supportive results (appendix #11).

The Admissions and Records coordinator was asked to envision the customers served by her unit as a first step to identifying the data needed to illustrate the unit’s efficiency. She has done an exemplary job of identifying nineteen demand and efficiency measures, providing guidelines to measure the activity, clues as to the sources for finding the data and an advisory on the availability of three years of trend data for the items. Seven of the 19 items can currently provide three years of trend data, and this provides a strong foundation for the first effort to inform a unit review by reference to a data base. It also represents one of the better exercises in visualizing customer service obligations by a unit coordinator (appendix #12).

The University of Hawai‘i Center at West Hawai‘i (UHCWH) located on the west side of the Big Island is a 2.5 hour drive from the Hilo Campus. A Center is both the local outreach site of Hawai‘i Community College and a point of access that brokers the bachelors, masters, and graduate certificates that are offered from UH Manoa, UH West O‘ahu, and UH Hilo via distance education, however UHCWH reports to the Chancellor of Hawai‘i Community College. Centers were established by Board of Regents action and are unique to Hawai‘i Community College, Maui Community College, and Kauai Community College.

In June of 2005 the director/staff of the Center met with the Institutional Researcher and the VC of Academic Affairs to review the data elements and the requirements for the unit review. A unit/program map of the UH Center West Hawai‘i was prepared in draft form and is now in the final review stages. It will be presented to the staff for their concurrence and approval. The unit review date was clarified and the review is not officially due until November 2006; however, given the momentum, the work underway on the review continues as planned.

The Center will use the NCHEMS student survey to gather satisfaction data. The UHCWH staff will supplement this nationally used instrument by preparing an additional 10-15 questions specific to this location and designed to elicit a profile of entering/new and continuing students for a two year institution. The plan is to have this survey distributed as a 20% representative sample for students in late November. The data then will be returned to the Center for analysis and use in the spring semester by the staff. A draft will be written in the summer of 2006. The unit review will be submitted for Fall/November 2006.

Institutional Efforts to Support Program/Unit Review Processes:

The Academic Senate of Hawai‘i Community College and its Executive Committee have met four times since the beginning of the fall semester. On the agenda at each of these meetings have been the matters of assessment and accreditation. At the first and second meetings of the year, the Executive Committee agreed on a time-line and process for handling the review of the current accreditation progress report. The Executive Committee will do the review and report its
results to the Senate. The Executive Committee has also made the Senate aware that it will be responsible for the first group of program/unit reviews that will be delivered by the Institutional Effectiveness Committee in early January. The Executive Committee and its chair are consulting with the Assessment and Accreditation Committees to devise an acceptable tool for evaluation and to determine to what extent the College Council, Assessment Committee, Institutional Effectiveness Committee, Faculty and Administration will participate in the formalized process of program review.

To facilitate matters, the Senate Chair is acting as Chair of the Standard Four Accreditation Committee and as a member of the Accreditation Steering Committee, the College Council, and the Assessment Committee. All of these bodies are aiding stakeholders (faculty, students, and administrators) to develop input for the design of a clearly understood assessment procedure that will be used to plan, evaluate and implement program/unit review and funding.

The College administration has committed to providing a line item to the College budget of $25K to support Program/Unit Review Action Plans. Although this amount may seem small, it represents an important commitment for a campus that has come through a projected half million dollar deficit in its last academic year. Although the College was able to stabilize the budget and produce black ink for the year, fiscal operations are very tight and the commitment of a line item to support Action Plans is a good faith effort to provide support from within the College budget. Biennium budget and/or Supplemental budget requests to the State Legislature represent the other possible avenues to resolving program and unit problems that may be amenable to increased staffing and funding solutions. However, the College administration hopes to inculcate the spirit among all program and unit faculty/staff that program self-awareness and a commitment to continuous improvement through best practices is the fundamental commitment that must be present for a successful program. More funding can never produce better programs unless this fundamental commitment is also present.

**Analysis of the Results:**

HawCC has reached the implementation phase of its program/unit review policy while it continues to work on amplifying the roles to be played by the reviewing bodies that will process the first batch of twelve program/unit reviews. All participants in the process feel some anxiety about the adequacy of their efforts. As is common to all initial efforts the personnel hope that their individual contributions will be sufficient, and we hope that the system for guiding the reviews and evaluating the results will function as flawlessly as possible.

Although the commitment of $25K to support action plans derived from the program/unit reviews is unable to cover personnel needs that may be identified, it can cover equipment/supplies needs or student help if judiciously used to respond to an immediate crisis. The point is that the amount budgeted represents what the College can afford for now and it is a good faith effort to show that the administration intends to pay attention to action plans. One of the vital life signs in organizational operations is the possession of a line item in the budget. The
College administration considers this line item to be permanent and subject to growth as the College budget picture improves.

The IR working in conjunction with key personnel including the Banner information systems technician and the Records Management specialist have produced the prototype data inquiry tool required to implement instructional program reviews. The challenge of working with non-instructional units during the summer months to assure clarification of their data requirement along with the prospect of a single system-wide template for instructional programs explains why the College phased these tasks in this manner. Unit review is particularly challenging for the IR because each unit tends to have dramatically different data requirements unlike the instructional programs where a significant level of standardized data reporting is possible. Moreover, the data for units may not be as accessible as for the instructional programs. In fact accessibility of data required to complete both the program and the unit reviews has been a significant challenge for the College. This challenge should be sufficiently answered for instructional programs by the time of the visitation. For non-instructional units the collection of data may be a work in progress with some of the units employing what they have available and establishing a plan for the future collection of additional data resources as they move forward.

The College has phased the program/unit review agenda over a three year period (12 in Year One, 14 in Year Two and 18 in Year Three) to work in continuous cycles thereafter to assure that all programs/units are reviewed triennially. Moreover, all programs/units will be receiving annual data reports of the elements used in their respective program/unit review to assure that they are able to track trends and review the impact of any action plan changes that they may have implemented. By phasing in this manner the representative sample selected for the first year informs programs in subsequent years of possible glitches that require attention. Additionally, the phasing allows programs/units to move forward on the schedule, but never backward, in case a biennium budget request to the State Legislature is anticipated. The triennial schedule establishes a frequency of review that assures currency of all reviews, and it guarantees that the College administration will have recent review reports for all program/units for every biennium budget session of the State Legislature with the exception of the first triennial cycle.

College faculty/staff are experiencing some anxiety about the use of survey results constituent to program/unit reviews. For the time being the College will be using existing survey mechanisms to include the CCSSE, graduate/leaver survey and employer surveys. The IR has secured a freeware program called “Zoomerang” that is available on the assessment web page and this is likely to provide the solution to survey needs given the size of most programs at the College (program restricts survey size to under 100 participants, but most of the programs at the College have fewer than 100 majors).

College faculty/staff are committed to the culture of evidence and the culture of continuous improvement. The requests for help from the IR reflect this commitment, and it has been necessary for the IR’s supervisor to establish a prioritization of his tasks to assure progress in the key areas. The College anxiously awaits the first cohort of program/unit reviews to determine the ramifications of a culture of evidence/continuous improvement. Lingering suspicions that
somehow this is a process to evaluate individual personnel or that the process is intended to eliminate programs must be dispelled. All College personnel involved in this process are trying to maintain a constructive emphasis by focusing on problem solving and support.

It has been too easy to lose sight of the fact that all of the foregoing is intended to enhance and improve student learning opportunities. So much background work has been necessary to prepare the institutional procedures, institutional support, data collection practices and data inquiry methods that the end product of improving student learning could easily have been forgotten. The ACCJC concern expressed in its latest action letter has brought the College into focus on the purpose of this cultural change. SLO are established for most programs and they are being debated for all programs. Division Chairs have taken the responsibility to cascade SLO from the program level to the course level.

All divisions/departments have made progress in the identification of program level SLO, and some divisions/departments have made greater progress than others in the assessment of program and course level SLO. Those divisions/programs that have either received or are candidates for national accreditation are best situated for providing such assessment data (Nursing, Food Service, Intensive English Program, Early Childhood Education). Strategies for gathering assessment of SLO at the College, program and course levels still need work. However, significant achievements in providing such evidence exist in certain divisions and departments that utilize capstone projects or are more advanced in the process of identifying other assessment strategies. Finally, those divisions/departments that can draw from techniques required by their national accrediting agencies to satisfy competency requirements are also well situated to illustrate SLO achievements by linking the competencies as constituent elements to the more broadly stated SLO.

Additional Actions to be Taken:

Two objectives must be central to College efforts and they are as follows: 1) make the program/unit review process work to assure that data analysis is central to the planning and budgeting process for the College; 2) keep the end product of improved student learning opportunities and outcomes as the guiding light of the process. Additional effort is required on both accounts and the College is committed to follow through.

The applicable metaphor to the implementation of the program/unit review process is that we are flying the airplane while we are constructing the landing gear. We are all hoping for a smooth landing and the Assessment Committee chair, Academic Senate chair and College Council chair are currently finalizing the composition of the Institutional Effectiveness Committee. This committee must have the gravitas to conduct its business as the first line of review for program/unit reviews with the authority to request clarifications and possible re-writes if the committee determines that crucial features of the collected evidence have been insufficiently analyzed, or if it determines that recommended action plans are unsupported by the evidence. Current prospects for the composition of the committee would employ a model with four
Second level of review for the program/unit reviews will be in the hands of the Academic Senate and the College Council respectively. Although each body understands its respective role in the review process, completion within the timeline (reviews received second week in January and cleared by the second week in February) is as yet untested. Recommendations by these bodies will be made to the Chancellor for final determination of appropriate responses as it relates to budget, staffing decisions, biennium budget and or supplemental budget strategizing, or possibly a deeper level of inquiry by immediate supervisors into possible economizing measures that may be possible within a particular program or unit. As we prepare for this initial round of program/unit reviews, we move forward with confidence in our collective ability to problem solve “on the fly.”

One glitch that was encountered in the completion of the program review for Tropical Forestry was the realization that not all programs have a separate account code for their supplies budgets. The VCAA office is taking responsibility to gather the information and consult with division/department leadership to determine the proper response to this issue. In some instances it would be problematic to provide separate account codes, but in others, Tropical Forestry as case in point, the separate account code is essential. The Vice Chancellor of Administrative Services has committed to establishing the separate accounts upon receipt of requests to do so. Fortunately, most of the programs that utilize specialized equipment and supplies already have separate account codes.

Keeping the focus on the improvement of student learning opportunities and outcomes, the VCAA is committed to devoting a portion of each Division Chair Meeting Agenda to reports of latest developments and progress with SLO and SLO assessment. In this manner information sharing, resource availability and cross fertilization of ideas can take place among the division/departments. In this forum, the VCAA must broach the issue of program charts that illustrate the relationship of course requirements for the program with the program SLO expectations. Such a chart should be uniformly rendered by listing the program SLO on the vertical axis along the left hand margin and the course required for the program along the horizontal axis at the top of the page. Completion of such charts for each program will show at a glance the contributions of each course requirement to the overall program SLO. Some but not all programs have completed such a charting exercise.

One of the features of the academic programs at HawCC has been their strong emphasis upon academic skills outcomes and pre-requisites (reading, writing and math). The VCAA’s office is committed to developing a validation study of reading and writing pre-requisites for the UHCC system in conjunction with the VCAA of Leeward Community College.

Finally, all administrative leaders are committed to promoting a learner centered rationale for all programs and non-instructional units. No matter how indirectly related an unit’s operations may be to SLO, the rationale for its practices must be based in a foundation of understanding the
profile of HawCC students and the needs that they bring to the campus with them. All programs and units are committed and administrative leadership will continually reinforce our commitment to removing unwarranted obstacles to learners and learning.

The Liberal Arts (A.A. degree) program will need to make a finalized choice of program SLO after long debate and consideration. One option tends to be more cross disciplinary and the other appears to be more discipline related even though both options share a number of similar features (appendix #13). The good news here is that a vigorous debate on student learning outcomes is taking place among liberal arts colleagues whose stock in trade is debate. Fortuitously the debate is learner outcome centered and it is stimulating serious involvement by the participants. The VCAA office will assure that a decision is made because the AA program (comprising 35% of student headcount at HawCC) is scheduled for a program review due date in 2006.

The College has benefited enormously from its work with nationally recognized consultant, Professor Emeritus Ruth Stiehl from Oregon State University. What we know of SLO and program mapping is derived from the College’s two previous two-day workshops with Dr. Stiehl. Her latest work on SLO assessment strategies would be well-timed for a third engagement with HawCC faculty. The College has made a joint effort with sister colleges in the UHCC system to bring Dr. Stiehl to Hawai‘i in February or March of 2006. The VCAA’s office is committed to support a separate exclusive engagement for HawCC faculty members as well. However, the College recognizes that bringing in a consultant can not be an excuse for delay, and the resources of the Academic Senate, Assessment Committee, College Council, the IR and the VCAA office will continue to seek best practices and stimulate collegial discussion, debate and decisiveness about assessment strategies.

SEE ACCJC Warning Letter in PDF
June 28, 2005

Dr. Rockne Freitas
Interim Chancellor
Hawaii Community College
200 W. Kawili Street
Hilo, HI 96720-4091

Dear Chancellor Freitas:

The Accrediting Commission for Community and Junior Colleges, Western Association of Schools and Colleges, at its meeting on June 8-10, 2005, reviewed the Progress Report submitted by the college and the report of the evaluation team which visited on Thursday, April 7, 2005. The Commission acted to issue a Warning and to ask that Hawaii Community College correct the deficiencies noted. The college is asked to submit a Progress Report by October 15, 2005. That report will be followed by a visit of Commission representatives.

The Progress Report of October 15, 2005 should focus on the concerns and University of Hawaii System recommendations as noted below:

Concern: Program Review.

Hawaii Community College needs to provide evidence that demonstrates that a conscious effort to improve student learning is occurring at the institution and that the college organizes its key processes and allocates its resources to support student learning. Furthermore, the institution needs to demonstrate its effectiveness by providing evidence of the achievement of student learning outcomes and evidence of institution and program performance through ongoing and systematic evaluation and planning and improvement (1996 Standards III.A. all, III.B. all, III.C. all).

System Recommendations:

Recommendation 2: The team recommends that the University of Hawaii Community Colleges develop policies and procedures to ensure:
- That the community colleges engage in regular assessment of institutional effectiveness, including program review;
- That the community college system as well as each college set priorities for implementing plans for improvement that are based in analysis of research data;
- That the colleges and the UH CC system incorporate these priorities into resources distribution processes and decisions;
- That the colleges and the UH CC system develop and employ a methodology for assessing overall institutional effectiveness and progress toward meeting goals expressed through plans for improvement; and
That the colleges and the UH CC system report regularly to internal constituencies and the Board on this progress (Standards I.B, III.A.1 and 2, III.B.3, III.B.4, II.C.1.e, II.C.2, III.A.6, III.C.1, III.C.2, III.D.1.a, IV.B.2.b, and the Preamble to the Standards).

Recommendation 6: The UH Community Colleges and the University of Hawaii System should identify more clearly the community college system functions and authority assigned to the two Associate Vice President offices and staff, and communicate those to the colleges and the University System-wide Support. Both organizations must then design workflow and decision-making processes that allow the Community College System-wide Support staff to provide support and delegate authority in areas of academic planning, administrative (including personnel) and fiscal operations (Standards IV.A.5, III.A.3, I.B).

Recommendation 7: The UH Community Colleges identify and implement the means to ensure that the Community College governance system at the system head and board levels meets accreditation standards by developing and implementing policies and processes that ensure the quality, integrity, and effectiveness of the student learning programs and services (Standards IV.B. all).

I have previously sent you a copy of the evaluation team report. Additional copies may now be duplicated. The Commission requires that you give the report and this letter appropriate dissemination to your college staff and to those who were signatories of your college report. This group should include campus and system leadership and the Board of Trustees. The Commission also requires that all reports be made available to the public. Placing copies in the college library can accomplish this. Should you want the team report electronically to place on your web site or for other purpose, please contact Commission staff.

On behalf of the Commission, I wish to express continuing interest in the institution’s educational programs and services. Professional self-regulation is the most effective means of assuring integrity, effectiveness and quality.

Sincerely,

Barbara A. Beno
Executive Director

BAB/61

c: Dr. David McClain, Interim President, University of Hawaii
Dr. Trina Nahm-Mipo, Accreditation Liaison Officer
Mr. Michael Rota, Associate Vice President, University of Hawaii
Dr. Patricia Lee, Chair, Board of Regents, University of Hawaii
Dr. Barbara A. Beno, Executive Director, Team Chair
Evaluation Team Members
Aloha Kakou,

HawCC has been placed on Warning status by the ACCJC as we expected based upon the Commission’s concern that the college fully implement a program review policy that revolves about a “conscious effort to improve student learning...and that the college organizes its key processes and allocates its resources to support student learning.” The good news is that the college has a program/unit review policy and is finalizing a template of data elements for that policy in time for implementation during the ’05-’06 academic year. Additionally, the college has worked diligently with Dr. Ruth Stiehl as its consultant to develop a structured approach to deploying student learning outcomes across the curriculum.

The ACCJC has praised the college’s achievements along these lines in the conclusion of its Progress Visit Team Report of April 6, 2005 which said in part: “...Hawaii Community College has made an excellent and substantial start to implementing an ongoing process for college assessment of institutional effectiveness.” The inevitable question that arises is why was a warning issued if the progress report was recognized as an “excellent and substantial start?” The answer is that a start is not full implementation and the commission has issued its warning as way of guaranteeing that we focus our efforts on effective follow through.

I urge the campus to take the warning that has been issued as a constructive challenge to complete the first wave of program/unit reviews that have been scheduled for the 2005-06 academic year with special emphasis placed upon BOTH defining and gathering assessment evidence of student learning outcomes for our campus programs. I have taken steps to assure that both the notification letter from ACCJC (6/28/05) and the Progress Visit Team Report (4/06/05) will be placed on the college’s Accreditation Web-page and I am including these documents as attachments to this message as well. After you have reviewed the documents, I hope that you will be as optimistic as I am that we can answer this challenge given dedication and concentrated work on the areas of concern.

Mahalo Nui.

Rockne Freitas
Chancellor
HAWAII COMMUNITY COLLEGE
PROGRAM REVIEW REPORT

Associate of XXXX Degree

Assessment Period: (eg. 2002-2005)

Any Hawaii Community College’s mission is to

Serve the community as...

This program’s mission is to:

Serve the community as...

Part I. Executive Summary of Program Status

Part II. Program Description
  History
  Program goals
  Program SLOs
  Admission requirements
  Credentials offered
  Faculty and staff
  Resources
  Articulation agreements
  Community connections, advisory committees, DOE connections
  Distance delivered/off campus programs, if applicable

Part III. Quantitative trend data chart (previous 3 years):

1. Number of majors
   Unduplicated Headcount of declared majors for both semesters.
2. Student semester hours for program majors in all program classes.
3. Student Semester Hours for all program classes. This will give a measure of crossover interest in the program
4. FTE course enrollment
   Student Semester Hours for all program classes/15
5. Number of classes taught \((n)\)
   Corresponds to \(n\) in 6 & 7 below
6. Average class size
   \[
   \frac{\sum e_1 + e_2 + \ldots + e_n}{n}
   \]
   where \(e\) is class enrollment
7. Average class fit
   \[
   \frac{\sum p_1 + p_2 + \ldots + p_n}{n}
   \]
   where \(p\) is enrollment/max enrollment
8. FTE of BOR appointed program faculty
   Headcount of all on tenure, tenure track, and multi-year contract faculty
9. FTE for classes taught in program
   Credits taught / full teaching load
   Note: Full teaching load is generally defined as 27 or 21 credits depending on program
10. Student/faculty ratio
    \((\text{Total SSH} / 15) / \text{FTE faculty}\)
    Note: FTE faculty is FTE for classes taught in program (from No. 9 above)
11. Unduplicated number of degree/certificates
    Note: All degrees and certificates awarded in a program in a year to a single student are counted as one item.
12. Cost of program per student major
    Regular salaries, overload, lecturer costs, supply and maintenance, and amortized equipment / (SSH of majors / 15)
    Note: Do we include all funding sources e.g. federal, special, revolving?
13. Persistence of majors year to year

Part IV. Assessment Results Chart for Program SLOs (3 year trend)
   Changes made as a result of findings

Part V. Assessment Results Chart for Course SLOs (3 year trend)
   Changes made as a result of findings

Part VI. Student satisfaction survey results

Part VII. Employer satisfaction survey results (CTE programs)
Part VIII. Analysis of Program
   Alignment with mission
   Strengths and weaknesses
   Evidence of quality
   Evidence of student learning
   Resource sufficiency
   Recommendations for improving outcomes

Part IX. Action Plan
   Include timeline and who is responsible

Part X. Budget implications

Appendix #4

See Unit Maps and Charts in PDF

Technology Support Advisory Subcommittees

Summer Task Force Summary Reports

September 15, 2005

Mission
The mission of the Technology Advisory Support Committee is to meet our Colleges’ growing demands in technology by creating and staffing a newly expanded Technology Department to include the areas of Media Service and Institutional Technology for the purpose of meeting increasing technological needs and requirements to successfully service students, staff and faculty living, learning and working on our island.

Subcommittee I: Mission and Vision
This subcommittee met three times during late spring and early summer, 2005. The purpose of the meetings was to write a mission statement and to create a current and future visual depiction of today’s Academic Computing Unit and tomorrow’s prospective Technology Department. Through much dialog, the consequent mission statement served as guide to all three subcommittees. The mission statement led the way, making clear the purpose, principles, aspirations, identity, values and benefits of a newly structured Technology Department at Hawaii Community College. A schematic and two
maps served as visual aids from which Subcommittees II and III drew upon when discussing, identifying, and finalizing efficiency measurements, staffing, equipment, and facilities requirements. The Future Map (see attachment) serves as our Vision.

**Scope**

This subcommittee discussed the broad purview of an expanded technology department. We began by listing technology services along with departments or areas that required (or would require) servicing. The results of this thick discussion were converted into a linear, visual schematic (see Schematic I) that identified initial staffing and two major arms of technology services including Media Services and Institutional Technology. Also identified are duties to be shared by both branches. Importantly, this schematic boldly illustrates, via a permeable box that connects the entire schematic together, an integrated experience—Assistive Technology. _Assistive Technology_ is defined as any item, piece of equipment, or system, whether acquired commercially, modified, or customized, that is commonly used to increase, maintain, or improve functional capabilities of individuals with disabilities.

This newly enhanced technology Department would encompass all Hawai`i Community College main and satellite campuses. It was determined per the subcommittee that the Director & Advisor of Technology should have University of Hawaii system-wide technology responsibilities and be a direct report and advisor to Hawaii Community College Chancellor. The director would also serve as advisor to the Library/Learning Center, Disability Center, and grant review processes. These responsibilities would be in addition to the director’s supervisory duties.

Ultimately, via the feedback loop of information flowing directional from subcommittees II and III back to subcommittee I, staffing, customers, and services relational to the technology department were narrowed and defined. Using the Ruth Stiehl Outcomes Map model, a map was created (see Future Map attached) to visually depict what this subcommittee determined as the key components of Hawaii Community College’s future technology department. Per the map, these components include: services (red circles), customers to be serviced (blue oblong), tech department staffing, and relationships or connections (use of arrows and concentric layers). Creating a map of what the technology department could or should be in 3 to 5 years proved a difficult task at times. Some subcommittee members pointed at their struggle to remain optimistic in this process and to have faith in a map model that reflected what our technology department could become. Members described long-standing budgetary constraints, geographical barriers, poor equipment, staffing concerns, and the effort it took to toss aside their often lackluster faith that this Future Map model could become a tangible reality some day. Subcommittee members repeatedly returned to the current affairs of the Academic Computing Unit as it stands today. Probing and necessary questions would result in another map. What services are currently provided? What customers are currently being served? Who, what, and where is not being served? What does our current staffing look like? Out of this discussion it was determined that a
current map of Hawaii Community College’s Academic Computing Unit was necessary (see Current Map).

Moving Forward

Notably, the committee’s work paralleled the learning outcomes based process (as defined by Stiehl). We began with what we wanted to be able to do out there...in the future. That is to say, we first created what we wanted our new Technology Department to be and do for us. Then we zoomed the lens in and created a map to show where we are right now. By contrasting the Future Map with that of the Current Map, all three subcommittees were able to use the two maps and the linear schematic to recognize natural relationships, necessary services, and adequate staffing (as well as to recognize the opposite, i.e., relational disconnects, missing services, and inadequate staffing).

Using the Future (or Vision) Map, along with information gathered via the process and data that emerged from Subcommittees I & II, a determinant amount of facilities space was calculated (see Facilities Graphic attached).

The mission statement and attached visual depictions as products of Subcommittee I, along with this descriptive narrative, are offered as guides and guidance to those responsible for building our new campus and new Technology Department.

Subcommittee II: Demand and Efficiency Measures

Measures Subcommittee Summary 10-12-05

The Measures Subcommittee was formed as one of three sub teams to produce a specific deliverable to the larger Technology Support Advisory Committee. The purpose of the various Subcommittees is to create the Technology Support Services Unit by first completing a “snap” program review of the existing support structure. The Measures Subcommittee was originally comprised of 10 members and was given the directive to define the data elements needed to illuminate the demand and efficiency profile of the unit. These measures would then be used in the ensuing program review at the end of the Summer break, once all members were back on campus.

Upon receiving this directive the Subcommittee set up reoccurring meetings in order to address all of the issues and be ready to deliver the list of measures by the August 15th due date. Leveraging off of a Technology Department Schematic, which was produced by the section 1 Mission and Vision subcommittee, the Measures sub team began the work at hand.

Technology Department Graphic

Starting first with the major activities, which were previously defined by the Mission and Vision subcommittee, a plan was devised to use Ruth Stiehl’s program assessment methodology to arrive at the demand and efficiency measures. By highlighting the major activities as outcomes of this process the sub team was then able to peel back
the various task layers to arrive at what measures one could use in determining a successful program.

The major activities were broken into 2 logical groupings; Media Services, and Technology. The next logical layer was the major services provided by the department, listed under each of the 2 technology groupings. For example, within the Media Services grouping some of the services listed were Video Conferencing, Projector, and A/V. For the Technology group some of the services listed were College Computing, Server Administration, and Web Master. The next logical layer under the service layer is the activity layer. By reducing each activity into its smallest component it became clear as to what types of measures one would need in order to identify what a successful program would look like (namely, the demand and efficiency measures). See link below.

**Technology Department Demand and Efficiency Measures**

The conversations that ensued were rich in nature and many other issues were identified in the process of determining the measures, which were also flagged in the documentation. Our findings are that most of the data required for the purpose of measurement falls into one of two categories. Either the data is non-existent, as we are trying to measure activities that have not occurred, or we have not been adequately recording/documenting the activities for one reason or another.

An example of the non-existent data category would be the Network Management service. Although this service was identified as an activity we should be doing, we currently are not doing it or are doing it in a management crisis situation, just barely keeping it up. An example of the data not being adequately recorded or documented would include usage data for the Polycom system across campuses. No one has been asking for this measurement data up to this point, which is why this data has not been collected.

In short, the only real documentation we have of the activities for this unit is the hardcopy work orders that have been used. This information would be sketchy at best if documented because there has been no specific requirement for data collection on the form. Although there are some “loose” categories the forms are simply not designed to be a data collection tool to the desired level of detail needed for a program review. The work order has been primarily used as a prioritization and tracking tool to provide for triage in what appears to be a severely shorthanded department. If the work order was rewritten to encompass some of the measures we are looking for it would prove to be much more useful as a tool to document current state and look for trends. This would be a recommendation going forward as a short term solution to this issue.

Another solution, albeit a long term one, is to develop and deploy an actual call tracking system of some type that would be specifically designed to track calls, dispatch a technician, and collect data in a meaningful way. This call management system could either manifest itself as an actual “call desk” where there is an actual person on duty to
take calls, or a web based solution where the data is kept on a web based data base. One could easily envision a hybrid solution where both the live body and the web based data base would work in conjunction with one another.

Other short term solutions that could be deployed given the adequate staffing to do so would include:

- Development of a survey mechanism of some type to be used to gather feedback.
- Instructional placards left with equipment where a little more information would be helpful.
- Training for Faculty, Staff, and Technicians.
- Equipment Depreciation Schedules created for all major pieces of equipment.
- Spare parts and back up equipment management.
Subcommittee III: Staffing and Facilities

Technology Support Services Advisory Task Force: Subcommittee on Staffing & Facilities

The sub-committee met four times during the summer of '05 on 6/21, 7/19, 7/26 & 8/09. The purpose of the meetings was to identify the staffing and facility needs of the Technology Support Services Department as outlined by the Subcommittee on Mission and Purpose. Said subcommittee identified a binary structure to the department comprising Media Services and Computer Services with interstitial services and responsibilities shared by these two wings. The Staffing and Facilities (S&F) Subcommittee drew on comparisons of similar technology support services organizations at Leeward, Kapi'olani and Maui Community Colleges. MauiCC provided the most relevant comparison because of the student headcount similarity of the two campuses, as well as complexity of mission with Maui obligated to serve its service area via distance education just as HawCC must.

S&F proceeded to identify staff positions required to provide the services defined by the Mission subcommittee. The group identified job categories and produced initial position descriptions, as well as defining basic principles for facilities and equipment management. The campus anticipates a particularly hopeful future given the prospect for new campus development in the next three to five years. Consequently, members of the subcommittee determined that general principles rather than specific plans are best identified at the present moment. Subsequent discussions with the chosen developers of the new campuses should follow the guidelines implicit in the principles defined hereafter. Since the chair of S&F did not produce regular meeting minutes members of the sub-committee who were unable to attend were not able to gauge the progress and direction of the group. The plenary committee should review the product of this subcommittee bearing this factor in mind.

The subcommittee encourages the campus to place a Director of Technology Support Services at the executive/managerial level to reflect the relationship of the department to the core mission and cornerstone values of HawCC. The Director of Technology Support Services would directly report to the Chancellor and bear responsibility for academic and administrative computing, as well as all forms of media services/distance education technologies. The Director would be supported by three direct reports serving as Coordinators of Media Services and Information Technology Services respectively, as well as an Education Specialist (see attached organizational chart labeled Hawai‘i Community College Technology Department for functional responsibilities of the two branches of the department).

The two Coordinators could be filled by APT personnel serving at PBB level to supervise their respective staffs of APT technicians serving at PBA level. The Ed Spec could be filled by an APT serving at PBA with responsibilities for implementing
programs and policies under the auspices of either Media Services or Information Technology as required by the Director. Examples of assignments that may require the oversight of the Ed Spec would include management of a program of faculty/staff development to facilitate distance delivery of instruction following a program jointly conceived by the Coordinators of Media Services and Info Tech Services; or managing a cadre of student workers at a Help Desk/Trouble Call Center following policies jointly established by the Coordinators of Media Services and Info Tech Services. Finally, the Director and the direct reports to the Director would be assigned a single Secretary II to manage the office complex of the department.

The Coordinator of Media Services would supervise a staff of three APT technicians at PBA level with two of the Techs to manage the Videoconferencing technology of the College at its main campus as well as its distributed sites. The other Tech would be responsible for the interactive television technology which is particularly central to the function of the University Center program in West Hawaii. For this reason the interactive TV Tech would have dual reporting responsibilities to both the Coordinator of Media Services and the Director of the West Hawaii University Center. Audio Visual equipment and the PA Systems could be placed under the responsibility of a Help Desk Center with the Coordinator of Media Services responsible for policies and procedures in the acquisition, maintenance, distribution and replacement of equipment. Finally, the Coordinator of Media Services would implement and oversee the maintenance of contracted services for telephone services for the campus and its outliers, as well as contracting with UH-Hilo for duplication services.

The Coordinator of IT Services would supervise eight techs to provide the college computing, server administration, network management, webmaster and student information system services. Three computer support techs would handle hardware/software installation as well as the more complex trouble call issues involving both administrative and academic computing. Two techs would assure the maintenance and security of a server complex that would allow the College to provide full functionality to its Outlook software, as well as maintain its own e-mail system. One tech apiece for network manager and a webmaster would provide the College with optimal services. Finally a tech/programmer for the student information system is required.

Among the principles to guide facilities management the College should follow a policy of centralization of location and management of its computer lab classrooms to economize its management. Additionally, the department must set a depreciation policy for the variety of equipment that it must manage. The ideal for computer replacement would be after three years, but currently the College budget will not support this so the goal must be once every five years. The Technology Support Department must be tasked with the duty to annually update the administration with inventory replacement needs for computers and peripherals. Most audiovisual equipment must be used until worn out since repair is usually not feasible. However a lifespan of eight years for audio visuals may be prudent for both budgetary and
upgrading purposes. Finally, the department should reap the benefits of cross fertilization by establishing private work bays within a common work area for most of the technicians. Although the Director, and the Coordinators would require private offices to carry out their supervisory responsibilities the principle of common work space for the remainder of the staff should be followed in the sub-division of up to 20,000 square feet of work and storage space for a department that comes to a total of 16 full time staff.

End of Summary

---

**Appendix #5**

**Hawai‘i Community College Mission Statement**

The mission of Hawai‘i Community College is to provide the community with a responsive educational environment that empowers learners to develop skills and to be responsible and productive in a complex world.

**Business Education & Technology Division**

**Intended Student Learning Outcomes**

1. Work both independently and cooperatively to achieve organization goals.

2. Adhere to the ethical standards of the profession and organization.

3. Prioritize and efficiently carry out personal and work tasks.
4. Engage in opportunities that will increase personal and professional capacity.

**Accounting Program**

**Intended Student Learning Outcomes:**

1. Apply basic math and computational skills to achieve accuracy in accounting systems.
2. Perform basic accounting tasks and maintain accurate accounting systems in profit and non-profit organizations.
3. Demonstrate work attitude and appearance consistent with professional practices in accounting.
4. Communicate with stakeholders in a manner that reflects organizational culture and sensitivity to diverse customer and community needs.
5. Perform basic office functions using standard and emerging technologies.
6. In a work environment demonstrate effective self-management through efficient use of time and personal commitments.
7. Participate effectively in individual and group decision making.
8. Use critical thinking skills to make decisions that reflect legal and ethical standards of the accounting profession.
9. Take advantage of opportunities for continuous professional development.
Business Technology (OAT) Program

Intended Student Learning Outcomes

1. Work as a member of an office team to meet the needs of customers from diverse populations (disabled, cultural, race, religion, sexual orientation, gender, age, etc.
2. Display a professional attitude in the office including accepting constructive feedback, respecting all persons, taking pride in work, and honoring diversity.
3. Organize and manage multiple administrative tasks and co-workers in an office making efficient use of time and resources.
4. Use current and emerging technologies to create and produce quality, mailable office work documents.
5. Use decision-making and research skills to make informed choices and confirm information in the office.
6. Create and manage company files according to company policies and standard procedures following general business ethics.
7. Communicate clearly through oral and written interactions complying with standard office etiquette. Take advantage of opportunities for continuous professional development

Information Technology Program

Intended Student Learning Outcomes
1. Select and create software and hardware systems that meet unique information needs of an organization.
2. Implement the hardware, software, and procedural components of a data communication system in a business environment.
3. Display a professional attitude and abide by the legal and ethical guidelines of the information technology field.
4. Work both independently and cooperatively to meet an organization’s information technology goals.
5. Teach technical skills to others.
6. Organize and manage multiple tasks and co-workers making efficient use of time and resources.
7. Take advantage of opportunities for continuous learning and development in the information technology profession.

**Marketing Program**

**Intended Student Learning Outcomes**

1. Apply basic math and computational skills to achieve accuracy in business calculations.
2. Demonstrate effective oral and written communication skills following common business practices.
3. Apply marketing concepts to real life activities, simulations, projects and case-studies.
4. Participate in the practice of ethical decision making and promotion of social justice.
5. Manage time and physical resources efficiently.
6. Develop the ability to think strategically as an individual and effective team member.
7. Demonstrate work attitude and appearance consistent with professional practices.
8. Describe how businesses and other organizations are adapting people, processes, and structures to a more global, technologically advanced business context.
9. Develop skills in the use of current technology and the capabilities that are needed to extend those skills over time.

Appendix #6

ACF Purposes of Accreditation (Outcomes)

BAKING PURPOSE: To apply the fundamentals of baking science to the preparation of a variety of products. To use and care for equipment normally found in the bakeshop or baking area.

BEVERAGE PURPOSE: To become familiar with and varieties of alcoholic and non-alcoholic beverages. To develop an appreciation for wine and food affinity. To explain laws and procedures related to responsible alcohol service.

GARDE MANGER PURPOSE: To develop skills in producing a variety of cold food products. To prepare items appropriate for buffet presentation, including decorative pieces

DINING ROOM PURPOSE: To perform dining room service functions using a variety of types of service. To demonstrate an understanding of quality customer service

MANAGEMENT PURPOSE: To prepare for the transition from employee to supervisor. To evaluate styles of leadership and develop skills in human relations and personnel management.

MATH PURPOSE: To perform mathematical functions related to foodservice operations

MENU PURPOSE: To apply the principles of menu planning and layout to the development of menus for a variety of types of facilities and service
NUTRITION PURPOSE: To describe the characteristics, functions, and food sources of the major nutrients and how to maximize nutrient retention in food preparation and storage. To apply the principles of nutrient needs throughout the life cycle to menu planning and food preparation.

ORIENTATION PURPOSE: To develop an understanding of the hospitality industry and career opportunities in the field. To investigate trade publications and professional organizations appropriate for continuing education. To become familiar with the organizational structure and basic functions of departments within hospitality and foodservice establishments.

PREPARATION PURPOSE: To develop skills in knife, tool and equipment handling and apply principles of food preparation to produce a variety of food products. To operate equipment safely and correctly. To apply knowledge of laws and regulations relating to safety and sanitation in the kitchen.

PURCHASING PURPOSE: To understand the overall concept of purchasing and receiving practices in quality foodservice operations. To apply knowledge of quality standards and regulations governing food products to the purchasing function. To receive and store food and non-food items properly.

SANITATION PURPOSE: To develop an understanding of the basic principles of sanitation and safety and to be able to apply them in the foodservice operations. To reinforce personal hygiene habits and food handling practices that protect the health of the consumer.

Hawaii Community College
Food Service Program Culture

The culture of the Food Service Program is expressed by these four values: EDUCATION, PASSION, RESPECT, SAFETY.

We endeavor for all culinary students and instructors to be guided by these values in our daily learning relationships, and by embracing these values in our education with one another; we set the tone and culture for our Hawaii Community College Food Service Program.

EDUCATION
1. I am committed to learning advancement.
2. I am open-minded and a good listener.
3. I will make learning enjoyable and fun.
**PASSION**
1. I love the culinary arts.
2. I give back to our community.
3. I feel to live is to cook.

**RESPECT**
1. I respect individual ideas and cultures.
2. I treat others with mutual respect.
3. I am empathetic.

**SAFETY**
1. I understand and observe all safety practices.
2. I act in a professional manner.
3. I actively maintain a safe learning and work environment.

**Mission**
The mission of the Culinary Arts Program at Hawaii Community College is to use the strength of the community and dedicated instructors to educate and train competent and creative culinary professionals who are successful in the workplace. Modern facilities, state-of-the-art equipment, a coordinated curriculum and skilled instructors will insure that program is competitive in the Pacific area.

**Vision Statement**
From the strong base established by our previous students and instructors, we view our future -
Our graduates, from diverse backgrounds, are well respected and highly motivated leaders in their field.
We are American Culinary Federation accredited.
We are known as a leading culinary school in the Pacific.
We operate in up to date, state of the art facilities.
We attract internationally known guest chefs and lecturers.
Our skills and work in the culinary arts contribute to the wealth of our community.

Name: _____________________

**FSER: 50 Fundamental Cookery Skills, Concepts, Issues and Assessment tasks**

*CHECKLIST OF REQUIRED SKILLS MUST BE VERIFIED BY ______ DATE IN ORDER TO PASS THIS COURSE.*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SKILLS</th>
<th>DATE COMPLETED</th>
<th>ASSESSED BY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>COOKING METHODS</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SIMMER</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BRAISE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ROAST/BAKE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BROIL/GRILL</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SAUTE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PAN-FRY</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DEEP-FRY</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>KNIFE SKILLS</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SHARPENING A KNIFE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>USING A STEEL</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>BASIC CUTS AND SHEPES</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LARGE DICE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MEDIUM DICE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SMALL DICE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BRUNOISE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RONDELLE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BATONNET</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JULIENNE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOURNE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHIFFONADE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MINCE GARLIC</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MINCE PARSLEY</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PEEL ORANGE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PEEL MELON</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STOCKS AND SAUCES</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHICKEN STOCK</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BROWN STOCK</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ROUX</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ESPAGNOLE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BECHAMEL</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOMATO</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HOLLANDAISE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOUPS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CONSUME</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SKILLS</td>
<td>DATE COMPLETED</td>
<td>ASSESSED BY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOUPS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CREAM SOUP</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHOWDER</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PUREE SOUP</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CLEAR SOUP</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TIE A ROAST</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TRUSS A CHICKEN</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CUT A CHICKEN INTO EIGHT PIECES</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CUT A CHICKEN FOR</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Hawai‘i Community College Progress Report, 10/15/05**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>GRILLING</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>DRESS AND FILLET A FISH</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VEGETABLES</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BLANCHE VEGETABLES</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PAR COOK VEGETABLES</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MAKE TOMATO CONCASE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PREP BROCOLLI</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PEEL PEPPERS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FLUTE A MUSHROOM</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STARCHES</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MASH POTATOES</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MAKE RICE PILAF</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MAKE AND COOK PASTA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MEASURE AND WEIGH INGREDIENTS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Concepts and Issues</th>
<th>Assessment Task</th>
<th>Assessed by</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Student Works safely in the lab, and accident prevention studied in FSER 21 Sanitation.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The student applies and demonstrates all principles and theories from sanitation. EX.Cleaning, sanitizing, HACCP, FIFO, Prevent time and temperature abuse.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The student can demonstrate organization of food items within all stations of the kitchen (Mise en place)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student maintains a positive mental attitude and practices alignment with our four values. Education, Passion, Respect, and Safety.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Concepts and Issues</th>
<th>Assessment Task</th>
<th>Assessed by</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Student works together with instructors, classmates and our customers to develop “Team work.”</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student understands and practices</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
good personal hygiene, and adhere to established dress code.

Student uses correct recipe formats

Student able to do menu research and development.

Student understands and applies food costing to luncheon

Student is competent with care and use of knives, tools, equipment, and materials.

Student able to convert a recipe to a smaller or larger yield.

Student able to identify primal cuts for beef, veal, lamb, and pork, grades of meat, meat inspection laws. Determine appropriate cooking methods for tender and less tender cuts of meat.

Student must know classifications of poultry/fowl, and the preparation and serving techniques for chicken, game hen, and turkey.

Student understands the identification and classification of finfish and shellfish. Emphasis on Hawaiian types include trends and quality preparation techniques.

Student keeps a note book with all handouts, culinary definitions and all luncheons arrange by course

**Intended learning Outcomes**

At the completion of this class the student should be able to perform the following “out there”

1. Plan and execute a complete four-course luncheon with course objectives. Soup, salad, entrée with one of the 5 mother sauces, dessert.
2. Exhibit a courteous attitude with teamwork.
3. Develop proper personal hygiene.
4. Demonstrates proper use, care and maintenance of knives, tools, and equipment.
5. Demonstrate all skills listed above.
6. Student understands and able to identify, classify, grade and prepare Finfish, shellfish, poultry, beef, pork, veal, lamb

7. Compile all information in an arranged notebook for future reference and usage “out there”

FSER: 50 Fundamentals Cookery

P.H. 4/23/04

Appendix #7

Division of Nursing and Allied Health

Nursing and Allied Health has developed Program SLOs for the Associate of Science and Practical Nursing Programs. This follows the established Graduate Outcomes for the two programs. The CHO program has program competencies. Since we have course objectives as well as extensive unit objectives for each nursing course we have not yet done course SLO’s. We have mapped all of our programs but they are not in electronic format. We have discussed assessment strategies for the program SLOs.

Hawai‘i Community College
Division of Nursing and Allied Health
Associate of Science Nursing Program
Student Learning Outcomes

1. The graduate will use critical thinking to plan and deliver safe, effective nursing care to individuals and families in all stages of life.

2. The graduate will take into consideration cultural values, health beliefs and healing practices of individuals, families and communities when providing nursing care.

3. The graduate will be able to integrate and apply nursing knowledge in order to practice safe, effective nursing care in a variety of health care settings.
4. The graduate will communicate effectively.

5. The graduate’s practice of nursing will demonstrate caring and compassion.

6. The graduate will be able to work as a member of a health care team to provide comprehensive care.

7. The graduate will be able to use technology in the provision of effective nursing care.

8. The graduate will practice within the legal and ethical framework of registered professional nursing.

9. The graduate will assume responsibility for ongoing professional growth and life-long learning.

Appendix #8

ENGLISH 20W FINAL EXAMINATION SPRING 2005

DIRECTIONS:

1. Choose ONE of the topics below and write a clear and correct paragraph of at least fifteen sentences and about 200 words. This covers about one page if you do not skip lines and about two pages if you do. Skipping lines is optional.

2. Write the number of your topic at the top of your paper.

3. Use pen only.

4. Proofread your paragraph carefully before you turn it in.

5. You may use two hours if necessary. You may leave early if you have finished and have carefully checked your paper, but you should not leave before one hour has passed.

6. **DO NOT** write your name on your paper. When you turn in your exam, identify yourself to the proctor by presenting your picture I.D.
7. Leave the exam and the questions with the proctor.

TOPICS: CHOOSE ONE.

1. Identify and describe three customs of Hawai‘i.

2. Identify and describe three favorite activities that you enjoy with your pet.

3. Many classes at Hawai‘i Community College require that students work in groups from time to time. Explain several advantages and/or disadvantages of participating in group work in college classes.

4. Our parents have a strong impact on the way we see the world. Explain three ways your parents have significantly influenced your outlook on life.

ENGLISH 22    FINAL EXAMINATION    SPRING 2005

DIRECTIONS:

1. Choose ONE of the topics below and write a clear and correct paragraph, or short essay, of at least twenty sentences and about 300 words. This covers about one and one-half pages if you do not skip lines and about three pages if you do. Skipping lines is optional.

2. Write the number of your topic at the top of your paper.

3. Use pen only.

4. Proofread your paragraph carefully before you turn it in.

5. You may use two hours if necessary. You may leave early if you have finished and have carefully checked your paper, but you should not leave before one hour has passed.

6. DO NOT write your name on your paper. When you turn in your exam, identify yourself to the proctor by presenting your picture I.D.

7. Leave the exam and the questions with the proctor.

TOPICS: CHOOSE ONE.
1. Classify people that you know into three distinctive personality types.

2. Contemplate two houses that you frequently visit. Compare or contrast these two houses or the families that inhabit them.

3. Owning a home has many benefits, but home ownership may cause problems. Discuss some of the negative effects of owning a home.

4. Most teachers believe that attendance is an important part of class performance, but sometimes students disagree. How important should attendance be in determining the grade in a college class? State your position and explain your reasons in detail.

5. Divide the music you listen to or the TV programs you watch into three categories. Describe the categories and give examples to help the reader visualize each category.

Appendix #9

HAWAI’I COMMUNITY COLLEGE

ENG 20W/22 and ESL 11/13/15 FINAL EXAMINATION POLICIES

PROCEDURES:

1. All students in each course take the same final examination, given at a specially scheduled day and time before other exams begin. No late exams are given. Students who are unable to take the exam at the scheduled time must make arrangements with their instructors prior to exam day.

2. Students should bring two pens and a dictionary to the exam. Students may also bring a thesaurus. Paper will be provided. No other materials are permitted.

3. Students must present a photo ID, such as a driver’s license or HawCC ID, to get their exam number.

4. To review their exams, students should see their instructors.

GRADING POLICIES:

1. Exams are graded “Pass” or “Fail” by writing instructors at a group grading session. No letter grades are assigned, but the quality of the exam plays an important part in the course grade.

2. A grade of “Pass” usually means that the student will receive the letter grade earned in the course to that point. An excellent exam, however, may raise a student’s class average.
3. A grade of “Fail” lowers a student’s class average by one full letter grade or more. If writing instructors as a group determine that an exam is seriously deficient, the student will receive no higher than a “D” for the course. A grade of “D” means that the student is not eligible to proceed to the next writing course in the sequence.

4. Not taking the exam earns a grade of “Fail” and means that a student will receive no higher than a “D” for the course except in highly unusual circumstances.

Appendix #10

DEVELOPING THE FOREST TEAM CURRICULUM
In November, 1998, thirteen participating Community Colleges, government agencies and private organizations met and went through the DACUM (Developing a Curriculum) process. This effort provided a detailed basis of the course content needed for the Pacific Tropical Forest Resource Technician.

The DACUM meeting was held during the preparation of the Preliminary ATE Grant Proposal, and was based on the assumption that the Formal Grant Proposal would include a Community College Trade and Industry (A.A.S.) Certificate. The A.A.S. degree is specifically aimed at non-transfer level technical training, and is ideally suited for the Pacific Tropical Forest Resource Technician program developed in the DACUM. However, funding for the A.A.S. program will not be available in the Pilot Program recommended by the NSF. The decision to develop the A.S. program as the Pilot Program was based on the current faculty and course availability at Hawai‘i Community College. The pilot curriculum being proposed for the Certificate in Agroforestry and Ecosystem Management Technician will include most of the topics in the following DACUM curriculum. I have indicated after each of the subject categories in the DACUM curriculum the topics that will be included in the Agroforestry and Ecosystem Management Certificate program.

Following implementation of the Pilot A.S. Certificate program, it is intended that further funding will be sought to develop the A.A.S. Certificate for the Pacific Tropical Forest Resource Technician. The P.I. for the current proposal will work closely with Hawai‘i C.C. Agriculture faculty members to develop courses that will be used both in the current proposal and in the future development of the A.A.S. Certificate.

The Pacific Tropical Forest Technician [and the Technician in Agroforestry and Forestry Ecosystem Management] assists in planning, implementing and monitoring ecologically sound forest management activities to optimize health, productivity and sustainability.

Category A Apply basic ecosystem concepts to Natural Resources

All of the topics in this category will be covered in courses in the proposed A.S. Certificate in Agroforestry and Forest Ecosystem Management Technician.

A.1. Acquire knowledge of forest ecology in Hawai‘i.
A.2. Use keys to identify native and introduced plants and animals.
A.6. Demonstrate awareness of wildlife population dynamics.
A.7. Demonstrate knowledge of natural cycles such as water, carbon, minerals, etc.
A.8. Understand unique Pacific island ecosystems.
A.9. Acquire knowledge of natural disturbances such as hurricanes, volcanoes, and fires.
A.11. Acquire basic knowledge of hydrology.
A.13. Be familiar with water quality and chemistry.
Hawai'i Community College Progress Report, 10/15/05

A.14. Understand habitat for aquatic animals.
A.15. Be familiar with the geography of the Pacific Islands.
A.16. Identify wetlands properties.
A.17. Understand edges and corridors.
A.18. Conduct an environmental assessment for a specific site.
A.19. Understand volcanic geology.

Category B   Understand general science concepts.

   All of these general science concepts will be covered in the proposed curriculum, as part of
   the General Science Core requirements and the elective courses.

   B.1. Complete core courses in science and math.
        Science to include ecology and either botany or zoology.
   B.2. Apply simple experimental designs.
   B.3. Analyze simple experimental data.

Category C   Understand environmental laws and regulations

   All of the following topics will be covered in the Introduction to Environmental Science
   and the Ecosystem Management courses. Some will also be covered in the General Education
   Core Social Science courses.

   C.1. Identify applicable regulations.
   C.2. Comply with regulations.
   C.3. Keep current on laws and regulations.
   C.4. Communicate with regulatory agencies and/or supervisor.
   C.5. Apply chemicals in a safe and appropriate manner.
   C.7. Be aware of listed species.
   C.8. Understand the effects of manipulation on species composition.
   C.10. Know coastal zone management law.
   C.11. Understand special protection zones.
   C.12. Be familiar with access use of land.
   C.13. Be aware of jurisdictional rights.
   C.14. Understand how rules are made and amended.
   C.15. Know agencies and their responsibilities.
   C.17. Know reasons for ordinances and the political ramifications.
   C.18. Understand how things get listed i.e. endangered species act.
Category D  Apply effective interpersonal and communication skills

These topics will be covered in the Core Requirements in the Communications, Social Science and Natural Science courses. The GIS and Ecosystem Management courses will also cover some of these topics.

D.1. Demonstrate leadership skills.
D.2. Be able to write reports, correspondences, etc.
D.3. Be able to diffuse personnel conflicts.
D.5. Give effective oral presentations.
D.6. Demonstrate computer literacy.
D.7. Write a management plan.

Category E  Recognize, collect and interpret field data

These topics will be covered in the Forest Survey, GIS and Ecosystem Management courses.

E.1. Inventory natural resources.
E.2. Demonstrate survey techniques.
   a. Must include land survey, GPS aerial photo interpretation, data loggers, and assorted
   survey equipment
E.3. Use GIS and other modeling programs in field analyses.
E.4. Interpret GIS and other modeling programs in field analyses.
E.5. Identify cultural and archaeological resources.
E.6. Produce reports on data analysis (both oral and written).
E.7. Analyze and summarize data.
E.8. Knowledge of field identification methods of plants and animals
E.10. Conduct an environmental assessment for a specific site.
E.11. Conduct property title search and tax map key search.
E.12. Review aerial photos and stereo photo interpretations.
E.13. Interpret topographical maps, flood plain maps, and volcanic hazard maps.

Category F  Understand commercial and conservation forest management practices

Most of these topics will be covered in the Agroforestry, Forest Survey and Ecosystem Management courses in the proposed curriculum.

F.1. Demonstrate general business skills and principles of natural resource economics.
F.4. Know integrated pest management.
F.6. Be familiar with mensuration and inventory management.
F.7. Understand restoration of dryland forests.
F.8. Practice silviculture.
F.11. Know coastal management issues and impacts of island upland practices.
F.21. Understand the issue of biodiversity.
F.22. Prepare and write a conservation plan for a specific parcel of land.
F.23. Know recreational uses of land.
F.24. Know public uses of facilities.
F.25. Be aware of tropical agroforestry practices.

Appendix #11
## Admissions & Registration Program Review Data Gathering

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Goal</th>
<th>How to Measure</th>
<th>Where Data Can Be Found</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>ADMISSIONS</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Actively participate in student recruitment</td>
<td># of school visits</td>
<td>Information Center</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOP for Admissions</td>
<td>when pau, pau</td>
<td>on my desk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Review and revise forms</td>
<td>track revisions and #s used</td>
<td>archives; BANNER</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Review and revise publications</td>
<td>track revisions</td>
<td>old catalogs, revision to website</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Review and revise Kama'aina</td>
<td>track revisions</td>
<td>Information Center; Records</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Streamline IEP-HawCC</td>
<td>when pau, pau</td>
<td>IEP and HawCC Admissions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Process applications in a timely manner</td>
<td>date applied/date accepted</td>
<td>BANNER PopSelect</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Implementation of Online applications</td>
<td>when pau, pau</td>
<td>actual application</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adequate training re: F1</td>
<td>conferences, mtgs, etc</td>
<td>personnel history, mtg minutes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Keep informed USCIS/ICE and SEVIS</td>
<td>conferences, mtgs, etc</td>
<td>personnel history, mtg minutes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>On-going staff training re: customer service</td>
<td>orientation, mtgs</td>
<td>orientation packet, mtg minutes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>REGISTRATION</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Info and training to faculty to eliminate green cards</td>
<td>scheduled training; # green cards submitted</td>
<td>schedule of trainings; add/drop boxes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOP for Registration</td>
<td>when pau, pau</td>
<td>on my desk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Review and revise forms</td>
<td>track revisions and #s used</td>
<td>archives; BANNER</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Review and revise publications</td>
<td>track revisions</td>
<td>old catalogs, revision to website</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increase utilization of online registration</td>
<td>add/drop forms; # registered</td>
<td>add/drop forms; # registered</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adequate training re: F1</td>
<td>conferences, mtgs, etc</td>
<td>personnel history, mtg minutes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Keep informed USCIS/ICE and SEVIS</td>
<td>conferences, mtgs, etc</td>
<td>personnel history, mtg minutes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>On-going staff training re: customer service</td>
<td>orientation, mtgs</td>
<td>orientation packet, mtg minutes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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**Liberal Arts Student Learning Outcomes**

Draft from 11/22-23/04 Ruth Stiehl Workshop

1. **Critical/Constructive Thinking:**
   Think and act out of intellectual insights and integrity.

2. **Communication:**
   Use computation, language and technology skills to participate fully in helping to resolve local and global issues.

3. **Work Pathways:**
   Assess personal passions and natural abilities to envision lifework opportunities and plan for further educational pathways.

4. **Life Systems:**
   Participate within social and physical (natural) systems in ways that honor and sustain the integrity of “life” systems.

5. **Creativity:**
   Use an ever-increasing awareness of self, others, and natural environments to produce unique ideas, works and solutions—creating new life on an old foundation.

6. **Leadership:**
   Engage persons across the whole community in working collectively to advance shared goals while continuing to celebrate who they are and where they come from.

7. **Care of Self and Others:**
   Engage in a growing awareness of self throughout life, developing and maintaining personal relationships, and caring for self and others within our community.

---

**LIBERAL ARTS PROGRAM STUDENT LEARNING OUTCOMES**

Draft as of 4/4/05

The Liberal Arts Program, which offers the Associate in Arts degree, prepares students for roles as continuing students, family members, employees, and citizens of local and global communities. We envision graduates able to achieve the following Student Learning Outcomes:

1. **Critical and Creative Thinking:**
Think and act out of intellectual insight and integrity. Gather, analyze, and evaluate information. Pose questions, synthesize ideas, solve problems, and reach logical conclusions. Create new ideas and works that express individuality.

2. **Communication:**
   Discover, construct and communicate meaning through observing, listening, speaking, reading, writing, and interactions.

3. **Mathematical and Scientific Reasoning:**
   Apply mathematical reasoning and scientific methods to solve problems.

4. **Historical Perspective:**
   Evaluate historical perspectives to inform present thought and influence future action.

5. **Integration and Application of Knowledge:**
   Use information, ideas, and methods from diverse disciplines to enhance intellectual, aesthetic, professional, and community life.

6. **Leadership:**
   Engage persons across the whole community in working collaboratively to advance shared goals.

7. **Values and Ethics:**
   Make informed and principled decisions with respect to individual conduct, the community, and the environment. Respect social, ethnic, and cultural diversity.

8. **Life Systems:**
   Demonstrate commitment to social and natural systems in ways that honor and sustain the integrity of life.
Report on the Substantive Change Request
Related to the System Reorganization
And Other Commission Recommendations

Background

As part of a university system administrative reorganization, the University of Hawai‘i Board Of Regents received a proposal in November 2002 that included the elimination of the Office of the Chancellor for Community Colleges. This reorganization proposal was approved by the BOR in December 2002 and approved by the ACCJC through its Substantive Change approval process in April 2003.

As part of the action approving the reorganization, the ACCJC requested a series of reports (August 1, 2003; November 1, 2003; April 1, 2004; November 1, 2004; and April 1, 2005) detailing various aspects of the implementation of the reorganization. In January 2005, the Commission placed six of the seven colleges on warning because of concerns expressed over system level governance issues and inconsistent development of program review and assessment policies and practices. In June 2005, the Commission removed four colleges from warning status. Those colleges remaining on warning were asked to submit progress reports on campus specific concerns and all campuses were asked to submit a report by October 15, 2005 that describes system progress on recommendations related to program review and assessment, system organization, and Board governance.

As detailed below, in June 2005 the University of Hawai‘i Board of Regents approved a reorganization of the community colleges, including the creation of a Vice-President of Community Colleges and the re-consolidation of the academic and administrative support units for the community colleges.

Responses to Commission Recommendations

2. The Team recommends that the University of Hawaii Community Colleges develop policies and procedures to ensure:
   • That the community colleges engage in regular assessment of institutional effectiveness, including program review;
   • That the community college system as well as each college set priorities for implementing plans for improvement that are based in analysis of research data;
   • That the colleges and the UHCC system incorporate these priorities into resource distribution processes and decisions;
   • That the colleges and the UHCC system develop and employ a methodology for assessing overall institutional effectiveness and progress toward meeting goals expressed through plans for improvements; and
   • That the colleges and the UHCC system report regularly to internal constituencies and the Board on this progress. (Standards I.B., II A. 1, and 2., II.B.3.a., II B, 4., II. C.1.e and II.C.2; III.A.6., III.B.2.b., III. C.1. and 2., III.D.1.a, IV.B.2.b, and the Preamble to the Standards)
In addition to continued improvements on each campus, the following system-wide actions have taken place to ensure an integrated approach to regular assessment, including program review, and subsequent use of this assessment information in planning and resource distribution:

a. On August 4, 2005, the Chancellors of all seven colleges adopted a recommendation from the chief academic officers that established common measures for academic program review. While colleges can expand on these measures for planning and resource allocation questions at the college level, the common information, including common data definition and source, will provide a comparative baseline of data for system-level decisions. On September 8, 2005, the Chancellors adopted common measures for all administrative and student services programs. Following the process used for the self study demographic information and achievement data (DIAD) template, the IR Cadre can identify, define, and tailor data requirements from system IRO products which meet standards of good evidence.

b. The previously agreed upon principles related to program review (see the April 1, 2005, progress report) and the common measures identified above were promulgated as community college system policy and procedures on September 15, 2005. A copy of the policy and procedures, including the common measures, is included in Attachment 1.

c. A high priority item was included in the community colleges supplemental budget request for consideration by the Board of Regents and subsequently the State Legislature. The budget request, if approved, would strengthen the staff supporting program review and assessment at the colleges and also create a program improvement fund that could facilitate continuous quality improvement as identified in program review and planning. A copy of the budget request is included as Attachment 2.

d. Work continues on creating a web-based access system for the program review and planning information so that all interested parties may review the assessment results of each program.

e. Work continues with the University system Institutional Research Office to create a more responsive environment for consistent, regular, and timely reports as well as ad hoc data query and for better business intelligence using data warehouses for student, faculty, and financial information.

f. Through the Board’s newly expanded community college committee, the Board of Regents will receive a regular briefing on program review and assessment, as well as on related program improvement plans and budget requests. More details are provided below in the response to Recommendation 7.

6. The UH Community Colleges and the University of Hawaii System should identify more clearly the community college system functions and authority assigned to the two Associate Vice President offices and staff, and communicate those to the colleges and
the University System-wide Support. Both organizations must then design workflow and decision-making processes that allow the Community College System-wide Support staff to provide support and delegated authority in areas of academic planning, administrative (including personnel) and fiscal operations. (Standards IV A.5, III A.3, 1B)

In the April 1, 2005, progress report; several alternative organizational models were under consideration. After further discussion and consultation, the Board of Regents on June 21, 2005 approved a reorganization of the community colleges. Key elements of the reorganization include:

a. The creation of a new position of Vice-President for Community Colleges within the University of Hawai‘i system organization. The Vice-President is responsible for system governance and advocacy for the community colleges.

b. Realignment of the system community college support functions so that they now report to the new Vice-President for Community Colleges. Michael Rota, Associate Vice-President for Academic Affairs, and Michael Unebasami, Associate Vice-President for Administrative Affairs, and their respective staff report to the Vice-President for Community Colleges and are totally committed to community college support.

c. The retention by the college CEOs of the title and authority of Chancellors with respect to college based operations. The Chancellors continue to meet and participate in the University-wide Council of Chancellors as well as the Council of Community College Chancellors and have a dual reporting relationship to the Vice-President for Community Colleges for community college matters and to the President of the University for matters of University wide concern. The structure is designed to ensure that the Chancellors have the appropriate authority as CEOs of accredited colleges while maintaining the system governance structure to assure policy and planning coherence and equitable resource allocation within the system of community colleges.

The reorganization proposal, as approved by the Board of Regents, is included as Attachment 3.

On July 23, 2005 the Board of Regents appointed John Morton, formerly Chancellor of Kapi‘olani Community College, as interim Vice-President for Community Colleges. Vice-President Morton and his staff are working with both colleges and University system personnel to establish clear reporting lines and levels of authority and responsibility for both the system staff and the colleges.

7. The UH Community Colleges should identify and implement the means to ensure that the Community College governance system at the system head and board levels meets accreditation standards by developing and implementing policies and processes that ensure the quality, integrity, and effectiveness of the student learning programs and services. (Standards IV B, all)
The standards established by the Accrediting Association for Community and Junior Colleges (ACCJC) require a degree of engagement and familiarity by the BOR with the issues and operations of the community colleges that were not adequately met through the current BOR structure. At its September 16, 2005 meeting, the BOR enlarged the community college committee and clarified its duties to allow the BOR to address these standards without impacting the other business of the BOR in its governance of the University system and the baccalaureate campuses. The new committee has the following characteristics:

**Membership**

The committee consists of six members, including each of the four neighbor island BOR members and two members appointed from O‘ahu. This membership ensures that all community colleges are represented by Regents from their respective islands on the committee.

**Frequency of meetings**

The committee will have quarterly meetings independent of the regular BOR meetings, although the community college meeting might precede the regular BOR meeting. The meetings will be of sufficient length in a workshop format to allow an in-depth exploration of the issues.

**Meeting Agenda**

- **Meeting 1**, to be held in September or October of each year, will focus on the broad community college mission and the degree to which the community colleges are meeting that mission. The focus topics will include access, workforce development, baccalaureate transfer, and engagement with the local communities. To the degree that new BOR members are appointed to the community college committee, this first meeting each year will also serve as an orientation for those members.

- **Meeting 2**, to be held in November or December, will focus on the financial health of the community colleges including, all sources of funds and financial aid for students.

- **Meeting 3**, to be held in February, will focus on program review and assessment results. Given the large number of programs across the seven campuses, the program review discussion will focus on those programs that were most successful and those programs that were most likely to be stopped out, terminated, or significantly modified.

- **Meeting 4**, to be held in April or May, will focus on planning issues for the upcoming year. The discussion will also focus on major initiatives and budget-related proposals.

**Meeting Location**
The meetings will rotate among the campuses so that in a two-year period, all campuses, including both the East and West Hawai‘i sites, will host the meeting. Time will be devoted to acquainting the committee members with local campus facilities and/or program issues.

Relationship to Regular Monthly Board Meetings

The committee meetings are intended to provide in-depth understanding and discussion with BOR members about the issues and directions of the community colleges. The intention is not to create an additional layer of approval authority for transactions. Regular transactional items would not come to the committee but rather would be processed through normal BOR monthly meetings.

The Vice-President for Community Colleges will serve as liaison to the BOR Community College Committee to communicate significant issues that emerge between the regularly scheduled meetings, to inform the BOR of significant accomplishments of community college faculty and/or students, and to respond to any inquiries from the BOR related to community college matters.

The first meeting of the new community college committee is scheduled to take place within the next fifty days.
SUBJECT: Review of Established Programs

1. Purpose

Program reviews are intended to provide a regular assessment of the effectiveness of degree programs, of significant non-credit programs, of areas of major curricular emphasis, and of major educational and administrative support functions. Program reviews are conducted by the faculty and staff in the program, based on agreed upon measures and program plans. Program reviews provide for assessment of student learning, program demand and efficiency, analysis of external factors impacting a program, and assessment of planned program improvements. Program review results shall be used for decisions relating to program improvement, program modification, and/or program termination.

2. Related University Policies

   a. Board of Regents Policy, Section 5-1.b Review of Established Programs  
      www.hawaii.edu/offices/bor/policy/borpch5.pdf
   
   b. University of Hawai`i Systemwide Executive Policy, E5.202 Review of Established Programs  
      www.hawaii.edu/apis/ep/e5/e5202.pdf

3. Policy Objective

This policy establishes a coordinated program review process within each College and across the Community College System that meets the requirements of the University Board of Regents and Executive policies, external mandates such as those required by the Federal Carl Perkins Act of 1998, and the standards of good practice established by program and regional accrediting bodies.

4. Required Elements of the Program Review

All Colleges shall develop program review policies and processes that comply with the following principles:

   a. Each instructional and non-instructional program shall undergo a comprehensive review at least once every five years.
   
   b. Program reviews shall result in improvement plans that are linked to the College strategic plan.
c. There shall be an annual report of program data which is analyzed, reviewed, and, where appropriate, reflected in updated action plans.

d. There shall be an overarching commitment to continuous quality improvement.

e. The program review process shall be collegial.

f. Program review information shall be publicly available.

g. Comparable measures shall be used consistently across Colleges.

h. Program reviews and resulting plans for improvement shall be used in decisions regarding resource allocation at the College and System level.

4. Programs Subject to Review

The following programs are subject to the program review policy:

a) All Board of Regents approved credit degree and certificate granting programs. Program reviews for degree granting programs should incorporate reviews of all related certificates and non-credit programs, and student service support.

b) All non-credit programs where the scope of the program is comparable to a credit degree or certificate granting program and where the program is not otherwise incorporated in the review of a degree granting program.

d) All educational and administrative support programs.

c) Any cross-curricular emphases or special programs that have been designated by the College as a significant component of the general education or strategic direction of the College.

5. Frequency of Program Reviews

All programs shall prepare annual reports documenting performance on agreed upon outcomes, key benchmarks, critical external factors, and planning improvements. All programs shall complete a comprehensive assessment at least once each five years in accordance with the schedule established by the College. If a program has completed a comprehensive self-assessment for the purposes of program accreditation within two years of the program review cycle, the results of the accreditation self-study may substitute for the comprehensive program review.

6. Content of Program Review

Program reviews shall include the following components:

a. Statement on the mission or purpose of the program, including the target student population
b. Information on external factors affecting the program

c. Historical trend data on key measures

d. Program health indicators with benchmarks to provide a quick view on the overall condition of the program

e. Required external measures

f. Analysis of the outcomes over the period of the review, including an assessment related to progress in achieving planned improvements

g. Recommendations for improvement or action to be incorporated into the unit plan or the College’s next strategic plan.

7. Dissemination of Program Reviews

The Office of the Associate Vice President for Academic Affairs shall compile an annual report of program reviews summarizing the reports completed and significant actions or issues identified in the reports. The Vice President for Community Colleges will report the results of the program reviews to the Community College Committee of the Board of Regents.

The program reviews and the annual summary shall be made available to the Community Colleges’ community and the general public through a public web site.

8. Assessment of the Program Review Process

Under the management of the Community Colleges' Director of Academic Planning, Assessment, and Policy Analysis, the established Community College System deans and/or directors groups are responsible for assessing the effectiveness of the system Program Review Process and to recommend changes to improve the outcomes of the process.

At the conclusion of each year, each established system vice chancellors/deans and/or directors group will review the measures and content of the program review in their respective area to ensure that the review provides the information necessary for program assessment and improvement.

At the conclusion of each program review cycle, each established system vice chancellors/deans and/or directors group will conduct an assessment of the overall program review policy and procedures to determine if improvements are necessary.

9. Annual Program Review Procedures

Within the principles outlined in Section 3, each College shall establish and operate its own program review process, each College is free to supplement the Community Colleges System agreed upon common set of program review data elements, and each College shall make available to the Community College System, summary data and analysis on a timely manner to facilitate the annual report to the Board of Regents.
Details regarding the common data elements, summary reporting formats, and timetables will be established separately for instructional programs, academic support programs, student services programs, and institutional support programs. The procedures and common measures for each may be found at the following Web sites:

**Instructional Programs** (Attachments 1-A & 1-B)  (www.hawaii.edu/???)

**Academic Support Programs** (Attachment 2)  (www.hawaii.edu/???)

**Student Services Programs** (Attachment 3)  (www.hawaii.edu/???)

**Administrative Services Programs** (Attachment 4)  (www.hawaii.edu/???)
Hawai‘i Community Colleges

Instructional Program Review Procedures and Measures

Associate in XXXX Degree

Assessment Period: (e.g. 2002-2005)

College Mission Statement

Program Mission Statement

Part I. Executive Summary of Program Status
Response to previous program review recommendations

Part II. Program Description
History
Program goals/Occupations for which this program prepares students
Program SLOs
Admission requirements
Credentials, licensures offered
Faculty and staff
Resources
Articulation agreements
Community connections, advisory committees, Internships, Coops, DOE connections
Distance delivered/off campus programs, if applicable

Part III. Quantitative Indicators for Program Review

Demand/Efficiency

1. Current and projected positions in the occupation (for CTE programs)
2. Annual new positions in the State (for CTE programs)
3. Number of applicants
4. Number of majors
5. Student semester hours for program majors in all program classes
6. Student Semester Hours for all program classes.
7. FTE program enrollment
8. Number of classes taught
9. Average class size
10. Class fill rate
11. FTE of BOR appointed program faculty
12. Semester credits taught by lecturers
13. Percent of classes taught by lecturers
14. FTE workload (Credits taught / full teaching load.)
   Note: Full teaching load is generally defined as 27 or 21 credits depending on
   program
15. Major per FTE faculty
16. Number of degree/certificates awarded in previous year by major
17. Cost of program per student major
18. Cost per SSH
19. Determination of program’s health based on demand and efficiency (Healthy, Cautionary, Unhealthy)

Outcomes
1. Attainment of student educational goals
2. Persistence of majors fall to spring
3. Graduation rate
4. Transfer rates
5. Success at another UH campus (based on GPA)
6. Licensure information where applicable
7. Perkins core indicators for CTE programs
8. Determination of program’s health based on outcomes (Healthy, Cautionary, Unhealthy)

Part IV. Assessment Results Chart for Program SLOs (3-5 year trend)
   Changes made as a result of findings

Part V. Curriculum Revision and Review
   (Minimum of 20% of existing courses are to be reviewed each year.)

Part VI. Survey results
1. Student satisfaction
2. Occupational placement in jobs (for CTE programs)
3. Employer satisfaction (for CTE programs)
4. Graduate/Leaver (for CTE programs)

Part VII. Analysis of Program
   Alignment with mission
   Strengths and weaknesses based on analysis of data
   Evidence of quality
   Evidence of student learning
   Resource sufficiency
   Recommendations for improving outcomes

Part VIII. Action Plan

Part IX. Budget implications
HAWAI’I COMMUNITY COLLEGES

ANNUAL INSTRUCTIONAL ASSESSMENT PROCEDURES AND MEASURES

Associate in XXXX Degree

College Mission Statement:

Program Mission Statement:

Part I. Quantitative Indicators for Program Review

Demand/Efficiency

1. Current and projected positions in the occupation (for CTE programs)
2. Annual new positions in the State (for CTE programs)
3. Number of applicants
4. Number of majors
5. Student semester hours for program majors in all program classes
6. Student Semester Hours for all program classes.
7. FTE program enrollment
8. Number of classes taught
9. Average class size
10. Class fill rate
11. FTE of BOR appointed program faculty
12. Semester credits taught by lecturers
13. Percent of classes taught by lecturers
14. FTE workload (Credits taught / full teaching load.)
   Note: Full teaching load is generally defined as 27 or 21 credits depending on program
15. Major per FTE faculty
16. Number of degree/certificates awarded in previous year by major
17. Cost of program per student major
18. Cost per SSH
19. Determination of program’s health based on demand and efficiency (Healthy, Cautionary, Unhealthy)

Outcomes
1. Attainment of student educational goals
2. Persistence of majors fall to spring
3. Graduation rate
4. Transfer rates
5. Success at another UH campus (based on GPA)
6. Licensure information where applicable
7. Perkins core indicators for CTE programs
8. Determination of program's health based on outcomes (Healthy, Cautionary, Unhealthy)

Part II. Assessment Results for Program Student Learning Outcomes (SLO)

Part III. Curriculum Revision
Courses reviewed/revised for currency, accuracy, integrity

Part III. Analysis of data
Alignment with mission
Strengths and weaknesses based on analysis of data
Evidence of quality
Evidence of student learning
Resource sufficiency
Recommendations for improving outcomes

Part IV. Action plan

Part V. Budget implications
HAWAI’I COMMUNITY COLLEGES

ACADEMIC SUPPORT SERVICES
PROGRAM REVIEW PROCEEDURES AND MEASURES

(IN PROGRESS)
HAWAI‘I COMMUNITY COLLEGES

STUDENT SUPPORT SERVICES
PROGRAM REVIEW PROCEDURES AND MEASURES

College Mission Statement

Program Mission Statement

Part I. Summary of Student Services with emphasis on particular program being reviewed

Part II. Mission, Purpose and Goals of the Sub-Programs

- Admissions and Orientation
- Registration and Records
- Counseling and Academic Advising
- Financial Aid
- Student Life
- Student Health Services
- Job Preparation Services

Part III. Quantitative Indicators for Program Review

Goal: Matriculation Services/Student Access

Measures:
1. Percentage of gender/ethnicity distribution compared to the population of the State
2. Number and percent of degree/certificate seekers based on intent
3. Percent of resident/non-resident breakdown
4. Percent of students receiving financial aid
5. Annual headcount trends
6. Percent of Applicants who enroll within one year

Goal: Retention Services/Student Progress

Measures:
1. Number and percent of students who report that Counselors helped them achieve or make progress toward their goal (CCSSE)
2. Average time for a student to complete degree
3. The percentage of first time students receiving orientation services (content to be defined)

Goal: Transition Services/Student Success

Measures:
1. The number and percentage of students who transfer to a four year institution having earned a degree
2. The number and percentage of students who transfer to a four year institution without a degree
3. The number and percentage of students who receive a degree or certificate

Goal: Quality Resources and Services/Student Experience
Measures:
1. Number of counselors per FTE student by demand/need
2. Number of enrollment services staff per FTE student
3. Average processing time per student request for service transactions
4. Number and percentage of students who are active in Registered Independent Organizations (RIOs) and Chartered Student Organizations (CSOs)

Part IV. Assessment Results – establish benchmarks
1. COMPASS placement scores distribution
2. Quantitative indicators
3. Qualitative indicators
4. Survey and other data sources
5. Student Satisfaction Surveys (use national survey and compare average rates)

Part V. Analysis of Program

Part VI. Plan for Improvement

Part VII. Budget Implications
I. Administrative Services Mission Statement

Administrative support services at each campus provide campus-wide executive leadership, budgetary and financial management, personnel administration, procurement and property management, facilities and grounds maintenance, security, physical facilities planning of both repairs and maintenance and capital improvement projects, and auxiliary services. Under the direction of the Vice President for Community Colleges, the University of Hawai‘i Community College systemwide administrative affairs unit directly coordinates, supports, and assists the community college campuses in policy formulation; budgeting, planning and coordination; budget execution and the effective use of available resources; organizational management and position control; human resources; facilities planning; and other administrative, logistical and technical services.

The campus and systemwide administrative services units support the primary program objectives of the Community Colleges, which are to develop eligible individuals to higher levels of intellectual, personal, social, and vocational competency by providing formal vocational and technical training and general academic instruction for certificates or degrees, or in preparation for the baccalaureate; and by offering adult continuing education for both personal and vocational purposes. The administrative services units directly support the academic mission of providing quality educational and related services to the students and the communities.

II. Strategic Plan Goals and Objectives & Campus Program Review Relationships

III. Program Review of Individual Administrative Services Units

- Description
- Analysis:
  - Measurements/Outcomes/Surveys
  - Workload/Efficiency
- Future Direction - Plan of Action

A. Budget & Planning measurements (Standard, comparable measures across campuses – CCBPO collection and distribution of data):

1. Fall and Spring Credit Headcount Enrollment
2. Fall and Spring Credit FTE Enrollment
3. General Fund + Tuition and Fee Special Fund (TFSF) Expenditure & Encumbrances (E&E)
4. Ratio of General Fund + TFSF E&E (fiscal year) per Credit Headcount Enrollment (Fall)
5. Ratio of General Fund + TFSF E&E (fiscal year) per Credit FTE Enrollment (Fall)
6. Ratio of General Fund Appropriation + collective bargaining (fiscal year) per Credit Headcount Enrollment (Fall)
7. Ratio of General Fund Appropriation + collective bargaining (fiscal year) per Credit FTE enrollment (Fall)
8. Expenditure & Encumbrances (E&E) (fiscal year) for all Appropriated funds (General, Federal, Special, Revolving)
9. Legislative Appropriations (fiscal year) for all Appropriated funds (General, Federal, Special, Revolving)
10. Tuition and Fee Special Fund (TFSF) Revenue (fiscal year)
11. Ratio of Tuition and Fee Special Fund (TFSF) Revenue (fiscal year) per Credit FTE Enrollment (Fall)
12. Ratio of Tuition and Fee Special Fund (TFSF) Revenue (fiscal year) per Student Semester Hours (fiscal year)
13. Quarterly BLS Reports
14. BLS Reports – 3 year Comparisons
15. BLS Reserve Status Report

B. Business Office measurements (Standard, comparable measures across campuses):

1. Number of UH Purchase Orders issued (fiscal year)
2. Average number of work days required to issue UH Purchase Order
3. Average number of work days required to submit PO payment documents to UH Disbursing Office
4. Number of RCUH Purchase Orders issued (fiscal year)
5. Number of UH P-Card transactions processed (fiscal year)
6. Number of UH FMIS AFP documents issued (fiscal year)
7. Number of RCUH Direct Payment documents issued (fiscal year)
8. Number of UH Departmental Checks issued (fiscal year)
9. Average number of work days required to issue UH Dept Checks
10. Number of UH Payroll Journal Vouchers processed (fiscal year)
11. Number of RCUH Payroll Journal Vouchers (fiscal year)
12. Number of UH Non-Payroll Journal Vouchers processed (fiscal year)
13. Number of RCUH Non-Payroll Journal Vouchers processed (fiscal year)
14. Number of UH Inter-Island Travel Completion Reports processed (fiscal year)
15. Number of RCUH Inter-Island Travel Completion Reports processed (fiscal year)
16. Number of UH Out-of-State Travel Completion Reports processed (fiscal year)
17. Number of RCUH Out-of-State Travel Completion Reports processed (fiscal year)
18. Number of UH invoices outstanding and total dollar value of UH Accounts Receivables at fiscal year end
19. Business Office staff FTE (Civil Service, APT)

C. Operations and Maintenance measurements (Standard, comparable measures across campuses):

1. Number of work orders completed (fiscal year)
2. Janitor FTE
3. Ratio of Building gross square feet per Janitor FTE
4. Groundskeeper/Laborer FTE
5. Ratio of Campus acres of land per Groundskeeper/Laborer FTE
6. Building Maintenance FTE
7. Security FTE

D. Human Resources measurements (Standard, comparable measures across campuses):

1. Number of PNF Transactions processed (fiscal year)
2. Number of New Appointments processed (fiscal year)
3. Number of Lecturer PNF documents processed (fiscal year)
4. Number of Form 6 Transactions processed (fiscal year)
5. Number of Leave Cards processed (calendar year)
6. Average number of work days required to establish APT positions
7. Average number of work days to fill faculty/APT positions
8. Number of Grievances/Investigations filed (fiscal year)
9. Human Resources FTE
10. Faculty/Staff Headcount

E. EEO/AA measurements (Standard, comparable measures across campuses):

1. Number of Training and workshops presented on campus (fiscal year)
2. Number of EEO related Training and workshop sessions attended (fiscal year)
3. Utilization analysis and numeric hiring goals
4. Number of EEO complaints formally filed (fiscal year)
5. Number of campus EEO investigations, including campus initiated investigations (fiscal year)

F. Surveys – Campus determined structure and content

IV. Summary of Issues and Direction for Administrative Services
**FY 2007 SUPPLEMENTAL BUDGET**
**BUDGET ADJUSTMENT REQUEST**

DEPARTMENT: University of Hawaii  
Program ID/Org. Code: Community Colleges - UOH 800/DD  
Program Title: Community Colleges - UOH 800/DD

Department Contact: Michael Uebssami, Associate VP for Administration and CC Operations  
Phone: 956-6280  
Date Prepared: August 9, 2005

**Department Priority _____**  
**Campus Priority _____**

**Request Category:**
- GOV Priority _____
- CS Trade/Transfer (+) (-) _____
- CS Chg to Fixed/Entitlement (+) (-) _____
- Other _____
- BOR _____
- New Priority X

**Program Review / Program Improvement Fund**

Funding to directly support accreditation related program review processes at the campuses and to provide a Program Improvement Fund with flexible resources to allocate to the campuses based on the outcomes of the program review processes to ultimately improve student learning.

**I. TITLE OF REQUEST:**

Description of Request:

**II. OPERATING COST SUMMARY**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>FTE (P)</th>
<th>FTE (T)</th>
<th>Supplemental FY 07 Request ($)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A. Personal Services</td>
<td>9.25</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>1,123,243</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. Other Current Expenses</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>560,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. Equipment</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L. Current Lease Payments</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M. Motor Vehicles</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**TOTAL REQUEST**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>(9.25)</th>
<th>0.00</th>
<th>1,683,243</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

By MOF:

A (9.25) 0.00 1,683,243
### III. OPERATING COST DETAILS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MOF</th>
<th>FTE (P)</th>
<th>FTE (T)</th>
<th>Supplemental FY 07 Request ($)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>College</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty, 11 mo</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>50,092</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institutional Researcher</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>40,043</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Director of Planning</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>65,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty, 11 mo</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>50,892</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty, 11 mo</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>50,892</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institutional Researcher</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>40,043</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institutional Researcher</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>39,262</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institutional Researcher</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>39,262</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institutional Researcher</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>9,815</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic Support Sp</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>54,492</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Personal Services</td>
<td>A</td>
<td></td>
<td>500,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lecturer Replacement - 130 Credits @ 1,405</td>
<td>A</td>
<td></td>
<td>182,850</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fringe Benefits</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Turnover Savings</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subtotal Personal Service Costs</td>
<td>9.25</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>1,123,243</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>By MOF</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>9.25</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>1,123,243</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B.</td>
<td>Other Current Expenses (List by line item)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prog Improvement Fund - Others</td>
<td>A</td>
<td></td>
<td>500,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3490 Supplies &amp; Non-Inventory Equipment</td>
<td>A</td>
<td></td>
<td>60,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subtotal Other Current Expenses</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>560,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>By MOF</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>560,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C.</td>
<td>Equipment (List by line item)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subtotal Equipment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>By MOF</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L.</td>
<td>Current Lease Payments (Note each lease)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subtotal Current Lease Payments</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>By MOF</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M.</td>
<td>Motor Vehicles (List Vehicles)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subtotal Motor Vehicles</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>By MOF</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL REQUEST</td>
<td>9.25</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>1,683,243</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
IV. JUSTIFICATION OF REQUEST

The community colleges are each accredited by the Accrediting Commission for Community and Junior Colleges (ACCJC) of the Western Association of Schools and Colleges (WASC). In June 2004, the ACCJC adopted new standards for accreditation that have placed additional emphasis on the processes linked to the improvement of student learning. This has heightened the expectation that each college will have a program review process in place that looks at the performance of every program and service. This requires that each college have the capacity to collect data, analyze performance, and use the results from these processes to determine resource requirements and allocate available resources to improve student learning. In addition, the ACCJC standards call for the system level administration in multi-campus districts (the Vice President for Community Colleges within the University of Hawai‘i system) to make system-wide resource allocations on the basis of the outcomes of the campus program review processes.

Following the December 2002 reorganization of the University, the ACCJC has evaluated the ability of the UH system organization to meet its standards for a multi-campus district. In 2004, six of the seven campuses were on Warning by the ACCJC for our inability to implement a program review process at the campus and system according to their expectations. While four campuses have successfully dealt with the on-campus component of the program review and resource allocation process and thus had the Warning status removed, three campuses are under Warning over this same issue. Part of the problem continues to be our inability to develop an internal resource allocation process across the campuses that is tied to the outcomes of program review.

In the current budget appropriation process, all Legislative appropriations are earmarked for specific program activities within each of the campuses, thus restricting the ability of the system to develop a resource allocation plan based upon the outcomes of the program review process. In addition, our capacity to collect data, analyze the outcomes of programs and services, and make resource allocation decisions is not capable of meeting the requirements of the New ACCJC standards.

The purpose for this request is to develop a system set of resources that can provide the infrastructure needed to meet the new assessment processes, and the flexible resources to differentially allocate resources across the colleges according to the needs identified in the program review process.

Campus Breakdown

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>FTE</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Honolulu CC</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>50,892</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kapiolani CC</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>105,043</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leeward CC</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>177,342</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Windward CC</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>50,892</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hawai‘i CC</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>40,043</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maui CC</td>
<td>2.25</td>
<td>204,539</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CC Systemwide /1</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1,054,492</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>9.25</strong></td>
<td><strong>1,683,243</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

/1 Includes $1,000,000 Program Review / Program Improvement Fund

V. RELATIONSHIP OF THE REQUEST TO STATE PLAN OR FUNCTIONAL PLAN

This request meets Goal A of the Community College Strategic Plan (Promote Learning and Teaching for Student Success) and Goal 1 of the UH System Strategic Plan and Goal 1 (Educational Effective and Student Success). This request is necessary to meet the fundamental goal of integrating measurable student learning outcomes and a cycle of assessment and improvement in all college functioning.
EXECUTIVE SUMMARY
REORGANIZATION PROPOSAL
UNIVERSITY OF HAWAI’I
SYSTEM ADMINISTRATION FOR COMMUNITY COLLEGES

The purpose of this reorganization is to establish a new organizational infrastructure between the University system and the autonomous community colleges and four-year campuses. The University is proposing the establishment of the Office of the Vice President for Community Colleges which will be responsible for executive leadership, policy decision-making, resource allocation, and development of appropriate support services for the seven community colleges. A dual reporting relationship is being proposed, whereby the Community College Chancellors report to the new Vice President for Community Colleges for leadership and coordination of the community college operations, and concurrently report to the President for system wide policy making. This dual reporting relationship is designed to preserve previous Board action to promote and facilitate campus autonomy in balance with system wide academic and administrative functions and operations.

The reorganization proposes to realign the community colleges academic and administrative affairs support services to the new Office of the Vice President for Community Colleges. The academic affairs support functions are being transferred from the Office of the Vice President for Academic Planning and Policy and the administrative affairs support functions from the Office of the Vice President for Budget and Finance/Chief Financial Officer.

The proposed reorganization is envisioned to have three positive outcomes: 1) improve the performance of the community colleges as a system and as individual campuses in light of accreditation standards for both the system and the community college campuses, 2) promote coherence in the conduct of activities such as program reviews that may lead to resource allocation decisions, and 3) enhance the advocacy for the community colleges as a group.

Additional funding required for the proposed reorganization is estimated at $25,000 annually and to be addressed through the reallocation of non-instructional funds. Charged against the $25,000 will be a portion of the salary of the Vice President and office equipment for the new Vice President and a Private Secretary. General funds made available as a result of the conversion of the funding source of other positions will be used for the new Vice President’s salary. Cost of the Private Secretary salary will be funded through an internal reallocation of funds. Consultation with faculty, staff, students and the unions has been completed.
I. PRESENT ORGANIZATION

As the chief executive officer of the University of Hawai‘i, the President is responsible for administering and coordinating University-wide functions through appropriate senior executives and managers. The UH System administration is currently comprised of the President, 16 senior executives, and 1 senior manager. At the system level, the following positions are direct reports to the President: Vice President for Academic Planning and Policy, Vice President for Research, Vice President for Student Affairs, Vice President for Administration, and Vice President for Budget and Finance/Chief Financial Officer. A chancellor for each of the ten campuses comprising the system also directly report to the President: University of Hawai‘i at Mānoa, University of Hawai‘i at Hilo, University of Hawai‘i at West O‘ahu, Hawai‘i Community College, Honolulu Community College, Kapi‘olani Community College, Kaua‘i Community College, Leeward Community College, Maui Community College, and Windward Community College. The Vice President for Legal Affairs and University General Counsel and the Director of Internal Audit report directly to the Board of Regents.

The following summarizes the results of the November 2004 system level reorganization:

- Three executive classes were abolished (Chief of Staff, Vice President for External Affairs and University Relations, and Vice President for International Education); one executive class created (Vice President for Budget and Finance/Chief Financial Officer); and five vacant positions abolished (position counts to remain with the University; one position count was used to convert a temporary Private Secretary position to permanent status), with an estimated annual budgeted cost savings of approximately $876,000.

- The Chief of Staff position was redescribed to Vice President for Administration.

- The staff and functions of the Office of Human Resources, Office of Information Technology Services, Office of the former Vice President for External Affairs and University Relations, and Office of Capital Improvements were reassigned to the Office of the Vice President for Administration. The Office of Information Technology Services reports to the President for planning and policy functions and the Vice President for Administration for operational functions.

- The staff and functions of the University Budget Office, Financial Management Office, Community Colleges Administrative Affairs, and Central Administrative Affairs were realigned to report to the Office of the Vice President for Budget and Finance/Chief Financial Officer.
• The staff and functions of the Office of Internal Audit were realigned to report directly to the Board of Regents with an indirect reporting line to the Vice President for Budget and Finance/Chief Financial Officer.

• The staff and functions of the University Risk Management Office were reassigned to report to the Office of the Vice President for Legal Affairs and University General Counsel.

• The Vice President for Academic Affairs was retitled to Vice President for Academic Planning and Policy.

• The staff and functions of the Office of the former Vice President for International Education were reassigned to the Office of the Vice President for Academic Planning and Policy.

• The staff and functions of the Distance Learning Office were reassigned to the Office of Planning and Policy.

• Changes to the functions of the Office of the Vice President for Student Affairs were adopted.

• The Council of Chancellors and Council of Community College Chancellors were recognized not as administrative units, but entities that provide advice and guidance on strategic planning and program development guidance to the President.

• The informal line of communication between the President and the Pūko’a Council and Student caucus was recognized.

II. PROPOSED REORGANIZATION

The reorganization proposes to create the Office of the Vice President for Community Colleges which will be responsible for community college related system policies, resource allocation, and central services and support for the seven community colleges. The new Vice President for Community Colleges will be the central leadership position, reflecting the collective mission of the community colleges.

The Community College Chancellors will report to the Vice President for Community Colleges, but will also have a dual reporting relationship to the President. The Community College Chancellors will report to the Vice President for Community Colleges for community college related system policies, resource allocation, and central services and support for the seven community colleges and to the President for system wide policy development, on par with the chancellors of the four-year campuses.
The proposal plans to retain the following community college executive positions:

- Chancellor, Hawai‘i Community College
- Chancellor, Honolulu Community College
- Chancellor, Kapi‘olani Community College
- Chancellor, Kaua‘i Community College
- Chancellor, Leeward Community College
- Chancellor, Maui Community College
- Chancellor, Windward Community College

The executive positions of Associate Vice President for Academic Affairs and Associate Vice President for Administrative Affairs will be retained, but realigned to report to the new Vice President for Community Colleges.

The reorganization proposal involves:

- Establishing the new Office of the Vice President for Community Colleges to report to the President.
- Creating a dual reporting relationship for the Community College Chancellors. The Chancellors will report to the President for system wide policy matters and to the Vice President for Community Colleges for operational matters.
- Realigning the Associate Vice President for Academic Affairs (Community Colleges) from the Office of the Vice President for Academic Planning and Policy to the Office of the Vice President for Community Colleges. The office will continue its respective functions, including providing leadership among the community colleges and insuring the integration of community colleges affairs with system functions.
- Realigning the Associate Vice President for Administrative Affairs (Community Colleges) from the Office of the Vice President for Budget and Finance/Chief Financial Officer to the Office of the Vice President for Community Colleges. The office will continue its respective functions, including providing leadership among the community colleges and insuring the integration of community colleges affairs with system functions.

There will be no other organizational or functional changes to the system wide offices. All ten chancellors will continue to report to the President and collectively meet as the Council of Chancellors, which is not an administrative unit, to advise the President on strategic planning, program development, and other matters of concern. The community college chancellors will meet as the Council of Community College Chancellors, which is also not an administrative unit, to provide advice to the President and Vice President for Community Colleges on community college policy issues and other matters of community college interest.
III. BACKGROUND AND REASONS FOR THE REORGANIZATION

Prior to January 2003, the University had a chancellor serving as the chief executive officer for the community college system and a provost for each of the seven community colleges. The community college chief executive officer was responsible for community college system policy to include all aspects of its management, operations and administration. In December 2002, the Board approved a reorganization of the system offices resulting in the abolishment of the Office of the Chancellor for Community Colleges and realignment of the provosts as direct reports to the president. The Provosts were subsequently retitled to Chancellors.

The proposed reorganization creates a new Vice President for Community Colleges that will be responsible for community college related system policies, resource allocation, and central services and support for the seven community colleges. Each community college chancellor would retain responsibility and control over campus operations, administration, and management. Community college chancellors would continue to have direct access to the President for University system-wide policy, on par with the chancellors of the four-year campuses.

In a January 2005 report, the Commission on the Accreditation of Community and Junior Colleges expressed concern that a lack of clarity, coherence, support, and advocacy persists regarding operational decisions distinct to the role and mission of the community colleges within the University of Hawai‘i System due to the current organizational structure. The proposed reorganization to create the Office of the Vice President for Community Colleges and a dual reporting relationship for the Community College Chancellors is intended to create an organizational structure responsive to the Commission’s concerns. The proposal preserves the Community College Chancellors direct access to the President for policy matters, and their role, responsibility and authority for the operations, management, and administration of their campus.

The proposed reorganization is envisioned to have three positive outcomes: 1) improve the performance of the community colleges as a system and as individual campuses in light of accreditation standards for both the system and the community college campuses, 2) promote coherence in the conduct of activities such as program reviews that may lead to resource allocation decisions, and 3) enhance the advocacy for the community colleges as a group.

The proposed reorganization of community colleges is consistent with the objectives of the System Strategic Plan, in that the proposal seeks to “...allocate and manage resources to achieve continuing improvement in organization, people, and processes and to secure competitive advantage.” The reorganization will not adversely impact the services to programs and students.
IV. IMPACT ON STAFFING AND RESOURCES

Positions will be redescribed as necessary, commensurate with the new functional statements. The following staffing changes are being proposed:

- Vacant Position No. 89001, formerly assigned to the Office of International Education, will be transferred to the new Office of the Vice President for Community Colleges and redescribed as the Vice President for Community Colleges.

- Vacant Position No. 100041, formerly assigned to the Office of International Education, will be transferred to the new Office of the Vice President for Community Colleges and redescribed as a Private Secretary for the Vice President.

- The staff and functions of the Associate Vice President for Academic Affairs (Community Colleges), Position No. 89222, will be organizationally realigned to report to the new Vice President for Community Colleges. There will be no changes in position duties or office functions as it relates to community colleges.

- The staff and functions of the Associate Vice President for Administrative Affairs (Community Colleges), Position No. 89140, will be organizationally realigned to report to the new Vice President for Community Colleges. There will be no changes in position duties or office functions as it relates to supporting the community colleges.

The additional cost to implement the proposed reorganization will be approximately $25,000 from the reallocation of non-instructional funds. The salary of the new Vice President for Community Colleges is comprised of a portion of the $25,000 and from funds made available due to the conversion of other positions’ funding from general to extramural funds. Office equipment for the new Vice President and Private Secretary will be charged against the $25,000. Cost of the Private Secretary salary will be funded through an internal reallocation of funds.

V. CONSULTATIONS DURING THE REORGANIZATION PROCESS

Copies of the proposed reorganization for consultation purposes were provided to the All Campus Council of Faculty Senate Chairs (ACCFSC) and the Student Caucus. Comments from the ACCFSC and Student Caucus were taken into consideration and incorporated as appropriate.

Consultation with the University of Hawai‘i Professional Assembly (UHPA) and the Hawai‘i Government Employees Association (HGEA) was completed. Comments and recommendations of the UHPA and HGEA were taken into consideration and incorporated as appropriate. Although blue-collar workers are unaffected by the
proposed reorganization, the United Public Workers (UPW) has been informed of the proposed reorganization.

The proposed reorganization addresses comments and recommendations made by the Office of Human Resources and University Budget Office.

VI. ALTERNATIVES CONSIDERED

Five organizational models were considered.

(1) **Separate community college system and governing board model (Kentucky model):** The community colleges would become a separate system with its own governing board. Community college chancellors would report to a chief executive officer for the community college system, who would report to the board. Community college administrative and academic policy/support functions would report to the chief executive officer for the community college system. A Hawai‘i variant would have the community college chief executive officer report to the current Board of Regents. *The separate community college system and governing board model was rejected because of the need to realize potential synergies between the community colleges and the baccalaureate campuses.*

(2) **Community college system chief executive officer model (Tsunoda 1983-2002):** A community college system chief executive officer would be responsible for community college system policy, management, and administration and report to the president. Community college chancellors would report to the system chief executive officer. The system chief executive officer would sit on the president’s cabinet and represent community college interests. Community college system administrative and academic policy/support functions would report to the community college system chief executive officer. *The community college system chief executive officer model was rejected because the campus Chancellors need sufficient authority as chief executive officers of their institutions to be responsible to their dynamic local environments and to be able to fulfill all of the expectations of the chief executive officer for a separately accredited college within a community college system.*

(3) **Community college coordinator model (Melendy 1965-72):** A vice-president level position would be created for community college coordination. Community college chancellors would report to the President. Community college system administrative and academic policy/support functions would report to the coordinating vice president. A variant would have the vice president exercise more control over such system functions as planning and system budgeting, and where policy, law, or accreditation dictate that the community colleges be treated as a system. *The community college coordinator model was rejected because the legal and Board of Regents structures for the community college system, such as a common legislative budget and common faculty classification and personnel policies, require more than just a coordinating function.*
(4) **Community college collective leadership model:** There would be no community college system chief executive officer. Community college chancellors would report to the president. Community college system decisions would be decided by the Council of Community College Chancellors with the council naming a permanent or rotating chair. The Council Chair would serve as a member of the president’s cabinet. Community college system administrative and academic policy/support functions would report to the chair. *The community college collective leadership model was rejected because of the lack of clear decision-making authority.*

(5) **Current organization (status quo):** The president serves as the community college system chief executive officer. Community college chancellors report to the president. Community college system administrative support functions report to the Vice President for Budget and Finance/Chief Financial Officer, and community college academic policy/support functions report to the Vice President for Academic Planning and Policy. *The current organization (status quo) was rejected because it does not address the current organizational ambiguities and operational needs of the community colleges.*

Chancellors and faculty generally agreed that there were a number of positive attributes to the present organization; in particular, some Chancellors and their faculties expressed the desire to maintain a direct reporting relationship between the Community College Chancellors and the President. At the same time, they recognized that more “coherence” among community college operations is needed in order to satisfy the current Accrediting Commission on the Community and Junior College standards. Other Chancellors and their faculties were more accepting of a reporting relationship through a community college system chief executive officer to the President.

In light of organizational concerns expressed by the Commission on the Accreditation of Community and Junior Colleges and the results of discussions with the community college chancellors and others, it was concluded that the appropriate organizational structure would be to establish for the Community College Chancellors a dual reporting relationship to the President and to a new Vice President for Community Colleges. Functionally, the new Vice President for Community Colleges will be responsible for community college related system policies, resource allocation, and central services and support for the seven community colleges. Each community college chancellor would retain responsibility and control over campus operations, administration, and management. Community college chancellors would continue to have direct access to the President for University system-wide policy, on par with the chancellors of four-year campuses.