FOLLOW UP VISIT REPORT

Honolulu Community College
874 Dillingham Boulevard
Honolulu, Hawai'i 96817

A Confidential Report Prepared for
The Accrediting Commission for Community and Junior Colleges
Western Association of Schools and Colleges

This report represents the findings of the evaluation team that visited
Honolulu Community College on November 12, 2013

Mary A.Y. Okada, Ed.D.
Chair

Honolulu Community College
Follow-up and Visit Report
Tuesday, November 12, 2013
Evaluation Team Roster

Dr. Mary A.Y. Okada (Chair)   Dr. Rene Ray Somera (Assistant)
President/CEO   Vice-President for Academic Affairs
Guam Community College   Guam Community College

SUMMARY OF FOLLOW UP VISIT AND REPORT

INSTITUTION: Honolulu Community College

DATES OF VISIT: November 12, 2013

TEAM CHAIR: Mary A.Y. Okada, Ed.D.
                        President, Guam Community College

INTRODUCTION

Honolulu Community College opened in its doors to students in 1920, when the Territorial Trade School was established in Palama. Subsequently, the school became part of McKinley High School and was later reestablished as Honolulu Vocational School; it was renamed Honolulu Technical School in 1955, and became part of the University of Hawai'i in 1965. In 2010, Honolulu Community College celebrated its 90th year anniversary as a comprehensive community college serving the urban Honolulu area and surrounding districts. The College serves a diverse assemblage of communities by providing high quality education for transfer to four-year institutions, associate degrees, career and technical education, certificate coursework, and apprenticeship. It also serves as the primary technical training center in areas such as transportation, information technology, education, communication, and construction.

On February 11, 2013, the Accrediting Commission for Community and Junior Colleges notified Honolulu Community College of its action on the accredited status of the institution at the January 9-11, 2013 Commission meeting. The Commission considered the Institutional Self Evaluation Report submitted by the Honolulu Community College, along with the report of the External Evaluation Team that visited the College from October 15-18, 2012. The Accrediting Commission issued a Warning to the College and required the Honolulu Community College to submit a Follow-Up report by October 15, 2013 to be followed by a visit of Commission representatives.

The Commission's notification letter to the College dated February 11, 2013 describes the Warning status as signifying that "an institution has pursued a course deviating from the Commission's Eligibility Requirements, Standards, or policies." The College was directed to correct the deficiencies noted and demonstrate that the institution has fully addressed the recommendations and Eligibility Requirements and Accreditation Standards in the Follow-Up report. The Commission also noted that for Recommendation #2, the College has taken significant steps to address the recommendation of the 2006 evaluation team, although there were still some components that needed to be addressed to fully meet the Eligibility Requirements and Accreditation Standards. Furthermore, the Commission noted that recommendations #2 and #3 stem from recommendations from 2006. The College has made

significant progress related to SLO assessment, but the formal assessment relating to the evaluation for effectiveness in distance education programs had not been addressed.

The Visiting Team was comprised of two members representing ACCJC, one on site and the other participating remotely. The team members reviewed the Follow Up report and other pertinent College research and supporting documentation. The ALO provided an agenda prior to the visit. The College provided a team room that contained printed copies of the information referenced in the Follow Up report. The ALO served as the point of contact for additional information or access to school officials/faculty on request. The Team felt welcomed and comfortable in the atmosphere that existed on campus. The campus displayed a sense of confidence in the accomplishments they have made on their progress.

Honolulu Community College is part of the University of Hawai'i Community College System consisting of six separately accredited institutions within the larger ten-institution statewide University of Hawai'i (UH) system.

Over the course of the visit, the Chair attended numerous meetings with groups that participated in the updates and responses to the External Evaluation report. Evidence provided in the training room, including online resources, were used to validate the Follow Up report. The Chair provided an opportunity for individuals to meet with her for brief discussions.

The College's follow up report discussed the progress made in addressing the College recommendations, along with the supporting evidence for continuous improvement. The team found that the College has made significant strides in addressing the recommendations and was well prepared for the team's visit.

System Recommendations (TO BE UPDATED ON RECEIPT)

System Recommendation #1
In order to meet the Standards for institutional effectiveness and integration of planning and resource allocation processes, including program review, it is recommended that:

- *The VPCC and the Chancellors develop broad-based, ongoing, collegial dialogue between and among the System and the Colleges to better assess the breadth, quality, and usefulness of UHCC analytical tools (e.g., UHCC APRD) and planning processes through feedback from College stakeholders.*

- *The Chancellors provide clear descriptions and training regarding the planning timeline and budgeting process. The information and training should be available to all College constituencies and reviewed regularly to ensure accuracy for resource allocations that lead to program and institutional improvement (Standard I.B.3, I.B.1, II.A.1.c, II.A.2.a, e, f, II.B.1, II.B.3.a, and II.b.4, I.B.1, I.B.4, I.B.6).*

System Recommendation #2
In order to meet the Standards, degrees offered by the Colleges must be consistent with the general education philosophy as outlined in the College catalog and that the rigor of the English and math courses needed to fulfill the degree requirements must be appropriate to higher education (ER 11, II.A.3, II.A.3.b).

System Recommendation #3
In order to meet the Standard, the System and the Colleges shall take appropriate actions to ensure that regular evaluations of all faculty members and others directly responsible for student progress toward achieving stated student learning outcomes include, as a component of the evaluation, effectiveness in producing student learning outcomes (Standard III.A.1.c).

System Recommendation #4
In order to meet the Standards, it is recommended that a comprehensive system-wide technology plan that includes and supports the development of a distance education be developed and implemented and is integrated with institutional planning (II.A.1.b, II.A.1.c, II.A.2.c, III.C.2, III.C.1, III.C.1.c, III.C.2)

System Recommendation #5
In order to meet the standard, it is recommended that the BOR a regular evaluation schedule of its policies and practices and revises them as necessary. In addition, the (BOR) must conduct its self evaluation as defined in its policy and required by ACCJC standards (IV.B.1.e, IV.B.1.g).

College Recommendation #1:
To fully meet the standard, the team recommends that the College extend its use of program review to ensure that all administrative units complete a cycle of evaluation that examines their impact on institutional processes that affect student learning. (Standard I.B.1, I.B.2, I.B.3, I.B.4, I.B.6, I.B.7)

Observations and Evidence
Every five years, the Honolulu Community College completes a comprehensive and cumulative program review process. Program review processes have been expanded from instructional programs to include administrative services by developing service area outcomes (SAOs) as the counterpart to instructional student learning outcomes (SLOs). The Administrative Services Unit Assessment Manual was produced in March 2013. This manual provides an overview on assessment, defines the goals of assessment, and the process in developing service area outcomes (although defined as administrative unit outcomes in the manual).

By incorporating the administrative units in the assessment process, the College confirmed its commitment towards creating a culture of assessment that guides its decision on institutional processes that affect student learning. In order to do this, however, the College provided professional development by way of the Mapping and Assessment Workshop held in April 2013. This allowed stakeholders the opportunity to work alongside other employees familiar with the assessment process in creating measurable and robust outcomes.

The College's approach to assessment included formalized institutional discussion efforts in key forums of the College. The completion of the assessment manual, professional development, identification of specific unit goals and activities, resulted in the Administrative Services Planning Document whereby units could track and report assessment results and the draft of the Administrative Services Annual Review, 2013.

Conclusion
The College has addressed this recommendation and meets the Standards.

College Recommendation #2:
As was recommended by the 2006 evaluation team, "in order to meet the standards' focus on ensuring student success and the quality of programs and services, the team recommends the College… develop and refine its program review process and to identify student learning outcomes at the course, program, and institutional levels. The College should also systematically assess these student learning outcomes and use the results of these assessments for the improvement of institutional effectiveness". In addition, the College should ensure that assessment of program quality occurs for all student support, academic and administrative programs. (2006 Recommendation 2, Standard IB.1, IB.4, IB.7, II.A, IIA.1.c, IIA.2.a, IIA.2.b, IIA.2.e, IIA.2.f, IIA.2.g, IIA.2.h, IIA.2.i, IIA.3, IIA.6, IIA.6.a, IIB.1, IIB.4, IIC.1.a, IIC.2, Standard IIA.1.b, IIA.1.c, III.A, III.A.6, IVA.1, IVA.2.b, IV.A.5, IVB.1.b)

General Observations and Evidence
In responding to this recommendation, Honolulu Community College did a thorough and comprehensive analysis of how to tie together all the discrete units of the institution into one coherent whole, insofar as learning outcomes assessment is concerned. This was accomplished through the conduct of intensive outcomes assessment training in April where all stakeholders of the college community gathered together for a collaborative discussion on conceptualizing, producing, and assessing outcomes. This collective effort truly provided each and every stakeholder of the college a heightened sense of ownership in this campus wide assessment initiative.

As a result of this work, Honolulu Community College provided extensive documentation on the completed annual assessment and program reviews across all instructional programs. They collected student learning assessment inventories for all courses. This inventory was done to provide information on the student learning outcomes (as stated on course syllabi), assessment method used to determine success, a summary of data collected, how results of the assessment is used to improve student learning, and how course SLOs are linked to program learning outcomes.

The college has taken the steps to develop and refine its program review process by emphasizing the institutional commitment and support towards a more systematic, sustainable method of outcomes assessment. As described in Recommendation #1, the college held a workshop for Administrative Services, Academic Support and Student Services, along with instructional faculty. The "Outcomes and Assessment Training" was held over a three-day period, focusing on creating robust and measurable assessment outcomes. The team found concrete evidence that this workshop produced student learning outcomes that were articulated at the course, program, and institutional levels across the board.

The documents reviewed by the team clearly demonstrated that the college had updated its processes to systematically assess student learning outcomes. In preparation for the training in April, the Vice Chancellor for Administrative Services convened a group of personnel to provide basic information on outcomes and assessment. The goal was to introduce and create Service Unit Outcomes. It is important to note that the evidence supports Service Unit Outcomes, Service

Area Outcomes, and Administrative Unit Outcomes that have been used synonymously throughout the documentation. The Administrative Services planning document was formulated and serves as the central point to capture assessment results and how processes or procedures are updated based on these results. This process is now incorporated into a yearly cycle of assessment and improvement and will be used for program review of all administrative units.

The Student Services Division conducted training for their personnel to focus specifically on outcomes. This training provided a general overview of the assessment process in terms of defining and establishing Student Learning Outcomes or Service Area Outcomes where applicable. In a similar process to administrative services, the student services developed an assessment plan and defined assessment tools to be used for the upcoming assessment cycle.

These new assessment protocols now parallel the assessment structure and infrastructure that has been in place in the instructional context, the area where outcomes assessment at HCC has truly gained the most substantive grounding.

However, a caveat needs to be said at this point, since the recommendation also covers how assessment results are to be used for improvement of institutional effectiveness. Since all the assessment plans put into place by the college are still ongoing, the short time period that has elapsed since the team visit and the follow up visit has not made possible any concrete results from assessment. In fact, the report states, "At the end of Spring 2014, the results of the assessment will be completed and each area will use a common template for reporting results. This information will be used for the following: (a) program/department improvement, (b) division prioritization for funding and advocacy, and(c) program review data and documentation." (p. 29). Because of the incipient stage of the comprehensive assessment process on campus, supporting evidence at the time of the follow up visit has not yet substantiated the use of assessment results for institutional improvement.

Conclusion
The College has partially addressed this recommendation and partially meets the Standards.

College Recommendation #3:
As was recommended by the 2006 evaluation team, in order to meet the Standards, the College must "develop a formal assessment process to evaluate the effectiveness of its Distance Education program in meeting the institutional mission. The process should include a systematic evaluation, analysis, communication, and improvement of the program, including assessment of how well each online course is satisfying its student learning outcomes, support for staff development, and technical assistance for faculty." This review must include a formal evaluation of student support services and learning resources including its design and delivery. The College should compare the instructional quality of face-to-face and distance education courses and develop a strategic plan for distance education. (II.A.2.e, II.A.2.f, II.B, II.C.1.c, III.A.5.a)

General Observations and Evidence
The College developed and finalized a strategic plan (2013-2018) for distance education that is student and instructor focused. The process of developing the plan involved collecting information via surveys, discussions with faculty teaching distance education courses, and a campus–wide Town Hall meeting.

Students taking online courses are provided with direct access to student services on the College website. A resource page provides many links to student services, such as counseling and tutoring. This link is available on the College's course management system, LauLima. Additionally, the College's main web page has the distance education resource page accessible for students and faculty.

The distance education infrastructure consists of the support personnel, the advisory committee, and the certification process for all courses. The Distance Education Coordinator oversees the distance education offerings and is currently working to get all faculty trained by providing a mandatory orientation focusing on course development and technical support.

To address the assessment of online courses and whether student learning outcomes are met, the college conducted course assessment strategies, documented the findings, and implemented changes, as appropriate. A matrix was developed to track the list of DE courses and indicated whether the same courses were offered face-to-face. In some instances where courses were only offered online, no comparative data existed; therefore, no comparisons could be completed.

A distance education survey was administered electronically to 817 students to gather information on the student support services and learning resources available. The response rate was 302 responses (37%). The survey focused on the frequency (how often services were used in various areas), quality (how good/bad the service was), and access (how and where to access services). The results of the survey will guide the college in further expanding DE offerings, ensuring that the types and levels of student services are provided to DE students at the same level of services and support as on-campus students.

Conclusion
The College has addressed the recommendation and meets the Standards.

College Recommendation #4:
To meet Eligibility Requirement 11, the College must finalize its discussion regarding General Education and ensure that General Education courses that are consistent with levels of quality and rigor appropriate to higher education be made part of all programs. (ER 11, II.A.3.a-c)

General Observations and Evidence
The College took immediate steps to address the recommendation by reviewing the general education requirements, including the levels of Math and English for the Associate of Applied Science (AAS) degrees. An update to the General Education policy (HCCP #5.213, 2013) was made to raise the level of the Math and English requirements to the transfer level equivalent of Math 100 and English 100 used for transfer to four-year institutions. Upgrades to curriculum documents were completed, to include career and technical education courses. In addition, the College catalog was updated to reflect the changes to course offerings that fulfilled the General Education requirements.

The team reviewed documents and participated in discussions with faculty and administrators on the review and updates to the general education requirements. The discussions included the restructuring of the general education board and the creation of two separate sub boards: one for career and technical education and one for articulation. Operating on an approved charter, the boards are now functioning and certifying courses.

Conclusion
The College has addressed this recommendation and meets the Standard.

College Recommendation #5:
To fully meet the standard, the team recommends that the College review personnel procedures for all hiring to ensure consistency, transparency, and confidentiality. (III.A.1.a, III.A.3.a, III.A.3.b.)

General Observation and Evidence
The College completed a review of the personnel procedures relating to the hiring of employees. The team confirmed that the College implemented an update to the procedures by revising the Standard Operation Procedures for screening committees and the hiring process. This update addressed the area of consistency by clearly defining the steps for recruitment. The first step is in the selection of the interview committee. To ensure compliance with EEO and Affirmative Action policies, the committee is comprised of a diverse group of representatives appointed by the Dean or Director of the hiring department. Interview committee discussions and recommendations are recorded in minutes. A test bank of interview questions will be established as a pool available to the committee to use in specific areas.

The team found through interviews and evidence that the College has put in place a training component linked to the interview processes. This training is done once a year for employees interested in participating in the interview process.

A review of the evidence confirms that the College has established personnel policies and procedures to support the transparency and confidentiality of personnel records. The College updated its confidentiality statement to ensure accountability of the interview process. The respective Deans or Directors of the recruiting department now convene search committees. If questions arise during the search process, they are subsequently referred to the appropriate department instead of the Personnel Officer.

Conclusion
The College has addressed the recommendation and meets the Standards.

College Recommendation #6:
To fully meet the standard, the team recommends that the College review its evaluation process for all positions and ensure that all staff and faculty (including post-tenure faculty) are evaluated in all operational units on a regular basis. (III.A.1.b.)

General Observations and Evidence
Honolulu Community College employs four classifications of employees: Executive/Management, Administrative Professional and Technical (APT), civil service, and Faculty (instructional and non-instructional). With the exception of the Executive/Management positions, all other classifications have individual collective bargaining agreements with the University of Hawaii that include negotiated evaluation schedules.

The evaluation process for executive/management is described in UHCCP #9.202; Performance evaluations for the APT personnel are conducted by their supervisors; Faculty evaluations processes are included in the University of Hawaii Professional Assembly (UHPA) Collective Bargaining Agreement; and

The College developed and implemented a policy (HCCP #9.202) entitled Employee Performance Evaluations that describes the evaluation process for all employees, along with the procedures for the respective classifications of employees as referenced in other related documents: UHPA Collective Bargaining Agreement for faculty; Administrative Procedure A9.170 for administrative, professional, and technical employees; Department of Human Resources, State of Hawaii Performance Appraisal System (PAS) for civil service positions, and UHCCP #9.202 Executive Employees Performance Evaluation for executive/management positions.

The new policy outlines the process for employee evaluation and identifies the responsibility of supervisors for completing employee evaluations in a timely manner, consistent with the timelines outlined in the respective negotiated agreements or administrative procedures. The 2013-2014 academic year is targeted for implementation. A review of the process will be evaluated afterwards.

Conclusion
The College has partially addressed the recommendation and partially meets the Standard.