February 11, 2013

Ms. Erika Lacro  
Chancellor  
Honolulu Community College  
874 Dillingham Boulevard  
Honolulu, HI 96817

Dear Chancellor Lacro:


The Commission acted to issue Warning and ask that Honolulu Community College correct the deficiencies noted. The College is required to complete a Follow-Up Report by October 15, 2013, demonstrating resolution of the deficiencies noted in the 2012 Evaluation Report. The report will be followed by a visit of Commission representatives.

Warning is issued when the Commission finds that an institution has pursued a course deviating from the Commission’s Eligibility Requirements, Accreditation Standards or Commission policies to an extent that gives concern to the Commission. The Commission may require an institution to correct its deficiencies, refrain from certain activities, or initiate certain activities. The Commission will specify the time within which the institution must resolve deficiencies, and may subject the institution to required reports and evaluation visits. During the warning period, reaffirmation is delayed, but the institution remains accredited and will be reaffirmed when the issues giving rise to the warning are fully resolved and the institution is removed from warning.

The Follow-Up Report should demonstrate that the institution has fully addressed the recommendations noted below, resolved the noted deficiencies, and now meets all Eligibility Requirements and Accreditation Standards identified in the External Evaluation Team Report and the recommendations.
Ms. Erika Lacro  
Honolulu Community College  
February 11, 2013

College Recommendations

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. (Standards I.B.1, I.B.2, I.B.3, I.B.4, I.B.6, I.B.7)

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, Eligibility Requirement 10, Standards I.B.1, I.B.4, I.B.7, II.A, II.A.1.b, II.A.1.c, II.A.2.a, II.A.2.b, II.A.2.e, II.A.2.f, II.A.2.g, II.A.2.h, II.A.2.i, II.A.3, II.A.6, II.A.6.a, II.B.1, II.B.4, II.C.1.a, II.C.2, III.A, III.A.6, IV.A.1, IV.A.2.b, IV.A.5, IV.B.1.b)

With regard to Recommendation 2 above, the Commission notes the College has taken significant steps to address the recommendations from the 2006 evaluation team. There remain, however, some portions of the 2006 recommendations that need to be addressed in order to fully meet the Eligibility Requirements and Accreditation 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. (Standards II.A.2.e, II.A.2.f, II.B, II.C.1.c, III.A.5.a)

College Recommendation 4:  
To meet Eligibility Requirement 11, the college must finalize its discussion regarding General Education and ensure General Education courses that are consistent with levels of quality and rigor appropriate to higher education be made part of all programs. (Eligibility Requirement 11, Standard II.A.3.a-c)
Ms. Erika Lacro  
Honolulu Community College  
February 11, 2013  

With regard to Recommendation 4, please note that degree credit for the general education component of a program must be consistent with levels of quality and rigor appropriate to higher education. A deficiency in this area implicates the College’s compliance with both Eligibility Requirements and Accreditation Standards.

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

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

The Commission notes that issues related to Recommendations from 2006 continue forward in College Recommendations 2 and 3 above. Significant progress has been made in addressing the issues in Recommendation 2 related to SLO assessment. However, the deficiencies noted in Recommendation 3 pertaining to developing a formal assessment process to evaluate the effectiveness of the distance education program have not been addressed.

**System Recommendations**

**UHCC Recommendation 1: Institutional Mission and Effectiveness**  
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 UHCC and the colleges to better assess the breadth, quality, and usefulness of UHCC analytical tools (e.g., UHCC Annual Report of Program Data (ARPD)) and planning processes through feedback from college stakeholders. In addition, the UHCC and Chancellors should provide training for the appropriate use of the tools to support on-going improvement and effectiveness.

- 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 allocation that leads to program and institutional improvement. (Standards 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)

**UHCC Recommendation 2: Student Learning Programs and Services**  
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 the rigor of the English and math courses needed to fulfill the degree requirements must be appropriate to higher education. (Eligibility Requirement 11, Standards II.A.3, II.A.3.b)
Ms. Erika Lacro  
Honolulu Community College  
February 11, 2013

Please note the linkage between System Recommendation 2 and College Recommendation 4.

**UHCC Recommendation 3: Student Learning Programs and Services and Resources**  
In order to meet the Standards, the UHCC 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)

**UH Recommendation 4: Resources**  
In order to meet the Standards, it is recommended that a comprehensive UH system wide technology plan that includes and supports distance education be developed and implemented and is integrated with institutional planning. (Standards 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)

**UH Recommendation 5: Board and Administrative Organization**  
In order to meet the Standards, it is recommended that the UH BOR adopt a regular evaluation schedule of its policies and practices and revise them as necessary. In addition, the UH BOR must conduct its self evaluation as defined in its policy and as required by ACCJC Standards. (Standards IV.B.1.e, IV.B.1.g)

I wish to inform you that under U.S. Department of Education regulations, institutions out of compliance with standards or on sanction are expected to correct deficiencies within a two-year period or the Commission must take action to terminate accreditation. Honolulu Community College must correct the deficiencies noted in Recommendations 2, 3 and 4 above no later than October 15, 2013, or the Commission will be required to take adverse action. In its Follow-Up Report, Honolulu Community College must demonstrate that the institution has fully addressed the recommendations noted above, resolved each of the noted deficiencies, and now meets all Eligibility Requirements and Accreditation Standards identified in the External Evaluation Team Report and the recommendations.

The External Evaluation Report provides details of the team’s findings with regard to each Eligibility Requirement and Accreditation Standard and should be read carefully and used to understand the team’s findings. The recommendations contained in the External Evaluation Team Report represent the best advice of the peer evaluation team at the time of the visit, but may not describe all that is necessary to come into compliance.

Institutions are expected to take all actions necessary to comply with Eligibility Requirements, Accreditation Standards and Commission policies. The Commission wishes to remind you that while an institution may concur or disagree with any part of the report, the College is expected to use the External Evaluation Report to improve educational programs and services and to resolve issues identified by the Commission.
Ms. Erika Lacro  
Honolulu Community College  
February 11, 2013 

The College conducted an educational quality and institutional effectiveness review as part of its self evaluation. The Commission suggests that the plans for improvement of the institution included in its Self Evaluation Report be used to support the continuing improvement of Honolulu Community College.

A final copy of the Evaluation Team Report is attached. Additional copies may now be duplicated. The Commission requires you to give the Evaluation Report and this letter dissemination to your College staff and to those who were signatories of your College Self Evaluation Report. This group should include the campus leadership, the Vice President for Community Colleges, and the Board of Regents.

The Commission also requires that the Institutional Self Evaluation Report, the External Evaluation Report, and this Commission action letter be made available to students and the public by placing a copy on the College website. Please note that in response to public interest in disclosure, the Commission now requires institutions to post accreditation information on a page no farther than one click from the institution's home page. If you would like an electronic copy of the External Evaluation Report, please contact Commission staff.

Finally, ACCJC staff is available to assist the College with consultation and advice on the recommendations identified above. Please feel free to call us.

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

Sincerely,  

Barbara A. Beno, Ph.D.  
President  

BAB/tl  

cc: Dr. Marcia Roberts-Deutsch, Accreditation Liaison Officer  
    Dr. John Morton, Vice President, Hawai‘i Community College System  
    President, Board of Regents, University of Hawai‘i  
    Dr. Mary A.Y. Okada, President, Guam Community College, Team Chair

1 Institutions preparing and submitting Midterm Reports, Follow-Up Reports, and Special Reports to the Commission should review Guidelines for the Preparation of Reports to the Commission. The Guidelines contain the background, requirements, and format for each type of report and presents sample cover pages and certification pages. The Guidelines are available on the ACCJC website under College Reports to ACCJC at: (http://www.accjc.org/college-reports-accjc).
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SUMMARY OF EXTERNAL EVALUATION REPORT

INSTITUTION: Honolulu Community College

DATES OF VISIT: October 15 – 18, 2012

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

The Accrediting Commission for Community and Junior Colleges (ACCJC) convened an eleven-member team comprised of peers from across ACCJC-accredited institutions to assess Honolulu Community College’s request for reaffirmation of accreditation status. From October 15, 2012 through October 18, 2012, this team conducted a comprehensive evaluation visit to Honolulu Community College. The purpose of this visit was to assess the degree to which the college meets the standards of accreditation, reaffirm and validate the findings documented in the institution’s self evaluation, assure ACCJC that the college continues to meet the eligibility requirements for accreditation, confirm to ACCJC that the college has been responsive to the recommendations from the 2006 evaluation team, provide guidance to the institution in the form of recommendations to improve the effectiveness of the college, and make a recommendation to ACCJC regarding the accredited status of the college.

In preparation for the October visit, the team attended an all-day training session on September 7, 2012 conducted by the ACCJC. Prior to that training, the team received the self evaluation report and supporting documents from Honolulu Community College. In preparation for the actual site visit, the team completed a set of assignments designed to familiarize members with the self evaluation, the recommendations from the 2006 team visit, the college’s focused midterm report completed on October 15, 2009, follow-up reports, and other pertinent college research and supporting documentation. The team members were organized into Standard teams to allow for more targeted and focused study and analysis. The team began the visit well prepared with a firm grounding of the self evaluation report, a set of written assessments of the self evaluation report, and a sense of the areas needing further investigation and clarification.

Honolulu Community College is part of the University of Hawai‘i Community College System (UHCC) consisting of six separately accredited institutions within the larger ten-institution statewide University of Hawai‘i (UH) system. On Sunday, October 14, 2012, the team chair, team assistant, system lead and an additional selected team member conducted a site visit to the district in concert with members of the University of Hawai‘i Community College System team. The purpose of this visit was to ascertain the nature of district-college functions relative to the standards. That afternoon, the full twelve-member Honolulu Community College team met to discuss the self evaluation, review areas needing further attention, and assess initial findings. A tour of satellite facilities was conducted on that day, as was a visit to the team room at the college to provide the opportunity for members to familiarize themselves with the evidence available in support of the self evaluation.
Over the course of the visit, the team held numerous meetings and interviews with individuals and groups, undertook research to validate the self study, observed facilities, including the Marine Education and Training Center and the instruction and support services occurring therein, and conducted a detailed and thorough review of distance education course offerings. To quantify this engagement with the campus, the team interacted with faculty, staff, administrators, students, and members of the Board of Regents. The team held two open forums where there was an opportunity conveyed for members of the institution to make appointments to see members of the team, including an invitation for brief individual appointments with the team chair, should there be a need to do so.

The college’s self evaluation report provided the underpinnings for this evaluation visit and it clearly was a work emanating from a genuine, inclusive, and introspective self-assessment. The team found the self study useful and informative. At the same time, it is noted that improvement in the presentation and citation of evidence within the self study and a greater focus and clarity within the description summary and self evaluation narratives would have created a stronger and more effective document. In some cases, portions of these narrative sections did not address the standard subsection at hand or were irrelevant. Further, in its effort to validate assertions and findings in the self evaluation report, the team sometimes found it a challenge to track down specific documentation and evidence cited within the narrative.

The college was not very well prepared for the team’s visit. Information and evidence was continuously provided to the team for the duration of the visit. However, the team readily connected with the institution and could sense the common purpose amongst the entire Honolulu Community College “family.”

As a result of the October 2012 comprehensive evaluation visit, the team has made seven commendations (five for the system and two for the college) and eleven recommendations (five for the system and six for the college). The UHCC system report is appended at the end of the college report.

**UHCC Commendations**

UHCC employees are engaged in a variety of activities that distinguish UHCC and contribute to student success. The following listing represents only a few of those activities for which UHCC is commended:

- dedicating efforts to support the success and achievement of Native Hawaiian students and the preservation and study of Native Hawaiian culture;
- establishing a fund to support innovation in support of student success and for preserving this fund in the face of serious fiscal challenges;
- encouraging and supporting a spirit of “ohana” throughout UHCC;
- adopting a tuition increase schedule for 2012-17 in order to provide stability and predictability; and
- using a common student database to transition students to four-year institutions, improving articulation, and awarding Associate of Arts (AA) degrees back to students based on their coursework at four-year colleges.
College Commendations

College Commendation #1
The college is to be commended for the development of the instructional and student support services provided through the Native Hawaiian Center (NHC), which actively preserves and perpetuates Hawaiian culture and values. (Standard II.A, II.B)

College Commendation #2
The college leadership should be commended for creating a structure and environment where all governance voices are valued. (Standard IV.A, IV.A.3)

UHCC Recommendations

UHCC Recommendation 1: Institutional Mission and Effectiveness
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 UHCC and the colleges to better assess the breadth, quality, and usefulness of UHCC analytical tools (e.g., UHCC Annual Report of Program Data (ARPD)) and planning processes through feedback from college stakeholders. In addition, the UHCC and Chancellors should provide training for the appropriate use of the tools to support on-going improvement and effectiveness.
- 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 allocation that leads to program and institutional improvement (Standards 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).

UHCC Recommendation 2: Student Learning Programs and Services
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 the rigor of the English and math courses needed to fulfill the degree requirements must be appropriate to higher education (Eligibility Requirement 11, Standards II.A.3, II.A.3.b).

UHCC Recommendation 3: Student Learning Programs and Services and Resources
In order to meet the Standard, the UHCC 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).

UH Recommendation 4: Resources
In order to meet the Standards, it is recommended that a comprehensive UH system wide technology plan that includes and supports distance education be developed and implemented and is integrated with institutional planning (Standards 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).
UH Recommendation 5: Board and Administrative Organization
In order to meet the Standards, it is recommended that the UH BOR adopt a regular evaluation schedule of its policies and practices and revise them as necessary. In addition, the UH BOR must conduct its self evaluation as defined in its policy and as required by ACCJC Standards (Standards IV.B.1.e, IV.B.1.g).

College Recommendations

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)

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 I.B.1, I.B.4, I.B.7, II.A, II.A.1.b, II.A.1.c, II.A.2.a, II.A.2.b, II.A.2.e, II.A.2.f, II.A.2.g, II.A.2.h, II.A.2.i, II.A.3, II.A.6, II.A.6.a, II.A.1, II.B.4, II.C.1.a, II.C.2, III.A, III.A.6, IV.A.1, IV.A.2.b, IV.A.5, IV.B.1.b, Eligibility Requirement 10)

College Recommendation #3:
As was recommenced 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. (Standard II.A.2.e, II.A.2.f, II.B, II.C.1.c, III.A.5.a)

College Recommendation #4:
To meet Eligibility Requirement 11, the college must finalize its discussion regarding General Education and ensure General Education courses that are consistent with levels of quality and rigor appropriate to higher education be made part of all programs. (Eligibility Requirement 11, Standard II.A.3.a-c)
**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. (Standard III.A.1.a, III.A.3.a, III.A.3.b.)

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

Honolulu Community College opened 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.

Reflecting the different communities served by the institution, Honolulu Community College students themselves are equally diverse. The ethnicity of students enrolled in the fall 2010 semester was as follows: 26% Hawaiian/Part-Hawaiian; approximately 20% Filipino; 11% Mixed ethnicity; 10% Japanese/Okinawan; nearly 10% Caucasian; and almost 10% for all other Asian groups combined.

Honolulu Community College last underwent a comprehensive evaluation visit in fall 2006. Based upon that visit, the Accrediting Commission for Community and Junior Colleges reaffirmed the college’s accreditation in January 2007 with the requirement that the college submit a progress report by March 2008, with a visit to follow. The 2008 report included progress made on three of the six major recommendations (#1, 2, and 5). This progress report was accompanied by a follow-up visit to the college by an ACCJC evaluation team in April 2008. At its June 2008 meeting, ACCJC accepted the follow-up report and required the college to submit a focused midterm report in fall 2009. The focused midterm report addressed progress in all six recommendations and provided particular attention to Recommendation #2: conducting meaningful, timely, and inclusive dialogue to develop and refine the program review process and to identify student learning outcomes at the course, program, and institutional levels. ACCJC accepted the college’s focused midterm report at its January 2010 meeting. In spring 2010, the college began organizing and preparing for this current comprehensive evaluation visit.

From October 15 through October 18, an 11-member team conducted a comprehensive evaluation visit to Honolulu College. The purpose of this visit was to assess the degree to which the college meets the standards of accreditation, reaffirm and validate the findings documented in the institution’s self study, assure ACCJC that the college continues to meet the eligibility requirements for accreditation, confirm to ACCJC that the college has been responsive to the recommendations from the 2006 evaluation team, provide guidance to the institution in the form of recommendations to improve the effectiveness of the college, and make a recommendation to ACCJC regarding the accredited status of the college.
Overall, the team found Honolulu Community College to epitomize its core values of integrity, excellence, collegiality, and inclusiveness. The college has a commitment to service and a strong belief in a common purpose - that being to serve the educational needs of students.

The team provided the College with a general overview of commendations and recommendations.
Evaluation of Institutional Responses to Previous Recommendations

Major Recommendation 1

The team recommends that the Chancellor and the Planning Council clearly state the purpose, function, and membership of all governance committees and ensure that minutes are published and accessible to all constituents. The team encourages the Chancellor and the Planning Council to focus the Council’s agendas on its primary purpose as stated in its Charter, develop a commonly agreed-upon definition of collegiality, and establish specific timelines for accomplishing the self-study Planning Agenda.

In response to this recommendation, the college’s four governance committees (i.e., Planning Council, Faculty Senate Executive Committee, Staff Senate Executive Committee, and Kupu Ka Wai Council) post charters and meeting minutes on the campus internal intranet site to make these documents easily accessible to all HCC constituents. Charters are reviewed annually and revised as needed to ensure equitable representation of college constituencies and “appropriate response to assigned responsibilities.” HCC is to be commended for its effort to involve Native Hawaiians in its governance structure.

The Planning Council (PC) focuses on reviewing and updating the College Mission and Goals, the Strategic Plan 2008-2015, and the Annual Budget Implementation Plan. As such, the PC has been responsible for educating the campus community about changes in planning processes and for creating greater awareness of annual Program Review and necessary assessment processes. The adequacy of efficient and effective inter-committee communications, however, is still an issue so greater effort must be exerted to achieve this goal.

The 2008 Memorandum of Understanding on the “Collegial Relationship Among Campus Constituencies” states expectations and responsibilities of all with regard to “communication, respect, and participation in decision-making processes.” The MOU is helping a ‘culture’ shift at HCC towards a more collaborative, more informed constituency regarding Program Review, including SLO assessment, analysis, and use of results in developing improved instructional and student services.

The Accreditation Oversight Committee for HCC is charged with developing an effective process and annual cycle for the Planning Agenda. A process now exists that helps the college community grasp the urgent prioritization of planning agenda items based on critical institutional needs.

The team found that HCC has sufficiently met the requirements identified in Recommendation 1.

Major Recommendation 2

To meet the standards’ focus on ensuring student success and the quality of programs and services, the team recommends the college conducts meaningful, timely, and inclusive dialogue with all college constituents to 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.

Concern about limited dialogue on important initiatives appears to be an issue that lingers at the college; is a recurring theme in the self evaluation report. An example of this appears on page 61 of the same report, which features an Actionable Improvement Plan (AIP) that emphasizes transparency, broad based dialogue and cross-committee communication. To the extent this AIP mirrors a theme in 2006 Rec. 2, the college still needs to do some work on “inclusive dialogue.” As such, there are lingering problems centering on the institution’s commitment to a meaningful, timely and inclusive dialogue” about important governance matters. (Standard I.B.1)

The college believes that fulfillment of this recommendation is to be achieved by program review reporting and use of results to promote student learning and provide justification for resources requested from the HCC Annual Budget Implementation Plan. All instructional and non-instructional programs complete annual assessments, as well as a comprehensive Program Review every five years. In August of each year, the system office provides data based on a set of parameters, and program reports are due in December. The reports are published and used in the spring for the budgeting process. This has led to an emerging campus dialogue about the meaning of system-generated data, its usefulness (or limitations) for the various programs’ needs, including possible alternative ways to do assessment and program review that take into account the uniqueness of HCC as an institution.

Since the last team visit in 2006, all courses and programs now have identified SLOs that are used for assessment and improvement of student learning. This is part of the program review process and is central to planning and budgeting. Mapping (alignment) of course and program SLOs is currently being done, and institutional learning outcomes (ILOs) are being finalized for implementation.

Several action steps from the 2009 Focused Midterm Report remain to be accomplished, however. They include the following:

- Completion of mapping course to program SLOs;
- Consistent periodic assessment of program outcomes as basis for program improvement;
- Assurance that all faculty carry out assessment of course SLOs; and
- Implementation of the plan for administrative assessment.

Insofar as student services are concerned, the previous team found that the student support units of the college had begun to identify student learning outcomes and had designed a program review cycle. By spring of 2008, the visiting team found that student service units were at the “development” stage of program review and joined the rest of the college at the “development” stage of assessing outcomes. At that time, all of the colleges in the system were developing a system-wide template for assessment.

The self evaluation asserts that all of the instructional and student support units of the college have developed student learning outcomes and that they are publically available. While some of the student support units enumerated their outcomes in the self evaluation report, there was
however no source presented for evidence of this assertion. During interviews, college personnel could not identify a location either in public documents or on the college’s intranet where these statements were delineated.

The report claims that evaluation of student learning outcomes is documented in the program reviews. The Five Year Program Review of Student Services, which covered the years 2005/06 – 2010/11, does contain student learning outcomes for each of the services but does not indicate the method of assessment and provides no results for their assessment. The team confirmed by interview that student service units do not participate in the annual reviews identified as being part of the entire program review process (although they apparently did participate for some years following the last accreditation).

The report also asserts that various methods of assessment including student satisfaction surveys, needs assessments, and the Community College Survey of Student Engagement are being used in student support service areas. Results of the CCSSE and a new student orientation survey were included in the program review and were discussed. However there were no specific program activities identified to address any deficiencies beyond a request for increased staffing. There is no indication that the survey instruments offered into evidence are related to the student learning outcomes, nor are they identified as such by interviewed staff members.

While SLOs have been created for student support service units there is little evidence that they have been assessed in more than a few instances. There is little evidence that various survey results have been used for systematic program improvement. There is no evidence that outcomes in student services enhance the success of student learning.

The team found that HCC has only partially met the requirements identified in Recommendation 2.

Major Recommendation 3

The team recommends that the college develop a formal assessment process in order 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 learning outcomes, support for staff development, and technical assistance for faculty.

At HCC, distance education is guided by a Distance Learning Coordinator and two committees (i.e., the Distance Education Advisory Committee and the Distance Education Review Board). The DEAC, chaired by the Coordinator, is responsible for ensuring that DE courses meet "academic standards, including parity with face-to-face offerings,” have technical support, and professional development for faculty. The DERB reviews and approves all applications for DE courses, a peer review process that "ensures that all DE courses...have clear and explicit SLOs and an indication of assessment methods to be used.”

HCC acknowledges the difficulty of assessment in DE courses as instructors are challenged with verifying that enrolled students are completing the surveys and other assessment instruments.
Yet, the self evaluation report claims that surveys are found to be “relatively effective” for comparing DE and face-to-face sections of the same course. Furthermore, the report asserts that various methods are used for communicating information and assessment results of DE courses, though the team did not find evidence to this effect during the visit.

The previous visiting team recommended that the college develop a formal assessment process for distance education courses. There are at least two assessment reports based on student surveys, suggesting the college pays attention to student learning outcomes and satisfaction with various services and programs. However, the college was unable to provide evidence on comparative successful completion data for online learning versus face-to-face classes (no data are cited in the Self Evaluation Report on disaggregated success rates, and no data either on the DE Assessment Web site). Interviews with administrators and faculty who teach distance education courses confirmed this team observation. In this regard, the response to this Distance Education recommendation from 2006 suggests a very limited degree of compliance on the part of the college.

The team found that HCC has not met the requirements identified in Recommendation 3.

Major Recommendation 4

The team recommends that the college develop a comprehensive facilities master plan and seek the funding to implement the plan in order to best serve the programs offered, to reflect the quality of its programs, and to project the college’s importance and image to the community.

HCC developed a “comprehensive facilities master plan” that was released in 2009 and presented for campus review in 2010-11. The plan “identifies several phases of campus growth and consolidation.” A major project, an Advanced Technology and Training Center, is now being planned, though funding has not yet been allocated. The College is also completing repair and maintenance projects.

The team found that HCC has sufficiently met the requirements identified in Recommendation 4.

Major Recommendation 5

The team recommends the development of written descriptions clearly delineating the role of the Chancellor and the Vice Chancellor of Academic Affairs in regards to the delegated authority given to the Vice Chancellor consistent with the responsibilities in Standard IV.B for the Chief Executive Officer of the college. The Chancellor is also encouraged to take steps to stabilize the administration.

The College has a large number of managers in interim positions (7) as a result of its recent reorganization. The Fall 2006 visiting team recommended that the “Chancellor is encouraged to take steps to stabilize the administration (2006 Rec. 5).” This is still a lingering problem and
suggests the College may not have a sufficient administrative structure in place to meet the institution’s mission. (Standard IV.B.2.a)

Roles of the Chancellor and Vice Chancellor of Academic Affairs have been clarified and descriptions of two additional administrators have been designed: Vice Chancellor for Financial and Administrative Services and the Executive Assistant to the Chancellor. While this administrative structure was in place at the time of the Midterm Report, HCC is currently in transition, with the VCAA having been appointed Chancellor only this academic year and all but two administrative positions either vacant or filled on an interim basis. During the campus visit, however, the team was provided with evidence that outlined the plan to fill these positions with a very definite timeline.

The team found that HCC has only partially met the requirements identified in Recommendation 5.

**Major Recommendation 6**

*The team recommends that the Chancellor develop a systematic plan that effectively communicates with the internal and external communities the vision, achievements, goals and long-range plans of the college.*

HCC’s vision, achievements, goals, and long-range plans are communicated internally and externally in many ways, such as town hall meetings, email, various list serves for specific constituencies and the whole campus, social media, an intranet site, the College website, and the UHCC system initiatives. The Executive Assistant to the Chancellor serves as a media liaison. Although there exists no systematic plan developed to meet Recommendation 6, the team verified that there is widespread agreement among campus constituents that opportunities for more inclusive sharing and dialogue, particularly in light of the new college leadership, continue to occur in very robust ways.

The team found that HCC has sufficiently met the requirements identified in Recommendation 6.
ELIGIBILITY REQUIREMENTS

The evaluation team found Honolulu Community College to be in compliance with the eligibility requirements set forth by the Accrediting Commission for Community and Junior Colleges.

1. Authority: The evaluation team confirmed that the University of Hawai‘i Board of Regents, under the authority of the State of Hawai‘i Law, Chapter 305, Hawai‘i Revised Statutes, is authorized to develop and administer a system of community colleges. In 1966, Honolulu Community College was authorized by the Board to operate as an educational institution and to offer undergraduate education. The institution is accredited by the Accrediting Commission of Community and Junior Colleges (ACCJC).

2. Mission: The evaluation team confirmed that in order to reflect the most current priorities of the institution, Honolulu Community College conducts periodic reviews and updates of its mission statement. The Board of Trustees adopted the current mission statement in May 2012. Transfer, associate degrees, career technical education, certificate coursework, basic skills, and lifelong learning form the essence of Honolulu Community College’s mission. Honolulu Community College shares its mission statement with the public through numerous channels, including the college catalog, the college website, college division offices, and several other official publications.

3. Governing Board: The evaluation team confirmed that Honolulu Community College has a functioning governing board responsible for the quality, integrity, and financial stability of the institution. The fifteen-member University of Hawai‘i Board of Regents has jurisdiction over the internal structure, management, and operation of the University of Hawai‘i campuses.

4. Chief Executive Officer: The evaluation team confirmed that the Chancellor serves as the Chief Executive Officer of the Honolulu Community College. The University of Hawai‘i Board of Regents approves the hiring of the Chancellor, who serves as the chief executive officer of the college. The Chancellor reports to the President of the University of Hawai‘i and is evaluated by both the President and the Vice President for Community Colleges.

5. Administrative Capacity: The visiting team confirmed that Honolulu Community College provides an adequate level of administrative oversight to ensure the efficient and compliant operation of all college processes and functions. An administrative staff supports the college president with the capacity to carry out the college’s mission. However, consistency and stability of administrative staffing is necessary.

6. Operational Status: The visiting team confirmed that Honolulu Community College is operational, with students actively enrolled in degree and certificate programs. The college offers Fall, Spring, and Summer Session classes. In the fall of 2011, 4600 students were enrolled at the college.

7. Degrees: The visiting team confirmed that Honolulu Community College provides course offerings to fulfill the requirements for associate degrees and certificates. In the 2010-2011
academic year, 556 students received either an associate degree or a certificate of achievement. The college attracts students to its degree programs primarily because of its unique program offerings.

8. Educational Programs: The visiting team confirmed that Honolulu Community College’s degree programs are congruent with its mission to provide associate in arts and science degrees, occupational certificates, and transfer education preparation. Programs are based on recognized fields of study in higher education, are of suitable content and length, present sufficient variety within disciplines, and are conducted and maintained at appropriate levels of quality and rigor.

9. Academic Credit: The visiting team confirmed that Honolulu Community College awards academic credit for coursework based on generally accepted practices in degree-granting institutions of higher education. All degrees, certificates, and courses are listed in the college catalog and on the website.

10. Student Learning and Achievement: The visiting team confirmed that Honolulu Community College has a variety of processes in place to ensure the integrity of its instructional programs. Student learning outcomes are defined and published for all instructional programs. All courses are required to have an approved course outline of record with instructional outcomes for student learning, methods for achieving those outcomes, and tools for evaluating levels of student achievement of the learning outcomes. To ensure high quality programs and services, the college has developed student learning outcomes (SLOs) for its courses.

11. General Education: The visiting team confirmed that Honolulu Community College students who are pursuing degree programs are required to take a significant number of general education courses. General education requirements are designed to cultivate a breadth of knowledge and encourage intellectual inquiry. However, not all course requirements for the AAS degrees are consistent with the general education philosophy as outlined in the college catalog and the expectation that the rigor of the courses fulfill the degree requirements appropriate to higher education.

12. Academic Freedom: The visiting team confirmed that Honolulu Community College faculty and students have the freedom to examine and question knowledge pertinent to the various academic disciplines. The academic freedom statement is included in the college catalog.

13. Faculty: The visiting team confirmed that Honolulu Community College employs 165 instructional faculty. All faculty members possess minimum qualifications in professional training and experience to conduct the institution’s educational programs. Faculty are expected to maintain currency in their program and continual professional development in their respective areas of instruction. Faculty develop and review curriculum and conduct learning assessments.
14. **Student Services:** The visiting team confirmed that Honolulu Community offers a comprehensive array of services to assist students in meeting their educational goals. These services are aligned with the institution’s mission and support student learning and development.

15. **Admissions:** The visiting team confirmed that Honolulu Community College has adopted and adheres to admission policies consistent with its mission.

16. **Information and Learning Resources:** The visiting team confirmed that Honolulu Community College provides appropriate information and learning resources to support its mission and the student learning outcomes of its programs.

17. **Financial Resources:** The visiting team confirmed that Honolulu Community College has the necessary funding base, financial resources, and projected financial development to address financial stability. State general funds, tuition and fees, grants and contracts are the primary sources.

18. **Financial Accountability:** The visiting team confirmed that the University of Hawai‘i prepares consolidated financial statements in accordance with Government Standards Board principles and annually undergoes a financial audit.

19. **Institutional Planning and Evaluation:** The visiting team confirmed that Honolulu Community College provides appropriate attention to, and resources for the development and implementation of, effective institutional planning.

20. **Public Information:** The visiting team confirmed that Honolulu Community College provides an accurate and current catalog that is delivered in both print and electronic form and includes all of the specified information. Information about accreditation and authorization are included as well as contact information for filing complaints. The catalog includes completion rates but does not yet contain student loan default rates. The team examined the college’s grievance/complaint procedure and complaints for the preceding five years. There were no patterns identified that indicate deficiencies in standards, eligibility requirements, or accreditation policies.

21. **Relations with the Accrediting Commission:** The visiting team confirmed that Honolulu Community College consistently adheres to the requirements, standards, and policies set forth by the Accrediting Commission for Community and Junior Colleges. Honolulu Community College is in full compliance and all of its disclosures are complete, accurate, and honest.
STANDARD I
INSTITUTIONAL MISSION AND EFFECTIVENESS

Standard IA. Mission

General Observations
The college has adopted a mission statement that expresses its commitment to student learning and disseminates the mission to members of its internal and external community in a variety of ways. The college's commitment to its mission is evidenced through its educational and student services programs, its institutional learning outcomes, and the alignment of the mission with its planning and budget allocation processes. The college has defined its intended student population as those in the surrounding communities, which is evidenced through student demographic data, and understanding their multi-faceted role in transfer, vocational education, and basic skills. The college assesses and communicates its effectiveness to the internal and external communities through print and electronic publications and presentations to various constituency groups. There is a systematic reporting about the implementation of the college's Strategic Plan to the Board and the college community, although information about how these activities have influenced change and improvements at the college is only apparent at the strategic direction level.

Findings and Evidence
The Honolulu Community College has a mission that defines its educational purposes, intended student population, and expresses its commitment to student learning. HCC seeks to fulfill its mission by determining the needs of its intended students, community, and the business and technical needs of the State of Hawai'i and the Pacific Rim. The college's intended student population is determined by their purpose of being an affordable, flexible, learning-centered, open-door institution, and by their mission of offering both a comprehensive community college education and serving as the primary technical training center for the Pacific Rim. (I.A and I.A.1)

Its unique location in the Kalihi-Kapalama section of the city of Honolulu, on the island of O'ahu in Hawai'i, and its specific role in the University of Hawai'i system also attract students. In addition to providing workforce training and development, the college serves as a primary entry point for students wanting to obtain an associate degree or to complete the first two years of a liberal arts degree (2+2 and 3+1 programs), with an objective to transfer to a four-year degree-granting institution. (I.A.1)

The college has an appropriate and well-communicated Mission Statement. The last sentence of the mission statement was created by students and signifies their participation in the progress. The current mission statement was reviewed in May 2010 and formally approved in October 2011 by the Planning Council and other major governance bodies and was subsequently approved by the UH Board of Regents in May 2012. The mission was distributed to and
discussed by the Chairs of the Faculty Senate Executive Council, staff Senate Executive Committee, the Kupu Ka Wai Council, Associated Students of the HCC and other governance bodies. The Mission Statement is published in the college catalogue, on the campus website, in the Strategic Plan, the Annual Report, and the accreditation self evaluation. (I.A.2, I.A.4)

The institution uses its governance and decision-making processes to review its mission statement on a regular basis and revises it as necessary. The Planning Council is tasked with conducting periodic reviews of the Mission Statement. The team was provided with evidence during the site visit that indicates a thorough and inclusive process for review and adoption of the current mission statement. The subsequent timeline calls for a review every three years, which is to be synchronized with the Strategic Planning cycle. The next cycle is targeted to begin in 2014. The Strategic Planning Subcommittee of the Planning Council is charged with updating the plan, reviewing the college’s mission statement and the strategic goals. (I.A.2, I.A.3)

The team found evidence of the Strategic Plan for 2008-2015, identifying the current updated mission statement and strategic goals. This superseded and augmented the goals provided in the self evaluation report. Although the prior eleven goals were assessed and reevaluated, they were not mapped to the new strategic goals due to the publication of the self evaluation report and the approval of the current draft of the Strategic Plan, updated in 2009. The mission is central to institutional planning and decision-making as evidenced by the inclusion of the college’s mission in the various planning documents, the alignment between the mission and the college’s strategic directions, and links between the planning and resource allocation processes. The college is proactive in updating its mission statement and efforts to use it to drive their planning process and program missions. As part of the reorganization of the college the shift to the 2002 standards, the goals were changed from qualitative statements to the quantitative Strategic Plan goals. This switch makes it possible to allow the rank ordering of needs for resource allocation. (I.A.4)

Conclusion
The college meets all the requirements set forth in Standard IA. The college has provided evidence of regular review of its mission statement, understands its student population, and seeks to deliver high quality services to those services. The college offers a variety of instructional and student services programs that support its mission and student population. Student learning is identified as a central component of the mission statement in its description as a “learning-centered, open door comprehensive community college.” The college’s mission statement was approved by the Board of Regents and is available to the college and the external community in publications and on the web site. The college’s planning process supports the stated mission statement and drives the development of strategic goals for the college and programs. Its centrality is evident in key planning and decision-making documents. The college communicates the understanding of its multi-faceted role in transfer, vocational education, and basic skills. The college acknowledges the need to serve an ethically and economically diverse community. Thus, the instructional, student services, and learning support programs align well with the stated mission, goals, and the needs of students. (I.A.1, I.A.2, I.A.3, and I.A.4)

Recommendations
None
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Standard IB. Improving Institutional Effectiveness

General Observations
The college has made progress on the elements of Standard I since the last accreditation team visit in 2006, but there is still work to be done. Program review processes have been put in place for instructional programs. There has been substantial dialogue on the college’s mission and it was revised in early 2012. There are significant SLO evaluation and implementation efforts underway but the college has not formalized institutional discussion of assessment efforts in key forums of the college. There appears to be an over-reliance on student reports of knowledge gained from “knowledge surveys” and a lack of attention to authentic assessments outside of CTE programs and pockets of the liberal arts programs. It is unclear that evaluation of faculty features consistent attention to the assessment of SLOs as a component of regular personnel evaluations. The overall impression left by the self evaluation report and the team visit is that there is assessment of learning taking place, but the use of the assessment results to make the needed changes need to be formalized in a broad-based dialogue within the institution. Put simply, the institution needs to begin “closing the loop” on assessment of learning and program review, to ensure that programs complete the entire cycle of evaluation, planning, resource request, program change implementation, and re-evaluation, and that discussion of this cycle needs to be institutionalized in a formal manner.

The general quality of the college’s Self Evaluation Report for Standard I was moderately weak. Some parts of the report were strong in establishing a link between the standards and evidence presented, other parts lacked critical evidence that could help make the case for institutional effectiveness. When the report was initially received by evaluation team members evidence hyperlinks did not work in the document. Evidence that could have been used to support the observations of the college was not included in the Self Evaluation Report. This left the team with the task of tracking down evidence via the college’s intranet and website, and searching out and requesting documents during the team visit.

Findings and Evidence
As suggested earlier, there is evidence that the College has engaged in a thoughtful, regular review of the college mission. (I.A, I.B.1) The evaluation team found evidence of extensive discussion of the mission statement at the college in a series of meetings between 2009 and 2011. The most recent formal revision of the Mission statement occurred on May 12, 2012 when the Board of Regents approved the document. Significantly, the mission statement revision featured important changes suggested by student representatives, who advocated for the inclusion of gender diversity and acceptance in the statement. The College Catalog features student learning outcomes for all instructional programs, and there is evidence that the college communicates these outcomes in course syllabi as well. Review of course syllabi by team members indicated that the listing of course level learning outcomes was widespread in both face to face courses and distance education offerings, although some instructors use inconsistent terminology like “learner objectives” or “learning competencies”. (I.A, I.B.1)

The College has made notable progress on strengthening campus dialogue about institutional improvement and planning and budgeting processes. (I.B.1) The mission statement has been
revised after considerable dialogue in governance forums. Program review processes have been modified, standardized, and are being used to formulate budget resource requests. Since the college’s midterm report, a new budget and resource allocation model has been debated and implemented at the college. Training on student learning outcome assessment has been enhanced, and faculty in individual departments have been meeting to develop assessment reports. Meeting minutes for key committees like the Planning Council demonstrate extensive dialogue about integrated planning, budgeting, program review and strategic goals. Budget requests are reviewed and prioritized not only by the Budget Subcommittee of the Planning Council, but also by several other governance groups (the Faculty Senate Executive Committee, Staff Senate Executive Committee, Student Government, and the Kupu Kai Wai Council). Faculty and staff report that they are pleased with the structured, open dialogue that has emerged in the new resource allocation process. Meeting minutes for most committees are readily accessible on the college’s intranet web site. (I.B.1)

The College has also agreed to take part in important national initiatives like Achieving the Dream (ATD) and regular use of the CCSSE survey for tracking trends of student satisfaction. As vehicles for broad discussion of institutional effectiveness, the college is well positioned to use CCSSE data and ATD data for institutional dialogue. Regular reports on these projects are or will be made in town hall forums or appropriate shared governance settings. Participation in these projects also ensures the college is engaged in a larger national dialogue about institutional effectiveness and student learning. (I.B.1)

Governance committee members interviewed by team members expressed a belief that the college had “turned a corner” in terms of collegial dialogue and they felt that faculty and staff were much more engaged in institution-wide dialogue about important budget and planning matters. Even so, there were still concerns expressed in the Self Evaluation Report about the need for more transparent communication of budgeting decisions (p. 61). Interviews with faculty and managers indicated this concern more than likely referred to the need to communicate back more regularly and effectively to the campus community the resource allocation decisions that had been made by the Council in its recommendations to the Chancellor. (I.B.1)

In one portion of the Self Evaluation Report, the college indicated that strategic goals identified for the college are not framed in measurable terms, suggesting there is no reference point for gauging improvement over time (see p. 62, Standard I.B.2). However, evidence gallery documents reviewed by the team suggest that there are measurable goals stated as benchmarks that are quantifiable (see the General College Meetings Link on page 51 of the Self Evaluation Report). The “non-measurable” comment may reference the College’s 2009 Strategic Plan Implementation Framework. That document does an effective job of identifying strategic goals and parties responsible for specific actions, but it is short on proposed action plans and it does not feature timelines for completion of the plan elements. College leaders should consider utilizing the Strategic Plan Implementation Framework as a launching point for renewed strategic goals for the College in the next planning cycle, with an eye toward maintaining an accountability framework for responsible parties who will lead these planning initiatives and including timelines for completion of various plans. Measurable outcomes should be a hallmark of those plans and goals. (I.B.2, I.B.3)
One of the key mechanisms for review of institutional effectiveness resides in the college’s instructional program reviews. These are completed via annual updates with more substantial program reviews every 5 years. The community college system uses “health indicators” that are applied to assess the status of instructional programs. The health of a program is determined by examining eight “demand” indicators, 11 “efficiency” indicators and 11 “effectiveness” indicators. Demand indicators focus in on student utilization, enrollment, and labor market needs of the region and state. Efficiency indicators focus on metrics like average class size, class fill rates, majors per faculty member, and costs per student. Effectiveness indicators turn the attention to course completions, persistence, and certificate and degree attainment. For each of the three areas, judgment calls are made about the relative health of the program (healthy, cautionary, and unhealthy). It is a potentially useful rubric that provides a quick read on the vitality and viability of programs. Including student learning (SLO) assessment results along with enrollment management performances and student achievement indicators will enhance the program health evaluation. (I.B.3)

Despite the implementation of a systematic approach to program review data, it is not clear that the program review data are being used to set standards of satisfactory performance at the institutional or programmatic level (Standard IB.2, Code of Federal Regulations 602.17[f]). The College has identified strategic goals that do highlight standards of performance for various measures that are reasonable and focused on some programs, but these rarely address levels of success at the program level (HCC Strategic Plan 2008-2015). The college is urged to identify metrics of success at the program level, with an eye toward setting specific goals for each academic and support program at the college, and should communicate progress toward those goals broadly to appropriate constituencies. (I.B.2, I.B.5)

In meetings with faculty and administrative leaders, some concern was expressed that the data metrics and “health calls” listed in the program review documents were made by individuals at the system level office and did not align well with local campus impressions of the health and vitality of actual programs. In several of the program review documents, faculty explicitly questioned the validity of the data metrics pertaining to employment labor market demand, and presented contextualized justifications for their own impression of their instructional program’s vitality. The gap between system office-provided data and local campus concerns suggests a need for better coordination within the system on the program review model and data metrics for program improvement, especially as they relate to employment possibilities for program completers. (I.B.3)

The College has recently undergone an administrative reorganization and has implemented a relatively new planning and resource allocation policy (HCCP 4.101, 2012). This policy is designed to impose a coherent structure on the budgeting and planning processes. Under that policy, the college’s main planning entity is the Planning Council, a 28-member committee with representatives from a broad cross section of employee groups. The charter of the Council was established in April of 2008. The Planning Council serves as a clearinghouse for budget and resource requests on an annual basis, with a Budget Subcommittee taking the task of consolidating resource requests from a planning matrix that individuals use to fill out request proposals. As indicated above, resource requests are referred to four governance groups for ranking as either high, medium or low priorities for the college (a third of the proposals must fall
into each tier). When these rankings are received back at the Budget Subcommittee, the requests are re-sorted and discussed by the Planning Council for recommendation to the Chancellor. As a means for integrating planning and program review with resource allocation decisions, the requests are required to be tied to a program review recommendation and to the UH system strategic goals or HCC strategic goals. (I.B.4)

This integrated budget and planning model is relatively new to the college, having been used three years in a row. In April 2012, after broad review and recommendations from governance committees and the Planning Council, the projects designated for academic year 2012-13 funding included projects necessary to meet health and safety concerns, Board of Regents priority projects, positions that were included in the college’s reorganization plan, and other projects that scored 3 points or higher on a ranking rubric. The connection of funded projects to Board of Regents priorities ensures that projects are tied to strategic goals of the college. Team members validated that the budget allocation process was working rather well, but that communication to the college community about funded projects and positions could be improved. (I.B.4, I.B.5)

The use of evidence in the assessment of progress toward goals and decision-making based on a systemic cycle of evaluation, integrated planning, resource allocation, implementation and reevaluation could have been much stronger. In the Self Evaluation Report, there were stated examples of how innovations or revitalized programs have evolved from the planning process, but the case was not made very explicitly in the report itself. For example, in the Self Evaluation Report, the college identified several programs that have been launched using external funding, and claims these were tied to the Strategic Plan, but the case was not made explicitly about how each of the projects reflects a particular strategic goal and how they were deliberated upon and “approved” through a planning and resource allocation process. (I.B.3)

In lieu of a clear connection to evidence in the actual report, team members asked HCC representatives to identify specific resource allocation decisions that might be “walked backwards” from an assessment project or program review, to a program review resource request or budget request, to a high priority ranking in the budget process to actual funding. Three specific examples were readily cited. First, a new faculty position in the Diesel Program was identified as one that had been singled out in a program review, resulting in a resource request and the reallocation of money from another program to fund the position (this was done by deciding to not replace a retiring faculty member in one division in order to fill the Diesel position). Another example cited was funding for equipment in the CENT program (Computing, Electronics, and Networking Technology). A third example was the reallocation of a CENT faculty line to a Basic Skills faculty position. (I.B.3)

In each of these examples, resource requests were justified by program review requests from particular faculty departments. Additionally, conversations with one faculty member identified that significant assessment of SLOs had occurred in the liberal arts program (through student knowledge surveys) and in the speech department, with each resulting in notable changes in teaching strategies. The speech faculty have implemented a common rubric for evaluating student speeches as a result of SLO assessment and implemented specific training on the use of Microsoft Power-point in distance education courses. Interviews with a History faculty member
who had been identified as an assessment champion also turned up evidence of a strong connection between assessments of course level SLOs, program learning outcomes, and changes in methods at the program level. As a result, the college could point to some significant changes in teaching and learning and resource relocation decisions that flowed from program review documents, and that meshed well with strategic goals for the college, but this evidence had to be gleaned from campus interviews and retrieval of documents from particular individuals. (IB.3)

Team members interviewed faculty who have served on the Assessment Committee and the Planning Council to determine whether the college has institutionalized a formal mechanism for discussion. Faculty indicated that this was an area in need of improvement, but that the Program Review process is being modified to include narrative discussion of SLO assessment reports in the 2012-13 cycle. The Assessment Committee had been recently reconvened with an Interim Chair who indicated a need to strengthen the institution-wide dialogue about SLO assessment and program change. Other faculty interviewed confirmed this impression. The Interim Assessment Committee chair stated that SLO assessment and program improvement is happening, “we are all doing it, [but] we just don’t have evidence to show you”. The results of assessment and evidence to support widespread improvement and measuring of results were not provided to the team. The use of a piecemeal approach to measuring results is ineffective. (IB.5, II.A)

While examples of strong SLO assessment were uncovered during the college visit, the visiting team learned during its visit that the college had failed to turn in its required SLO progress report to the ACCJC on time. Team members were hopeful that they would receive a copy of the report to provide evidence that the college had attained the level of proficiency on SLO implementation. As a result, the visiting team cannot say with confidence that the college has attained the level of proficiency on the use of SLOs in pursuit of a continuous cycle of program improvement as the ACCJC Rubric of Institutional Effectiveness indicates. (IB.5)

According to the ACCJC Manual for Institutional Self Evaluation, Section 5.4, institutions should present evidence of student achievement and learning that is “disaggregated by age, gender, race/ethnicity, socio-economic status, delivery mode, instructional site, cohort group, and other categories relevant to the institution’s service area.” This is also a hallmark of Accreditation Standard IB, which emphasizes the provision of evidence of “the achievement of student learning outcomes and evidence of institution and program performance.” An example of the report’s weak approach to evidence of student learning appears early in the document, where assessment/placement data are not disaggregated beyond Achieving the Dream cohort data (p. 10). No effort was made to analyze the data along important demographic or student characteristics. Similarly, no disaggregated data appeared for graduation rates, course completion rates, progression from one course level to the next, and transfer rates. Data for some key tables were out-of-date (Fall 2010 data for a Fall 2012 evaluation, see p. 13 for example).

The analysis of data along different characteristics is important for the college to identify gaps in achievement and learning that persist across various groups. At HCC, for example, nearly one-quarter of students receive Pell grants (23% - fall 2010 data, p. 5). It might be important to know if financial aid recipients are more committed to their studies and therefore exhibit higher rates
of course completion, term-to-term persistence, and transfer. Likewise, it might be significant to know if Asian students of Japanese or Filipino descent perform better (or worse) than students who are native Hawaiian, especially as the college devotes resources to Native Hawaiian completion and student success initiatives. No such sensitivity to student achievement data was present in the Self Evaluation Report. Data that break out degree completion rates by ethnicity and gender are available at the University of Hawaii system office level (for all universities and community colleges in the system), but they were not cited in the HCC Self Evaluation Report. There is also no evidence of the use of the data across the College for evaluation and decision-making. (I.B.3, I.B.5)

In line with this deficiency, there was a surprising absence of tables and charts beyond the standard demographics discussed early in the Self Evaluation Report. Moreover, the co-authors listed for the standards did not identify an institutional research presence in the crafting of the document. Team members verified that the Office of Policy, Planning and Institutional Research did participate by responding to ad hoc data requests from various team members, but the participation of the office’s two researchers was limited to that support role. Admittedly, institutional researchers are not the sole practitioners of a culture of evidence on a college campus, but they are vital for pulling together coherent data on student success and achievement and institutional effectiveness. The lack of data suggests the need for focused improvement by the college in the use of institutional research as it evaluates the effectiveness of its programs and its planning and resource allocation processes. (I.B.6)

The Standard I report on mission and effectiveness did not reference the College’s Long Range Development Plan (LRDP – the College’s facilities plan). It left the impression that medium term and longer range facilities planning is unrelated to the improvement of student learning and institutional effectiveness, and unrelated to the strategic goal setting and program review process. Because of this, there is little evidence that the facilities plan was tied to other institutional plans addressing College mission and achievement of that mission. The report does cite to strategic goals and an implementation framework for strategic goals for the 2008-15 period, but this is not the equivalent of a plan that outlines ongoing planning and resource allocation processes and the systematic review of their effectiveness in improving instructional programs, student support services, and library and other learning support services. (I.B.6, I.B.7)

**Conclusion**

The college partially meets the requirements set forth in Standard I.B. There is some evidence that the institution maintains on-going dialogue about the continuous improvement of student learning and institutional processes, but there should be wider and more systematic discussions of SLOs and PLOs. Faculty and instructional leaders have put in place a program review and assessment cycle that uses standard data metrics and evaluative reporting processes that reflect well on the college’s efforts to engage in a self-reflective dialogue about student learning outcomes and achievement, but there are concerns about the data included in program reviews. Student learning assessment reports for instructional programs are available on the college’s intranet website, and the reports suggest that this is an on-going process. Some changes have been made in response to those assessment reports, suggesting that some of the faculty are “closing the loop” in evaluation and implementation. The college engages in a cyclical program review process that includes dialog, assessment of learning outcomes, and it results in changes
designed to improve student learning and program effectiveness. The institution modifies its program review processes as needed in order to improve its effectiveness.

The college could do a better job communicating its plans and goals to the broader public to develop a culture that includes robust dialog about institutional effectiveness, practices, and structures that support broad-based and collegial planning processes.

However, in order to fully meet the standards, planning at the college need greater clarity, definition, and alignment to ensure that these processes are integrated. In addition, the college needs to complete program reviews for administrative support services at the college. Subsequently, the college needs to engage in a regular and systematic assessment of its planning processes and structures of this review.

**College Recommendations**

**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)

**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 should occur for all student support, academic and administrative programs. (2006 Recommendation 2, Standard I.B.1, I.B.4, I.B.7, II.A, II.A.1.b, II.A.1.c, II.A.2.a, II.A.2.b, II.A.2.e, II.A.2.f, II.A.2.g, II.A.2.h, II.A.2.i, II.A.3, II.A.6, II.A.6.a, II.B.1, II.B.4, II.C.1.a, II.C.2, III.A, III.A.6, IV.A.1, IV.A.2.b, IV.A.5, IV.B.1.b, Eligibility Requirement 10)
STANDARD II
STUDENT LEARNING PROGRAMS AND SERVICES

Standard IIA. Instructional Programs

General Observations
Honolulu Community College clearly understands the two primary facets of this standard: one, that it offers high quality instructional programs, with articulated student learning outcomes leading to degrees, certificates, employment, or transfer to a four-year institution in alignment with its mission; and two, these instructional programs are continually reviewed and assessed to ensure currency and improvement of teaching and learning processes to benefit students.

The college uses various data sources (e.g. State Dept of Labor and Industrial Relations (DLIR), Hawai‘i Workforce Infonet, and the college’s institutional research office) to identify community and student needs that assist greatly in the development or revamp of instructional programs. In addition, the college is engaged in various analysis and reporting activities to evaluate the college’s effectiveness in its program delivery. Hence, in addition to annual assessments, the college performs program review on a five-year cycle, which includes program health indicators for demand, efficiency, and effectiveness, such as retention, persistence, transfer, and certificate or degree completion rates. Program reviews also contain action plans that are either short-term or long-term goals. Tied to these goals are resource implications that inform decision-making regarding program funding. In addition, analysis of institutional research data, and faculty consultation with industry leaders and program Advisory Committee members, are factors that can lead to changes in a program’s curriculum. The centrality of the role of faculty in the area of curriculum development and revision is clearly evident.

Findings and Evidence
The college’s mission, student population base, and strong community and business/industry partnerships drive and inform the nature, scope, and structure of HCC’s curriculum. The college has developed its student learning outcomes for programs and courses, and publishes student learning outcomes (SLO) in its College Catalog and in course syllabi. A random review of course syllabi, however, revealed that there seems to be inconsistency in the SLO terminology, with “Course Learning Objectives,” “Learning Competencies,” and “Student Learner Objectives” appearing in the sample course syllabi made available in the team room. (II.A)

Program and course offerings in transfer preparation, career and technical education, and basic skills are the predominant areas of focus for the college. Specifically, the college offers general education and foundational skills courses in over three dozen disciplines. Occupational degrees are offered in nearly thirty programmatic areas. Programs are required to complete annual assessments and program review on a five-year cycle, focusing on a standard set of program metrics supported by quantitative data generated from the system-provided ARPD. The annual assessment template established for instructional programs provides thoughtful guidance to faculty as they assess their programs and course-level student learning outcomes. At the end of a
five-year period, a program review template is used to synthesize program data that yield quantitative ratings of Unhealthy, Cautionary, or Healthy based on very specific system-wide metrics. (II.A.1, II.A.1.a, II.A.1.b, II.A.1.c)

Through document analysis and interviews with faculty and administrators, the team found that although the structures and processes of assessment and program review are in place, there exists some level of resistance about the value and meaningfulness of the metrics of assessment and program review as they link to resource allocation issues. Metrics are identified by members of all community colleges and discussed on a regular basis. Ironically, this system requirement has also spurred a healthy discussion on campus regarding what health indicators data mean, as applied uniquely to the institution. The discomfort by some with the data generated by the system has therefore become a source of robust conversations for other means of assessment, with a greater focus on the use of authentic or embedded assessment of courses and programs. Through interviews with faculty, the team verified that a good number of them have been engaged in these types of authentic assessment in their classes, though it has not reached the level of institutionalization that provides a forum for systematic discussion. This is perhaps the reason why this type of assessment was not even discussed substantively in the self evaluation report. Those who were interviewed confirmed that there is currently minimal support for faculty training on doing authentic or embedded assessment activities outside of the annual assessment templates and the program review process. (II.A.2.a-e)

In its Self Evaluation Report, the college claims to have reached the level of “Proficiency” in terms of its SLO implementation. But what does “proficiency” look like on the ACCJC Rubric for Institutional Effectiveness? According to this rubric, the following eight (8) characteristics define this level:

1. Student learning outcomes and authentic assessment are in place for courses, programs and degrees.
2. Results of assessment are being used for improvement and further alignment of institution-wide practices.
3. There is widespread institutional dialogue about the results.
4. Decision-making includes dialogue on the results of assessment and is purposefully directed toward improving student learning.
5. Appropriate resources continue to be allocated and fine-tuned.
6. Comprehensive assessment reports exist and are completed on a regular basis.
7. Course student learning outcomes are aligned with degree student learning outcomes.
8. Students demonstrate awareness of goals and purposes of courses and programs in which they are enrolled.

Through a careful analysis of documents provided to the team, supplemented by interviews with faculty, staff, administrators, and student leaders during the visit, the team found that of these eight characteristics, the college has not fully met the elements described in items 1, 3, and 8 above. In descriptor 1, for example, the college has not institutionalized authentic or embedded assessment in its program review/annual assessment processes. As a result, the campus dialogue about assessment results is oftentimes sporadic and department-based, without reaching a level of coordination and momentum, particularly on qualitative approaches utilized in course or
program assessment (descriptor 3). Furthermore, students have not been given ample opportunities to participate in the dialogue about SLOs, as validated by interviews with students (descriptor 8), and the glaring lack of student involvement in the development of the Self Evaluation Report perhaps confirms this team observation. Only one student was, in fact, a committee member (Standard 3B) in the entire report. Upon further analysis, the team also discovered that the college could be at the "Development" level for one element of the rubric, yet be at the "Sustainable Continuous Quality Improvement" level for another element of the rubric. A good example would be that the college specifically links SLOs to program reviews, which is at the "Sustainable Continuous Quality Improvement" level. However, as validated by the team’s review of available syllabi, the level of SLO discussion on campus needs to be more widespread and institutionalized so that consistency in SLO verbiage and a collective understanding of what SLOs means become entrenched in the institutional culture. The SLO Report which was due to the Commission during the week of the visit, and which was not submitted by the college on time, is perhaps an indication that SLO implementation at the college needs more work. Because of these reasons, the team concluded that the college is still at the “Development” stage insofar as the overall level of SLO implementation is concerned. Ultimately, the obligation of the College is to meet the Standards pertaining to SLOs and assessment. Moving forward, the faculty and administration must move away from achieving elements of the ACCJC Rubric for Institutional Effectiveness, to ensuring that practices deeply address the intents and purposes of SLOs and assessment in program review and planning for institutional effectiveness and educational quality. (II.A.1.c, II.A.2.a, II.A.2.e, II.A.2f)

Through interviews and document review, the team found that the college has a variety of processes in place to ensure the integrity of its instructional programs including the curriculum review and approval process, program review across the instructional areas, SLO implementation, data collection and analysis (including regular student surveys), and industry partner collaboration. The Committee on Programs and Curricula (CPC) provides oversight for course and program decisions, and a Distance Education Review Board (DERB) reviews courses for appropriateness for online delivery. At the time of the team visit, roughly fifty course sections were available via online delivery. The college uses a Sakai-powered learning management system for online delivery named Laulima. The platform allows for the posting of customary online course information (chat rooms, class resources, posting of assignments, syllabi, class-wide emails). The team validated that, as indicated in the Commission standard, regular and effective contact between the students and instructors can be established and monitored using these methods. (II.A.2, II.A.2.a, II.A.2.d, II.A.2.e)

A strong component of its instructional offerings are career and technical education (CTE) programs. Guided and supported by strong campus and community commitments, the college has established, cultivated and maintained meaningful partnerships with business and industry. These partnerships yield proactive labor market needs identified by the constituents, through its curriculum development, program review and strategic goal setting processes. A number of new program enhancements have been added at the College since the last team visit in 2006. The most recent expansion of CTE programs focused on a Construction Academy and a Construction Management program to meet the growing need for 8,000-trained professionals in the construction industry. Through a review of committee meeting minutes, the team validated that Advisory committees exist and provide solid feedback for CTE programs. (II.A.2.b)
Through interviews with faculty and administrators, discussion of distance education quality has so far focused primarily on student satisfaction surveys. For example, the college reports that 85% of students surveyed in 2008 would recommend or consider taking a distance education course using the same delivery mode (Self Evaluation Report, p. 112), yet this conclusion is primarily based on student self-reports. At the time of the writing of the self evaluation report, there was no comparative study done on student learning in the two modalities the college currently makes available to its students: face-to-face versus distance education. Thus, the college’s self evaluation report is silent on the success of distance education students versus students taking traditional face-to-face course work. The only evidence presented in the report is the 2008 survey indicating students’ satisfaction with the delivery method of instruction. Although the team was provided a 2011 online survey report, which was a follow up to the 2008, survey, it was another satisfaction survey. No apparent comparison had been made between student achievement (as measured by final course grades) and delivery method of instruction. During the team visit, institutional researchers provided a recently completed study of success rates in face-to-face and online classes. The recency of this study represents a glaring lack of attention to the quality of instruction across delivery platforms, particularly so in light of the 2006 team recommendation on the same issue of Distance Education assessment. The Distance Education Advisory Committee (DEAC) functions to ensure adequate support to maintain a high quality and effective distance education program. The committee recognizes the need to assess, evaluate, and provide comparative data on student success with the comparable traditional courses. (II.A.2.d, II.A.2.e)

It is perhaps the discussion of what constitutes General Education that has divided the campus faculty the most in the year prior to the visit. The voices of faculty in various discipline areas have been heard in numerous town hall and subcommittee meetings on this issue. These discussions have in fact yielded a clear and concrete philosophy of general education, which also established criteria to place courses on a CTE General Education List and a separate Liberal Arts degree General Education List. However, the lists appear to allow less than transferable course work for CTE students, and nothing below transfer level for Liberal Arts students. (II.A.3)

Actionable Improvement Plans (AIPs) throughout Standard II.A of the self evaluation report indicate that for Liberal Arts, the college meets the ACCJC standards, but that the college does not for CTE programs and the AIPs state that “the CTE programs must continue to review, revise and update their GE component” (Self Evaluation Report, p. 129). As a result, there appears to be two distinct GE criteria at this point. Based on document reviews and interviews during the visit, the team found that the faculty still appear to be divided on the establishment of more stringent General Education requirements for the CTE degree programs. The curriculum committee first endorsed a “seven hallmarks approach” (11-0-1) in November of 2011 and then had that vote rescinded in March 2012 (8-5 vote). At the time of the visit, continuing discussions had changed the requirements to five hallmarks. The General Education policy (HCCP #5.213) issued in April 2012 codified these faculty discussions into a concrete policy that should now guide the final decision of the faculty regarding this issue. In all cases, degrees must require college-level general education, including mathematics and English. The College should ensure that all graduates of degree programs, whether in CTE or Liberal Arts, obtain a similar accumulation of units derived from the same GE philosophy. In this light, the college should
work to clarify its general education component for both sets of students in its college catalog, schedule of classes, and online materials. (II.A.3.a, II.A.3.b, II.A.3.c)

The team verified that all the degree offerings at the college include focused study in at least one area of inquiry or in an established interdisciplinary core. (II.A.4)

The team also found that the college ensures that students completing their Associate in Applied Science degrees demonstrate technical and professional competencies that meet employment and other applicable standards and are ready to sit for external licensure and certification exams. (II.A.5)

The team verified that the institution provides clear and accurate information about educational courses and programs and transfer policies to students and the general public. The college catalog clearly defines its degrees and certificates in terms of their purpose, content, course requirements, and expected student learning outcomes. The college catalog, along with the Student Handbook and the college website, are the primary sources of information for students when it comes to programs, courses, and college policies that govern them. Information about the college’s credit transfer policy, articulation agreements, as well as students’ academic rights and freedoms are readily available to students through the website and hard copy materials. (II.A.6, II.A.6.a, II.A.7)

Conclusion
The college partially meets this standard. It must now dedicate persistent efforts to ensure that student learning outcomes are produced, measured, and analyzed, with the results providing the data to implement necessary changes in the teaching and learning environment.

The team believes that the college, through its various instructional offerings, meets the mission of HCC and addresses the varied educational needs of its students through programs consistent with their educational preparation and the diversity, demographics, and economy of its surrounding areas. As an integral part of the assessment culture, there exists rich evidence of completed annual assessment and program reviews across all instructional programs at the college. There is a strong quantitative approach to assessment and program review, as evidenced by the system-mandated templates that are required for completion at specified deadlines. The college is encouraged to supplement this component with a variety of qualitative tools and methodologies that include embedded or authentic assessment of courses and programs, both in the DE and face-to-face environments. The team highlights the need for faculty training support of this qualitative assessment initiative at the institutional level.

College Recommendations:

See College Recommendation #2

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)

**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-e)
Standard IIB. Student Support Services

General Observations
Due to a recent reorganization (approved August 2012), Honolulu Community College provides comprehensive student support services through a variety of programs which have been structured into two areas:

1. Student Services (Admissions and Records, Advising/Counseling, Mental Health and Wellness, Career and Employment Center, Financial Aid, Student Health Services, Student Life and Development, and two specialized programs - - a TRIO grant and the Native Hawaiian Center which is being included within the Native Hawaiian Program of the college) and the

2. Academic Support Division (services for disabled students [Student ACCESS], a new “Student Success” area [which includes the remaining College Skills Center functions of testing & tutoring and a retention office], the Educational Technology Center, the Library, and the Design Center.)

The self-evaluation report descriptions were reflective of each program’s view of itself without a flavor of integrated effort. Evaluation sections were brief; the college had some “actionable improvement plans” for this portion of the Standards. For purposes of this report the new “Academic Support Division” is treated in Standard II.C.

Actions by which the college can evaluate its effectiveness and plan for improvement in meeting the needs of its students have received considerable attention since the last accreditation. Two results of this attention are the newly adopted reorganization and the new policies on remedial education both of which have long-term implications for the provision of student support services. The college is urged to design assessment measures and evaluate the efficacy of these changes. The college as a whole has apparently accepted the concept of regular and consistent assessment as a core institutional process and has designed a comprehensive program review process. That the institution is still struggling with the implementation of the concept, however, is evident through the improvement plans throughout the self-evaluation.

Honolulu Community College addresses the support needs of students from communities across its service area through the provision of services on the main campus and through the delivery of an expanding distance education offering. In addition to outreach and recruitment efforts, it provides student support services to any student who is admitted. As part of the admissions process, students are assessed as to their proficiency in English and mathematics. Concerns over the success of students in these disciplines led in part to the recent reorganization of how the college provides learning services and to the successful acquisition of an Achieving the Dream grant. In addition the college regularly assesses students using the Community College Survey of Student Engagement.

There is little evidence to suggest that college-wide or “student-support-service-wide” discussions have occurred about how student access, progress, learning, and success are
consistently supported in either traditional or DE delivery modes. Support for student success appears to be handled individually unit-by-unit with each service addressing the immediate needs of the presenting students.

Any student who has been accepted at the college may enroll in DE sections and is deemed able to benefit from these programs. The self evaluation indicates that student demographic information is not disaggregated for the DE population, nor is student achievement data. There is no indication that the particular student service needs of distance learners have been discussed nor taken into consideration in admissions policies and procedures.

Findings and Evidence
As a result of the team's review of information and conduct of the visit, the team finds that the institution’s student support services enhance achievement of the mission regardless of location or means of delivery. Each of the student support service units has a mission that is aligned with that of the college and strives to deliver high quality services that are characterized by concern for student access, progress, and success.

The college extends its services into the many communities it serves, either through programs physically accessed or through distance education. Structures that are in place to assure consistently high levels of quality are the process of program review (which includes the results of SLO assessment and other data collection) and satisfaction surveys of all types; these processes include the distance education offerings of the college. Each of the service units report using both of these avenues to assure improvement of services although no evidence was presented in the self evaluation as to the results of these assessments. The Five-Year Program Review of Student Services describes the mission, goals, student learning outcomes, and structure of each program and in most cases includes results of some assessment. There is evident discussion of the components of the program review, but the discussion does not indicate a direct relationship between data and achievement of goals/outcomes. Although considerable assessment is being conducted, it is not linked in any way to the desired outcomes. Interviews with some faculty members confirm continuing confusion as to the integrated structure of outcomes-assessment-program improvement. DE services are also assured to be of high quality and comparable with institution's face-to-face offerings by evaluation and review through the college program review process. That there are gaps in services for distance students is evident in the improvement plan for this section which suggests that “... the College continue to create solutions and/or means of service delivery for DE students who are unable to meet in-person obligations…” (II.B.1).

Honolulu Community College assures that students have accurate and current information about courses/programs/credit with which to form an educational plan, about services available to them to successfully complete that plan, and about policies/regulations that apply to them. This information is described in the catalog that is clear and well structured and is delivered in both printed and electronic form. However in the electronic form, the links to the various sections (such as those for Services for Students, Academic Regulations, Tuition & Fees, Degrees and Certificates, Program Descriptions) lead to the entire catalog website rather than to the specific section. The degree of difficulty in finding information is increased dramatically from the perspective of the distance reader.
The catalog includes: the official identifiers for the institution, the mission statement, course/program/degree offerings, the academic calendar, a statement of academic freedom, descriptions of available student financial aid and learning resources, and information about administrators/faculty/governing board members. Information about accreditation and authorization are included as is contact information for filing complaints. The catalog also includes completion rates but does not yet contain student loan default rates. Examination of financial aid documents indicates that the default rate for the college approximates ten percent. Issues of academic freedom, student financial aid, and available learning resources for DE students are addressed by the same means as for traditional education students. The catalog describes the cable and online instructional delivery requirements applied for the DE courses. DE sections are identified in the schedule of classes by a locator. The catalog is silent as to which if any programs are offered completely through this mode. The interaction between faculty and students is said to be by email or via the Laulima course management system. (II.B.2.a)

The catalog likewise contains detailed information on admissions requirements, student fees and other financial obligations, and requirements related to degrees/certificates/graduation/transfer. The admission policies and admission requirements appear to be the same for traditional programs and for programs offered in DE mode. The college website indicates that classes at a distance may be taken by any enrolled HCC student and indicates no required or suggested preparation. The self evaluation is silent as to the rationale for this decision; interviews and minutes of student service area meetings and of the Council on Student Affairs confirms that there has been no “student-support-service wide” discussion of distance education. The fees for DE courses are the same as for traditional courses with the exception of an additional fee for certain classes delivered by cable. Issues related to student fees and other financial obligations are clearly addressed.

In spite of the lack of a focused DE discussion, HCC has made a significant effort to provide student support services to DE students. A well-prepared download is available on the DE website entitled, “Essential Resources for DE Students” which includes links to many services. Counseling, tutoring, health, and other student/academic services are available to DE students and are clearly addressed in the electronic format. The College Skills Center has extended its tutoring services through a contract with “Smarthinking”, an online and call-in tutoring service. The self evaluation is silent as to whether or how DE student attendance is monitored. (II.B.2.b)

Major policies affecting students (including those enrolled in DE) are clearly delineated in the catalog. Policies and procedures for all of the indicated topics are found in sections of the catalog titled: Services for Students (including student regulations), Academic Regulations, and Tuition and Fees. There is a statement in the catalog regarding Board policy on academic dishonesty and the associated sanctions. There is apparently no policy regarding the expectation of academic honesty. The policy on the college website governing the Student Conduct Code is dated 1971; the college is urged to review its content. (II.B.2.c)

Policies that directly affect students are either included or referenced in the catalog. In most cases a contact person is identified who is the resource person for that information. By its own
admission the college is working to assure that recently adopted policies related to remedial education are consistently reflected in the catalog and other documents. The self evaluation is silent on the process the college uses to ensure that the information in its publications is easily accurate and accessible to students, including students enrolled in DE, prospective students, and the public. However, interviews with college personnel reveal a process of review at least once a year. That review is section by section with no particular assurance that all of the pages that relate to a particular issue are updated at the same time. There are, for example, several sections that refer to the General Education requirements; those pages appear to be in conflict. The improvement plan for this section notes that the college has convened a task force "... to review information sources and processes, and identify means to improve consistency." The college is urged to implement this plan.

The institution has a process for and maintains records of student complaints and grievances. The policies and procedures related to this process are handled through the office of the Dean of Student Services who is responsible for the disposition and follow up of the petitions. Complaints and grievances filed by students studying in DE mode are handled in the same way as those received from face-to-face students. The number of complaints from distant students appears not to differ from those on campus. The team examined the college's grievance/complaint procedures and complaints for the preceding 5 years. There were no patterns identified that indicate deficiencies in standards, eligibility requirements, or accreditation policies. (II.B.2.d)

Honolulu Community College provides the array of comprehensive student support services expected of a fully functioning community college. It reports using internal assessment tools to determine the needs of the student population as well as the nationally benchmarked instrument of the Community College Survey of Student Engagement. The most recent student services program review documents the CCSSE results and includes a discussion of some of the findings. The information provided does not disaggregate the data by location. Although there is no evidence of an integrated effort to determine the potentially different needs of the DE population, at least some units have recognized the special issues. Health Services addresses differences in service on its DE information page. (II.B.3)

The college is committed to providing student support services to all of its students regardless of location or mode of delivery. Recognizing the personnel and budget difficulties of this commitment, Honolulu Community College has turned to web resources to meet the needs. The registration, payment, documents interface processes are handled through the college portal for all students, as is the STAR degree-audit advising system. Student service personnel have extended their services through use of email and Skype.

The self evaluation is silent as to any evaluation of services that is disaggregated by location or mode of delivery. Interviews during the site visit confirm that there is no disaggregated means of evaluation nor is there a method for logging services used by distant students as compared to on campus students. The team confirmed that students use a unique student code and password to access the courses offered at a distance. The interaction between student service faculty and students is said to be by email or telephone.
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Interviews conducted during the visit indicate that there has been no systematic discussion as to
delivery of services to students in distance education. Each unit has tried to extend its traditional
services to those students without a carefully considered assessment of the need, inquiry as to
method, or evaluation of results. Minutes for the Council of Student Affairs reveals no
overarching discussion of this issue.

The need to extend student support services to an increasing population of distant students has
come at a time when on campus service hours have been reduced due to budget constraints. The
college traditionally offered face-to-face services during evening hours; for the past two or three
years that evening opportunity has been reduced to a couple of days per week. The college no
longer has any hours of service after 4:30 PM. On the one hand, this reduction puts increased
stress on the provision of services. Alternatively, it provides the opportunity (out of necessity) to
examine different methods of service delivery. Increasing use of the STAR advising system and
a greater reliance on the UH portal are evidence that the student service units are turning to these
other methods. The college is urged to systematically consider the delivery of service at a
distance. A thoughtful study of the issue has the potential for developing processes that will
benefit not only students enrolled in distance education classes but also those students who are
not able to access the college during the day. (II.B.3.a)

Honolulu Community College offers many opportunities that encourage personal and civic
responsibility and provide for the intellectual, aesthetic, and personal development of its
students. Activities and events promoted by Service Learning, Life Skill Workshops, the student
newspaper, the Associated Students, and various clubs are cited as examples.
Many of the activities documented in the self evaluation require face-to-face participation.
While there is no reason that a distant student could not participate in several of the activities
through Skype or similar technology, there is no indication that the college addresses distant
participation nor has had a discussion about how to promote these attributes for DE students.
(II.B.3.b)

Honolulu Community College designs and maintains a counseling/academic advising program to
support student development. The program’s faculty counselors are expected to be
knowledgeable and competent in advising students about all degrees and programs of the
college; all of them are responsible for students at the main campus, at various sites, and in DE.
In addition, each of the counselors has a specialist area of assignment such as a particular CTE
program or a college initiative such as Jump Start for high school students. Counselors provide
academic counseling and advising to students by appointment, through drop-in, by going to
classes, and by holding workshops.

In the self evaluation of this section, the college notes that “There has been marked progress in
developing missions, goals, and objectives …” in this area. Guided by national standards, the
units have developed programs to address specific goals. Cited in the self evaluation is Passport
to College, an orientation and registration session that is mandatory for new incoming students
and the STAR process, a web-based degree audit program. The self-evaluation is silent as to
how DE students participate in the Passport session. Interviews, however, reveal that there is an
online session available.
The college asserts that the quality and efficiency of academic counseling is done using such tools as student evaluation forms and quantitative reports from the SARS appointment system. No specific examples were entered into evidence nor was there any discussion of how the results are considered or used for program improvement. There is no evidence that evaluation of services is disaggregated by location or mode of delivery. (II.B.3.c)

The team finds that Honolulu Community College designs and maintains programs, practices, and services that enhance student understanding and appreciation of diversity. Specific service units that lead in this effort are the Native Hawaiian Center, the TRIO-SSS program, and the Student Life and Development office. Together they plan and organize a myriad of events, activities, and student-led opportunities for students, faculty, and staff to achieve a better understanding of the diverse population of the college and of the state.

The self evaluation indicates that some of the programs related to the understanding of diversity have missions, goals, and student development SLOs, however there is little evidence that the institution uses any assessment to determine the effectiveness of these events and activities. Assessments are carried out regularly that indicate the number of activities and/or the number of students participating.

The programs and activities documented appear to be primarily, if not exclusively, face-to-face. The self evaluation is silent as to how the institution promotes student understanding and appreciation of diversity in the online teaching environment. (II.B.3.d)

The college accepts graduates from any U.S. high school, persons who have received the GED, or persons 18 years of age or older who can benefit from the instruction offered. Honolulu Community College has an “open door” policy for admission. Students under the age of 18 may be considered for early admission through a defined process and may also qualify for the college’s Running Start Program whereby they can receive both high school and college credit. The college adheres to federal law when admitting international students.

In concert with the other Hawai‘i community colleges, Honolulu Community College uses the COMPASS reading, writing, and mathematics placement tests for initial placement into English and mathematics (and now, reading) courses. The self evaluation indicates that faculty members within those disciplines evaluated these assessments for development of initial placement scores when the instrument was adopted. However there is no evidence that they have been recently validated on Hawai‘i community college students. Neither is there evidence that placement scores have been aligned to any changes in curriculum.

The self evaluation is silent on the evaluation of placement processes other than to say that the COMPASS coordinator meets regularly with his/her counterparts at the other colleges. It is likewise silent as to the evaluation of cultural and linguistic bias in the instruments and processes. There are no separate admissions or placement regulations or practices for a student to enroll in DE sections. (II.B.3.e)

The team finds that Honolulu Community College is careful and diligent in maintaining student records permanently, securely, and confidentially whether stored electronically or in hard copy
form. The college adheres to the Hawai’i state law and the Family Educational Rights and Privacy Act and appropriately maintains the confidentiality of records. The catalog and registration guide contain statements about FERPA that are clear and accurate. (II.B.3.f)

The team finds that the student support services units of Honolulu Community College have been and continue to be engaged in a dialogue vis-à-vis student learning. Statements of mission, goals, outcomes, and objectives have been developed by faculty and vary greatly in their format and composition. The link between the statements, the strategies for attaining them and the specific methods for assessment are not yet evident however. There is no transparent link between the stated activity evaluation processes and the assessment of a particular outcome. As the results of the assessments become topics for college-wide dialog, these issues will make it difficult to determine the degree of success of students in meeting the outcomes, to analyze patterns within that success, or to present the information to a variety of stakeholders. The discussion of the attainment of the outcomes and their use in program improvement is not addressed in the self evaluation.

Evaluation of the achievement of the outcomes is likewise obscure. There does not appear to be a repository of assessment results. No evidence was presented for the process by which the results of assessments are considered or used for improvement. Indeed, interviews with faculty reveal a wide range of understanding of an assessment/planning process. (II.B.4)

**Conclusion**
The college partially meets this standard.

The team finds that the student support services units of Honolulu Community College have made significant progress toward the identification, evaluation and documentation of student learning since the last accreditation. The College has established an institutional framework with support from existing organizational structures. Leadership groups have accepted responsibility for implementation and faculty and staff are fully engaged. As reported in the self evaluation, this endeavor is a work in progress and is proceeding with a degree of unevenness. Although student learning outcomes exist for each of the units, there is not yet systematic assessment linked to their achievement. To achieve the next steps in the process - - dialogue about student achievement of the outcomes, about implications of those results for learning at Honolulu Community College, and about the institution-wide commitments needed to support that learning - - will demand continuing attention by all parties.

A similar need for focused attention exists in providing services to distance education students. The team finds that the student support service units are stretching limited resources to try to accommodate these students in traditional ways. Student service personnel who were interviewed indicate that they have been too busy trying to deliver high quality services to step back and take a comprehensive look at the issue. However, the increasing demand for service and the necessity of providing comparable service dictate the need for such an evaluation.

The team finds that there is a strong desire within student services to provide excellent student support to the students of Honolulu Community College. This motivation is exemplified in the
activities of the Native Hawaiian Center. Its contributions include supporting students, providing a rich buffet of cultural activities, and partnering with other units to further student learning.

Commendation:

*College Commendation #1:*
The college is to be commended for the development of the instructional and student support services provided through the Native Hawaiian Center (NHC), which actively preserves and perpetuates Hawaiian culture and values. (II.A, II.B)

Recommendations:

*See College Recommendation #2*
Standard IIC. Library and Learning Support Services

General Observations
The College addressed Standard IIC by selecting the Library, the College Skills Center (CSC) that includes the Student ACCESS (disability services) unit and the Educational Media Center (EMC) as the departmental units that provide services and resources for Standard IIC. These three units work independently under Academic Support Services.

As part of a reorganization implemented in August, 2012, responsibilities were added to the College Skills Center while moving English and math courses and tutoring to the those departments and separating out the Student ACCESS/Disability Services under a new Student Success Coordinator. The Educational Media Center is being reorganized into two units, the Education Media Center and a new Design Center.

The Library serves students, faculty, staff and community members. The library's mission statement and goals outline the role of its' facilities and its place in the educational process of the college.

In order to support the library's mission and goals, there is a staff of 5 librarians (including the Head Librarian), 2 library technicians and 3 librarian assistants. The Library consists of five main departments, Access Services/Circulation, Technical Services, Bibliographic Instruction, Reference Services, and Administration.

The Library's collections include 62,000 print books (4700 titles added 2005-2010 and 461 added in FY 2010) and 40,000 e-titles. The library subscribes to 18 full text databases and 3 e-book collections and an online video collection. Students can access the databases using a user name authentication system. The Library participates with the Libraries of the University of Hawai‘i System for its access to Voyager [Ex Libris], the integrated library system (ILS). The community members can gain access to library materials including online databases.

The Library resides on the first two floors of Building 7 with approximately 34,200 square feet of space. There are over 300 study carrels and table seating, five group study rooms for student and faculty use, and restrooms on each floor. The Library provides access to 37 networked computer terminals. Twenty-five of these computers are dedicated for bibliographic instruction. Six computers are available exclusively as “research terminals;” they provide access library subscription databases, the online catalog, and University of Hawai‘i web portal sites.

The librarians are responsible for collection development within their assigned specialties and work collaboratively with faculty to ascertain curriculum needs. Professional literature and publishers' catalogs are used to provide lists of reviews and new publications from which librarians make selections. The librarians have an ongoing program to weed outdated/obsolete, damaged beyond repair, or no longer relevant materials to the curriculum. The Head Librarian has final authority for the purchase of materials.
There are currently three librarian positions that provide instructional teaching. The librarians also provide reference and research assistance to students, faculty, and staff. A Reference Librarian is able to assist patrons on a one-to-one basis at the Reference Desk, during all hours the Library is open. Reference assistance is also available via telephone and e-mail. The Distance Education Librarian assists students taking online and cable courses, and military-based courses with library research and resources.

The College Skills Center (CSC) is in the process of completing the reorganization of its functions within the college. Math and English courses formerly taught within the Center have been moved to the Math and English departments respectively. The tutoring in these two areas also moved to the departments. The Student ACCESS unit provides services to students with disabilities enrolled at Honolulu Community College. The unit authorizes, coordinates, and implements all academic accommodations and works with eligible participants in developing and authorizing reasonable academic accommodation.

Currently, the CSC responsibilities include testing and proctoring services, tutoring services and classes for test preparation (COMPASS). The Center offers online tutorials through a system wide commercial service called “Smarthinking” which can be used by online and campus students. The CSC consists of one coordinator (11-month faculty), three educational specialists, clerical and technology personnel and a .5 FTE LSK 30/30A lecturer. The CSC uses both person to person interactions as well as online capabilities to reach its student populations. The CSC has established an advisory committee with representatives from each division to guide it.

The newly independent Student ACCESS unit provides serves to all students with disabilities and well as identifies access issues college wide and assists the college in solving such issues. The unit’s mission states “Student ACCESS is committed to assuring equal access to Honolulu Community College facilities, programs, activities, and services by students with disabilities”. Student services include counseling, testing services, general tutoring, interpreters, captioning services, textbook conversions, and access to assistive technology.

The Design Center/Educational Media Center’s (DC/EMC) Mission Statement is to “research, plan, develop, and deliver high quality media resources for faculty, administration, and student organizations.” The Center serves the main campus and 4 off campus sites. The reorganization of the EMC also calls for the name to be changed to the EdTech group.

The DC/EMC is comprised of four main units: Instructional/Media Design/Production, Media Support Services, Print Shop and Duplication, and Graphics. DC/EMC staff includes the DC/EMC Director and an office assistant, two Media Specialists in Instructional Design/Media Production, two Media Support Electronics Technicians, a Print Shop Supervisor, Publications Specialist, Duplicating Machine Operator and Graphic Artist in the Print Shop and Graphics area.

DC/EMC equipment can be categorized into several categories. The two largest categories are production equipment and classroom equipment. Production equipment is used by staff to create the media products used by College faculty and staff members. Classroom equipment is the equipment installed in the classroom for classroom instruction.
Findings and Evidence
The library has a complete set of services and programs. The library uses many formal and informal assessment methods including student and staff surveys to elicit information to base its policy and operational decisions. The library’s program reviews and annual assessments outline data-points and identify program needs. The Library’s various survey and assessments are the evidence on which the library bases its decision making. The Team found evidence of this decision making process in assessing and improving its web presence, (particularly for Distance Education courses) and its physical space for computer users. (II.C)

The library shares one student learning outcome with the UH system: “The student will evaluate information and its sources critically.” No other student learning or student service outcomes have been developed nor implemented. While the team found many instances where the one SLO is being evaluated such as in library instruction sessions, the library should consider what other student outcomes it feels it should pursue. (II.C.2)

The Library supports the concept of information competency through its library instruction program of orientation sessions and at the reference desk. However, outside of the library efforts, the Team could not find any evidence that there is any formal inclusion of information competency into the college curriculum, especially in general education courses. (II.C.3.b, II.C.1.b)

The library’s 2011 survey of students finds that students are able to gain access to the materials they need to fulfill their research. (Students: 73.9% Agree or Strong agree that they can find all needed materials; they can find Books 65% and Periodicals 64.8%). However, the library through its program have found that the book collection needs to be updated and obsolete materials be removed from the collection. In a survey of the book stacks, the team found many obsolete books (over 35 years old). The team found that the current book budget itself is inadequate to address this issue. The team’s analysis of the rest of the materials budget finds that that it is adequate to meet the research needs of the students. (II.C.1)

The librarians collect materials based on the illustrated needs they find in their student interactions, the course outlines by serving on the curriculum committee and in talking with the faculty. The librarians use many review sources to evaluate which materials to purchase, either in print, electronic or other formats. However, the team found that the librarians do not have a formal collection document to guide in their collection building efforts. There is no guide that would assist them in their selection processes that would discuss the formats to use, the subjects and reading levels to acquire or how to serve special populations. (II.C.1.a)

The team found that the library evaluates its library instruction sessions through the use of the Survey Monkey software. The surveys are given to students after library instruction sessions. The team also found the library tracks its reference interviews through the use of Gimlet, a tracking data system product. Both products assist the library in the evaluation and assessments of the instructional program. (II.C.1)

The library supports the Distance Education student through its website, its databases which include periodicals, e-books, reference sources and help guides (LIBGUIDES). Reference
assistance is offered through email and by phone during library open hours, Library instruction is offered through the LIBGUIDE software program. In the library survey, 75% of distance education students felt that library services are excellent or good. The library’s efforts are to be commended. However, as the internet and the world of connectivity continues to expand, the Team recommends that the library renew its efforts and expand its services into new ways to connect to the college’s students online. (II.C.1, II.A.1)

The College Skills Center’s (CSC) basic mission as stated by the program review is in “providing access to the skills necessary for students to become responsible self-directed learners”. The reorganization of the CSC will necessitate that each unit address its own section of the full CSC former mission statement. The new CSC will need to produce a new program review for its programs, especially since its last full review was six years ago, while the units that left the CSC will need to produce new program reviews as well. (II.C.2)

The CSC units all evaluate their services through a number of methods. Each area, testing, tutorials and COMPASS preparation produce annual satisfaction surveys. The commercial company, Smarthinking also provides data back to the college in order allow the Center to assess that service. The CSC units also use demographic data they collect internally to determine needs of various student cohorts. The current annual assessments which include data from surveys and other sources provides efficiency statistics for hours, staffing, number of tests administered and some user satisfaction information (hours, friendliness of staff, and how satisfactory the services are at the center). (II.C.2)

The Center provides a student tutor-training program. The tutors are selected in conjunction with discipline faculty who recommend students to the center. The tutor training program was assessed in 2009 and improvements introduced. After the Center recognized that tutors (after being trained) were not evaluated, the Center implemented an evaluation process in 2011. (II.C.2)

The CSC created measureable student outcomes for its tutorial students (both for on campus and for the Smarthinking online students) based course completions, grades received, persistence in re-enrollment and other criteria as compared to non-tutorial students. These outcomes have been used to enhance the services within the CSC. These measurements may need to be adjusted as the reorganization is implemented and each service unit may need to create new or different outcomes in the new units. (II.C.2.)

The newly separated Student ACCESS (disability services unit) works with the College and eligible students in developing and authorizing reasonable accommodations. One of the unit’s student learning outcomes include:

Students who receive disability accommodations through Student ACCESS will be able to:

1. Follow specified procedures and timelines.
2. Use accommodations effectively.
3. Exhibit self-advocacy skills.
4. Learn about their condition(s), strengths and weaknesses, and relevant disability laws.
5. Demonstrate academic responsibility.

The Student ACCESS unit assesses their outcomes through student surveys that were used in the creation of their 2010-2011 program review. The surveys show that the students find that the department has an overall satisfaction rating of 83% (Excellent). (II.C.2)

The team found that the department also tracks campus disability access issues and maintains a document entitled "IICC Campus Committee on Disability Access – Honolulu (CODA-H) Updated List of Disability Access Concerns". The document maps where accessibility concerns are noted, solutions reached and implemented. After the list was implemented in 2004, many improvements have been made to the campus. (II.B.3.b, II.C.2)

The Design Center/Education Media Center is currently undergoing a process of reorganization into 2 different units. The reorganization efforts are to focus all expanding production efforts into the new Design Center while separating the other Media Center activities into the Education Tech group.

The current Center has been using an annual satisfaction survey to elicit information from users of its services and needed improvements. Included in the faculty survey is a student learning assessment question to faculty that the department has used to adjust its services. Given its role to provide equipment and services to staff and faculty, the Center seems to be doing its job well. The Annual Assessments and Program reviews are well outlined with goals for purchases lists. (IIC.2)

Conclusion
The college meets the standard. Overall, the reorganization has affected many departments in library and learning resources. The College and each of the affected departments will need to assess how the reorganization has worked in serving students and the mission of the college.

The library has created a welcoming place, both a physical place and an online place. They use documentation to make many decisions. The team finds that the library should consider additional outcome measurement outside of the system student learning outcome. The team finds that the library should consider creating a formal and documented collection development instrument and process. The team also finds that the library, in its next program review or annual assessment process, should plan how to continue to support distance education. Finally, the library should use its planning documents and college systems to address its inadequate book budget and print book collection.

The College Skills Center and the Design Center/Educational Media Centers are in transition due to the College reorganization. The various mission statements will need to be re-written to include new responsibilities. The newly separated units need to go through their own program review process. Also, each unit should evaluate the former outcomes and create ones for their services.

Recommendations
See College Recommendation #2
STANDARD III
RESOURCES

Standard IIIA. Human Resources

General Observations
Honolulu Community College employs a total of 592 individuals. Of these individuals, eight are employed in Executive/Management positions; sixty-eight in Administrative Professional and Technical positions, seventy-one in civil service positions, and 165 instructional Faculty, and lecturers full or part time account for one hundred positions. There are an additional 180 lecturers in the apprenticeship program. The college has demonstrated through its policies, procedures and practices an exceptional commitment to diversity while recruiting qualified staff in all areas of employment.

HCC had submitted and was just approved a reorganization that focused on the alignment of campus human resources that affects Academic Affairs, the Pacific Center for Advanced Technology Training and the Administrative Services areas. The proposal ended the Pacific Aerospace Training Center.

Findings and Evidence
Honolulu Community College ensures that current and newly hired personnel have the appropriate education, training, and experience that qualify them to provide consistently high quality, relevant programs and services. The selection process begins with a well-defined process to justify either a new position or refilling an existing position.

The personnel selection process begins with a well-defined process to justify either a new position or refilling an existing position. Then a certification is required stating that there are sufficient funds for the position. HCC as a unit within the University of Hawai‘i conforms to guidelines for the state civil service, the Board of Regents faculty positions, four levels of Administrative, Professional and Technical positions, and Executive/Management positions. The Planning Council and administration have established a budgetary flowchart and timeline through which position requests and justification for positions follow. HCC is required to conform to union contracts, UH system office procedures, and the state employment rules. UH handles procedures pertaining to job descriptions and forms. These procedures ensure that the qualifications of employees respond to the needs of the various programs and the institution. (III.A.1)

The selection process for all positions appears to be comprehensive. The job descriptions describe the duties and responsibilities as well as minimum qualifications. It would assist with transparency and communication if job descriptions were on the college website along with salary schedules. However the job descriptions are only public and viewable when the position is advertised thereby limiting transparency and communication. The team verified in interviews that faculty are involved in the hiring of new faculty and processes are in place that verify that applicants meet minimum qualifications. There is evidence to support that each candidate for a
faculty position is appropriately screened, questions developed and reviewed by the EEO/AA Coordinator, and references and background checked. Interviews with faculty revealed that EEO/AA procedures were not followed by the EEO/AA coordinator during the approval of interview questions, for example, were rejected that had previously gone through the committee process. The team found that there was inconsistent guidance from Human Resources in providing procedures for hiring committees which is one of the factors that has caused some personnel to avoid serving on screening committees. (III.A.1.a)

The evaluation process for executive/management is described in administrative procedures and the feedback process occurs through a 360° Performance Assessment survey. Performance evaluations for the APT personnel, which are to be conducted by their supervisors, are completed at low rates. The team was not able to find evidence that supervisors and administration are held responsible to ensure that performance evaluations occur in a timely manner. (III.A.1.b)

Attachment 1 of the Guidelines for Tenure and Promotion, UH-Community Colleges 2012-2013 includes language that the identification and assessment of student learning is part of a faculty member’s primary duties. The team did not find evidence that the faculty evaluations including the post-tenured include a component evaluating the effectiveness of producing student learning outcomes. The team found some conflicting opinions about the role of the faculty union contract versus the Guidelines for Contract Renewal and this Standard guiding this process. (III.A.1.c)

Professional ethics are addressed in the Chancellor for Community Colleges Memo CCCM #2600, Statement on Professional Ethics (Faculty). The Staff Senate approved a statement of ethics in 2009 and the E/M positions fall under the Hawai’i State Commission Ethics Guide for State Elected Official, State Employees and Commission Members. (III.A.1.d)

The Self evaluation identified and interviews by the team verified that when a position is vacated by a retirement, termination or resignation, the Division Chair or Dean determines if the need is still accurate by providing data and other supporting evidence to determine if the position should be recruited for replacement. The Vice Chancellor of Academic Affairs and the Chancellor then approve the position request. If the data indicates there is not sufficient workload to replace the person, then the position is used for other needs identified in the budgeting and prioritization process.

The team found through interviews and evidence that there are sufficient qualified faculty with full-time responsibility to the institution. HCC has had instability in the administrative positions in the past and still has four positions filled on an interim basis. Interviews with the Vice Chancellors and the Chancellor confirmed that the prior instability in the administrative positions would be addressed through the filling of positions as reported by the chancellor. This issue was also noted by the 2006 visiting team. Consistent and appropriate levels of administrative staffing will need to remain a priority at the College. (III.A.2)

The institution has established written personnel policies and procedures that are on the intranet. (III.A.3.a)
The HCC Self evaluation indicates and observations of the location of personnel files for each employee revealed that these records are kept in secure files according to confidentiality and security procedures. However, the team found in interviews with APT and civil service, representatives that there is tremendous concern about the lack of confidentiality when employees communicate with Human Resources. The interviews and observations reflect that this is primarily due to the location of human resource personnel desks located in the middle of the second floor surrounded by administrative offices. Due to lack of privacy, employees are limited in their ability to access their own personnel records required by the standard. (III.A.3.b)

HCC serves a very diverse student body and places emphasis on equity and diversity when planning, creating policies, developing programs, and selecting employees. The EEO/AA coordinator is involved in every aspect of the hiring process of personnel. The various programs that HCC offers for the students are many and there is a strong focus on programs serving Native Hawaiians. The college recently made some changes to its mission statement which includes a statement that “The college will acknowledge, promote, and maintain a multicultural environment where gender diversity and other aspects of personal identity are appreciated and respected”, thereby reflecting an understanding of and concern for the issue of equity and diversity. (III.A.4.a)

HCC has an Affirmative Action Plan and an EEO/AA coordinator and the team did find some data limited to faculty and students describing diversity and did not find that the data is used regularly to assess HCC’s record in employment equity and diversity consistent with its mission. (III.A.4.b)

A review of the evidence confirms that the majority of employees are covered by labor union contracts that define working relationships. There is a sexual harassment policy and a workplace violence policy. There also is a Student Conduct Code. The Office of the Dean of Student Services is responsible for the enforcement of the Student Conduct Code. There is a defined new employee orientation and all relevant policies are explained along with the violation reporting procedures. (III.A.4.c)

HCC has two college professional development committees and professional development provided to faculty, and staff. There are surveys to assess interest and topics. The committees meet monthly and discuss future and past events. The team found that there was a lack of a systematic process to link the assessed needs of the staff to the college’s strategic planning process as well as a developing a process to evaluate those activities and use the results as the basis for improvement. (III.A.5.a, III.A.5.b)

The team found no evidence that the college systematically assesses the effective use of human resources and uses the results of that evaluation as the basis for improvement. (III.A.6)

**Conclusion**
The college partially meets the standard. There is insufficient evidence that there is integrity of the human resource processes and procedures for all hiring to ensure consistency and transparency, and that all human resource processes and procedures are completely confidential.
There is also insufficient evidence employee evaluations are completed on a regular basis and faculty evaluations, including post-tenure, include a component assessing the effectiveness in bringing about Student Learning Outcomes.

College Recommendations:
See College Recommendation #2
See College Recommendation #3
See UHCC Recommendation #3

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)

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)
Standard IIIB. Physical Resources

General Observations
The Honolulu Community College main campus is located in the Kalihi-Palama district, approximately two miles northwest of Honolulu’s Commercial Business District. The campus consists of twenty-one buildings that occupy approximately twenty-six acres. The facilities were constructed between 1930 and 1980, with the exception of the Kikea Training Center, which was completed in 2008. Satellite locations include the Automotive Mechanics Technology, Diesel Mechanics Technology, Marine Educational and Training Center, Aeronautics Maintenance Technology, Commercial Aviation, and Pearl Harbor Apprenticeship Program. The self-evaluation report and the long-range development plan provides a comprehensive listing of the current facilities, ongoing projects with anticipated timelines for completion, and a framework for reorganizing expanding the campus.

The college is actively engaged in planning and development activities that support learning programs and services for students. Planning for physical resources is integrated with institutional planning to ensure that facilities are conducive to student learning. Current planning for physical resources involves improving facility use and increasing facility efficiencies through equipment upgrades and building renovations. The coordination of the Long Range Development Plan with the college’s Strategic Plan assures the alignment of college facilities with student learning.

Findings and Evidence
The college has established programs to support environmental sustainability, including recycling of solid waste, managing and properly disposing of electronic waste and energy conservation. Receptacles for recyclable materials are conveniently located on campus. Energy conservation focuses primarily on the control of central air conditioning systems.

Through a grant from the National Institute of Food and Agriculture, U.S. Department of Agriculture, the college constructed a greenhouse to support hands-on training on environmental sustainability. The greenhouse is designed to support instructional activities in gardening techniques and food production. These endeavors support the current Strategic Plan (2008-2015), while maintaining and improving the existing physical environment.

The college has been able to maintain its current physical resources while focusing on the needs to support its future education programs and services. The Long-Range Development Plan, completed in February 2011, provides the anticipated physical development in campus facilities necessary to carry out the college’s academic needs and objectives. The Strategic Plan addresses energy conservations and sustainable development, with a commitment to maintain and improve existing physical environment. The creation of an Energy Management Program allows for energy efficiency and monitors classroom utilization.

The college plans for and systematically replaces and repairs major equipment as needed. Health, safety, and code requirements are prioritized for funding. The college seeks funding to
support plans for building maintenance and upgrades, as well as replacements of physical resources, the college ensures that high quality physical resources are used to support its programs and services. A Facilities Renewal Reinvestment Model is being implemented to optimize the analysis of maintenance and budgetary needs. (III.B.1.a)

The Health and Safety Steering Committee provides an inspection and review process that is used to review procedures for access, security, and safety of campus facilities to assure compliance with applicable codes and standards for safety and performance. College personnel carry out their job responsibilities with a sincere commitment to supporting student learning and creating a welcoming, safe, and effective learning environment. As a consequence, the facilities are well maintained and provide physical spaces conducive to and supportive of the teaching/learning process. Even older buildings, which have not yet undergone renovation, are well cared for and provide environments and spaces supportive of the educational process.

College employees have a deep sense of pride and ownership in the college facilities which further demonstrates the college wide commitment to maintaining a healthful learning and working environment. However, through interviews with college personnel, there is a sense that more resources are necessary to support the monitoring of physical resources. (III.B.1.b)

In order to assure the feasibility and effectiveness of physical resources in supporting institutional programs and services, the college plans and evaluates its facilities and equipment on a regular basis, taking utilization and other relevant data into account. The team verified that the construction plans for the campus are contained in the college’s Long Range Development Plan and are linked to the college’s strategic goals and Strategic Plan. Based on program review recommendations, assessments and modifications to existing facilities are planned. The future challenge for the college will be whether this process can be sustained due to the recent economic downturn and resulting state budget challenges and potential college budget limitations.

Long-range capital plans support institutional improvement goals and reflect projections of the total cost of ownership of new facilities and equipment. In order to support academic excellence and implementation of the Long Range Development Plan, the college allocates resources to maintain and enhance the learning spaces with necessary equipment and other instructional resources. The college’s Strategic Plan was used to develop the ten-year master plan for the future development of its facilities and physical resource assets. The college employs long term planning approaches to support the modernization and upgrade of facilities and equipment. The team found that the college develops deliberate and thoughtful plans for current and future facilities and equipment upgrades and replacements as well as for the total cost requirements for sustaining college facilities in the long term. (III.B.2.a)

Physical resource planning is integrated with institutional planning. The institution systematically assesses the effective use of physical resources and uses the results as the basis for improvement. According to the Long Range Development Plan, the college is undergoing construction and renovation so that all existing instructional facilities will be remodeled over the next decade, provided that state funding continues to be available.
The college has a clear and well-communicated process for determining how facilities and equipment funds will be allocated. When facilities and equipment requests are generated, the College’s governing groups and the Planning Council reviews and processes these requests. The work of this committee is informed by input from various campus groups. Further, the committee uses approved college plans, including resource allocation needs documented in program review, when determining the relevance and appropriateness of facilities and equipment requests. The committee also considers all proposal linkages to the college Strategic and Implementation Plans. The Planning Council assesses and evaluates requests and provides recommendations to the Chancellor for funding consideration. Examples of areas where the college has placed deliberate emphasis include: the maintenance of a well-cared for, safe, and secure campus for all students, and a campus that is physically accessible for students with disabilities. (III.B.2.b)

Conclusion
The college meets the requirements set forth in Standard III.B. This is evidenced by the information provided in the self evaluation, long-range development plan, college strategic plan, and interviews with college personnel, and physical observations.

Recommendations
None
Standard IIIC. Technology Resources

General Observations
Information Technology at Honolulu Community College has recently undergone a functional alignment and consolidation as a result of campus reorganization. This reorganization in technology services came about in an effort to improve campus technology since the last accreditation team visit in 2006 and seems to be working well. A technology consultant, hired by the ad-hoc Technology Users Advisory Group (TUAG), was contracted to prepare recommendations that resulted in a “Strategic Technology Plan for Honolulu Community College” in April 2010. An Information Technology Strategic Plan 2010-2015 was then developed that is aligned with the college’s Strategic Plan Update 2008-2015. The Technology Advisory Committee (TAC) provided input for the plan but currently is not functional because it is not aligned with the new IT reorganization. HCC realizes the need to reestablish a functional committee to continue to provide feedback to the Information Technology Center (ITC) in an advisory role to support the college’s 49 computer laboratories and over 700 computers.

Findings and Evidence
Now in charge of information technology is the Chief Information Officer (CIO) who oversees the ITC and supports the Academic Support Division. The ITC provides network services, campus server maintenance, student computer lab support, and purchasing. There is a need to inform the college community of the IT Strategic Plan (2010-2015) and to implement the Plan. Specific goals for the IT Strategic Plan (2010-2015) are delineated on the IT intranet site through a series of slides with audio. The CIO has a series of slides on the ITC webpage that lists targeted activities and accomplishments from summer and fall 2012. The ITC will continue to report on the achievement of goals as part of an ITC Annual Report or Program Review. There are also useful links to the online IT Services Catalog. Although there is a 2000 Strategic Plan for Information Technology posted on the UH system website that is intended to provide a guiding framework for its 10 campuses, the document has not been updated nor reviewed since 2005. The Academic Support Division consists of the Design Center, Student Success Unit, the Library, Policy, Planning and Institutional Research, and the Educational Technology Unit. The latter supports Distance Education, instructional media, and technology training. The CIO reports to the Vice Chancellor of Academic Affairs. (III.C.1)

For fall 2012, HCC offers more than 50 distance education (DE) courses taught by over 30 faculty, as evidenced by the DE website on the HCC intranet. The learning management system for DE is Sakai or locally known as Laulima. Faculty training for Laulima is supported by the Educational Technology Center and has taken place despite the fact that Laulima is not imposed upon its faculty. Cable telecourses are produced in the Education Technology Center’s TV studio and transmitted from the UH Manoa master control server. Student ACCESS provides services for students with visual, hearing, and reading disabilities. The old HCC email system has been terminated and UH Google Mail is now in effect. The Distance Education Advisory Committee (DEAC) functions to ensure adequate support to maintain a high quality and effective distance education program. A needs assessment to evaluate distance education will be conducted this year. Furthermore, additional research will be conducted in the near future by the DEAC to compare student success in distance education courses with their comparable

53
traditional courses. Results from an online DE survey to students in fall 2011 were mostly positive in relationship to technology satisfaction. (III.C.1.a, III.C.1.d)

An ITC Help Desk (Call Center) has been developed for technology support and has a goal of responding to 90% of technology requests within 24 hours and 100% within two working days. There is also an online site for creating and submitting “Trouble Tickets” using GLPI software. This same software is used to document inventory, incident reporting, and requests. In order to maximize technical support for new computers, all purchases (PC and Mac) now require a three-year maintenance agreement. After the three year period, a determination will be made as to whether the agreement should be renewed or simply replace the equipment. As noted in the self evaluation report, the current adequacy of technological support of the 7+ technology/computer labs on campus is unknown. (III.C.1.a)

IT training for students, faculty, and staff is primarily through the IT Computer Lab. For example, a series of training workshops for GLPI software was conducted in March 2012. Another venue for student software training is through the Native Hawaiian Center with their Technical Specialist. The Pacific Center for Advanced Technology Training (PCATT) provides for non-credit training in advanced technologies for the college and local community through its annual Apple Summer Institute and IT Summit. Its Director is also responsible for Continuing Education. Distance Education support and training is delivered by the Education Technology Center. Distance Education assessment surveys are completed each semester to determine level of student support. According to the results of a campus-wide survey distributed by the Staff Development Committee (SDC) in May 2011, there is a need for technology training in computer applications, software, and intranet navigation. The SDC realizes the need for training and plans to offer professional development activities in concert with Human Resources. (III.C.1.b)

Interviews with staff revealed that the role of ITC in the procurement process for technological equipment apparently has not been clearly understood by a number of college personnel. To resolve this issue, the ITC has delineated the process on its intranet site, including purchasing procedures for desktops, laptops, and iPads for college use. This provides for a more centralized procurement system for campus-wide support services. ITC also consults with other programs and units seeking to procure technology resources through the program review process. There is no formal computer replacement policy, as the transition is being made for acquisition of virtual desktops. Existing equipment will be monitored by GLPI, a new web-based tracking system for inventory, incident reporting, and requests. Emergency backup of servers and files exist on tape. Shared file servers are being consolidated for improved management and control. (III.C.1.a, III.C.1.c)

Funding for technology for some computer labs is requested through the annual assessment and program review process that involves resource allocation requests. These requests are ranked by governance committees, after which the Planning Council provides recommendations to the Chancellor. After one year of implementation, it appears that there were areas of the budget request process involving technology that could be improved. As an outcome of an evaluation of the budget process, individuals requesting funds will be invited to speak to the Planning
Council and answer any questions related to their requests before the budget is finalized. (III.C.1.d, III.C.2)

**Conclusion**
The college meets this standard. There are areas, however, that the team strongly urges the college/system to address.

The UH system, in order to provide a framework for IT initiatives across its 10 campuses, needs to revisit its outdated IT Strategic Plan which was last developed in 2000.

Although the reorganization of information technology at HCC is admirable, it is important for the college to inventory all technology labs on campus and determine current level of technical support and needs. The reorganization of IT on campus, as well as the new centralized Help Desk and GLPI system and IT procurement procedures are widely viewed as a needed improvement. Although recently implemented, these structures will need to be evaluated for effectiveness. The college is to be commended on its visionary IT Strategic Plan and efforts to create an “ubiquitous learning environment” through virtual desktop infrastructure to better support student learning.

According to the self evaluation, a significant number of faculty are unfamiliar with existing classroom technology. Although some training has taken place, the ITC is committed to standardize classroom technology that may alleviate the need to retrain faculty using different technology from room to room. In addition, the team recognizes that although not all technology needs are being met, interviews with faculty and staff indicated that there is a renewed sense of optimism that needs will be met as IT strategic plans and processes are implemented.

Although HCC has a budgeting and planning process that integrates technology resource planning with institutional planning, the team urges the college to develop a formal assessment of the effective use of technology resources and use the results for improvement.

**Recommendations**
None
Standard IIID. Financial Resources

General Observations

Like its other counterparts in the system, Honolulu Community College relies on state revenues to finance a significant portion of its operations. And like many community colleges across the nation, HCC has had to offset reductions in general fund appropriations with federal funds and tuition increases, while balancing the demands of enrollment increases. The primary sources of operating revenue are the General Fund, and Other Non-State Revenue that totaled approximately $31.5 million in 2012. The University of Hawai‘i strategic planning process provides the direction and the focus for the budget development process at the 7 community colleges. Strategic planning and budget development are closely linked processes at HCC as evidenced by the development of the 2007 Assessment and Planning Guide, which was subsequently finalized in HCCP #4.101 in 2011. Budget priorities are established based on the achievement and advancement of strategic planning goals. Oversight to the process is provided by the Community Colleges Strategic Planning Council (SPC) that is the primary body for assuring system-wide participation in the UHCC strategic planning process. At the campus level, this participation is sought through the Planning Council and the governance committees. The new financial management system, called Kuali, is intended to provide increased efficiency and improve access to data and information that informs decision making at the college and represents a pioneering effort in open source software, thereby saving the system hundreds of thousands of dollars in annual software maintenance costs. The team reviewed evidence indicating that a system of effective resource planning for the college exists. The district and the college comply with financial data requirements, including submission of an annual independent audit report and audited financial statement, the annual fiscal report to the ACCJC. Minimum fund balance requirements exist regarding the unrestricted general funds and excess reserves are available to address unforeseen circumstances of anticipated funding shortfalls. Based on the self-evaluation report, documented evidence, and interviews with college staff, the college has provided evidence to demonstrate that the college has sufficient financial resources and planning mechanisms to support its programs and services and to improve institutional effectiveness both in the short-term and long-term.

Findings and Evidence

As part of the University of Hawai‘i system, HCC is part of a heavily centralized financial model, particularly in relation to policy setting and initial allocation of resources to the community colleges through the budget process. The system office works closely with the campus in the budget development/legislative process and the budget execution process. The HCC campus has an annual review process that was outlined in its Assessment and Planning Guide (Draft of 2008). This guide provides guidance to the college community about the importance of conducting annual assessments across instructional and non-instructional programs for the purposes of improvement and resource allocation. In a subsequent College Policy memo dated April 29, 2011, the Chancellor provided further guidance to ensure that the planning, resource allocation and assessment process is consistent with the mission of the college, external needs of the community, and tied to University System priorities and the college’s Strategic Plan. The Chancellor affirms the role and scope of the Planning Council in
implementing the college’s resource allocation plan. In practice, the Planning Council serves as the venue for prioritizing budget request recommendations that are derived through consultation with the standing governance committees. (III.D.1.a, III.D.1.b)

Because of the declining state revenue the general fund appropriation has been declining even while college enrollment has reached record levels. The loss of general fund revenues has been offset by increased tuition revenue, Federal stimulus funds, negotiated salary reductions, and through increased efficiency and productivity in operations that has provided financial stability during the economic downturn. The budget process is established at the system level and is comprised of a biennial operating budget for General, Special, Revolving, and certain Federal funds and submitted to the Legislature in odd-numbered years. Supplemental budgets to amend any current appropriation in a fiscal year biennium may also be prepared and submitted to the legislature in even numbered years. At a local level, the college relies on these budgets to support programmatic needs that are the product of annual program reviews and the Strategic Plan priorities. System-wide Facilities Repairs and Maintenance Plans for FY 2012 are funded from the UHCC allocation of the FY 2012 CIP Capital Renewal and Deferred Maintenance (CRDM) appropriation. The college campus prioritizes projects, with critical projects funded first. Final decisions are rendered by the System Office upon receipt of the next year’s Supplemental Budget (per System memo dated, October 17, 2011). For FY 2012, HCC’s current funded Design and Construction allocation totals $2.4 million, and has deferred repair and maintenance costs totaling $25.6 million. American Recovery and Reinvestment Act funds (federal stimulus money) were replaced by the State Legislature with general funds for enrollment growth funding, equipment replacement, innovation funding, and campus operations. Salary shortfalls are met from new tuition revenues based on the increased tuition rates. However, adjustments are made to the general fund allocations to ensure that all campuses can meet their salary obligations when the campus does not generate sufficient new tuition to cover the salary shortfalls. Employee benefits, including disability retirement, are covered by state law and are standard for most employees. The state covers the cost of health benefits, as well as vacation and sick leave thereby freeing the college from carrying this obligation. (III.D.1.c)

A new campus-based budget process was developed over the past four years that was intended to broaden the dialogue regarding how funding decisions to support programs are made. Since 2009-10, the College has refined a financial planning and budget development process that was described to the college community in a 2011 College Policy Memo entitled, Integrated Planning, Resource Allocation and Assessment. The Operational Model specifically reflects a process that ties strategic planning to assessment and resource requirements, thereby reflecting a systematic cycle of evaluation, integrated planning, implementation, and re-evaluation. The Annual Budget Development Flow Chart is the college’s attempt to bring transparency to the importance of linking strategic planning to resource allocation. There is evidence to suggest that Budget Request and Proposal Forms are consistently used as the basis for review and prioritization by the college’s four governing bodies, which then are moved forward to the Budget Subcommittee of the Planning Council. A review of the Summary of Requests reflects participation by key stakeholder groups to provide input into the development of the college’s budget process. While the College does not present evidence of systematically assessing the effective use of financial resources or the validity and effectiveness of its internal controls, interviews with several managers and faculty members affirmed that process changes have been
enacted over the past several years through ongoing dialogue at the Planning Council that has resulted in an improved budget and planning process. (III.D.1.d, III.D.2.e, III.D.4)

The college seeks to fund all current and long-term financial obligations following all applicable generally accepted accounting principles as reflected in the annual audits. Annual audit reports are conducted for the community college under the UH system consolidated audit. An annual audit plan comprised of mandatory and discretionary external audits and internal audits performed by the System Internal Auditor, is reviewed and approved by the Board of Regents according to the 2012 Board of Regents Reference Guide. An external audit conducted at the System level is performed every two years in accordance with requirements of OMB circular A-133 and the Government Accounting Standard Board (GASB). Additionally, the Hawai‘i State Auditor occasionally conducts operational audits, the results of which are shared with the University System, the governor and the legislature. Corrective action plans and implementing audit recommendations rest with responsible program managers at the College, however there were no audit recommendations on record for HCC. Internal controls of the System are established by the UH System Office of Procurement and Real Property Management (OPRPM) and the college clearly identifies authorized signers (Fiscal Officer Authority), who for example can sign for financial transactions less than $25,000. Transactions over $25,000 and all contracts and grant proposals are approved by OPRPM thereby providing further evidence that internal controls are appropriate and insure financial integrity. (III.D.2, III.D.2.a, III.D.2.b, III.D.3.b, II.D.3.g, III.D.3.h)

A comprehensive website for the office of the Vice President for Community Colleges provides a detailed overview of the UHCC System’s budget process including graphic depictions of general funds appropriated by college as well tuition revenue, appropriated non-general funds, extramural funds, private funds, the biennium budget, the budget allocation methodology, and capital improvement projects. A series of charts with drill-down capabilities by individual campuses provide widely accessible and easily consumable financial information for the college community and the public at large. Quarterly reports on the financial status of the UH are presented to the Board of Regents at board meetings. These reports include selected balance sheet items and liquidity metrics, income statement metrics, analytical comments, and a consolidated funding report on budget status. At the college, employees have access to Kuali which allows for electronic approvals, provides web accessible and digital archiving, and creates dashboards of financial reports to keep college staff apprised of college budgets and expenditures and allow them to plan accordingly. As a regularly attending non-voting member of the Planning Council, the Associate Vice Chancellor of Administrative Services ensures that budget-related communications are accurate and flowing through the organization. (III.D.2.e)

The college operates several auxiliary (facilities rentals, child care center, and parking services) that are all audited annually by the State of Hawai‘i Auditor and the UH Internal Audit Office. The self evaluation report and information reviewed in the Supplemental Guidelines for Standard III.D (binder 2 in the team room) reflect the foundation is audited separately from the University and has had no material findings in the last five years. (III.D.2.d)

The reserve policy has been modified at the System level to reflect a minimum reserve of 5% and targeted reserve of 10% of the operating funds. It is reported at the UHCC website that all
campuses currently meet the 5% reserve levels, and HCC reserves exceed 10%. These reserves allow for contingencies or significant unforeseen circumstances and ensure long-term financial stability. (III.D.3.a)

Based on decisions made at the UH System office with input solicited through monthly Vice Chancellors of Administrative Services meetings a number of financial management improvements have been implemented. Some of these functional improvements include ePurchasing, eTravel, eDeposits and a financial data mart. Additionally, the System reduced printing and hardware costs for the colleges by implementing laser printed checks, automated fund transfers and electronic disbursement of reports. (III.D.4)

Conclusion
The college meets this standard. HCC is part of the University of Hawai‘i system and has an annual operating budget of approximately $31.5 million; and currently receives grant awards in the amount of $25,240,827. A system wide allocation model that was developed and agreed to by the Chancellors of the community colleges determines the college’s annual allocation. An outcome funding allocation process links strategic outcomes to funding. Efforts have been made to bring transparency to the budget process through a planning document entitled Integrated Planning, Resource Allocation and Assessment Policy Memo, and all the governance groups in the decision-making and allocation processes of the college commit the college to ensuring broad participation. A system initiative of the UH System office, Kuali, provides real-time access to budget information to authorized users. Based on a review of BOR and college policies, the System website, college evidence, and interviews with system and college staff, the team finds that HCC meets the standards of financial resources.

Recommendations
None
STANDARD IV
LEADERSHIP AND GOVERNANCE

Standard IVA. Decision-Making Roles and Processes

General Observations
The leadership of the university system resides in the office of the President who oversees all universities, community colleges, and the one four-year community college. Reporting to the president of the system is a vice president of community colleges. The chancellors of the six plus one community colleges report to the Vice President of Community Colleges and sit on the Council of Chancellors through a matrix organizational structure designed to ensure the community colleges have an equal voice in the overall university system.

Honolulu Community College has a chancellor and two vice chancellors, one for academic affairs and one for administrative services. The college has identified positions such as deans, directors, and division chairs as critical to the leadership of the college. The standing governance committees and councils are also considered important to the leadership and governance. They include the following:
1. Planning Council (PC)
2. Campus Leadership Team (CLT)
3. Kupu Ka Wai Council (KKW)
4. Faculty Senate Executive Committee (FSEC)
5. Staff Senate Executive Committee (SSEC)
6. Associated Students of the University of Hawai‘i – Honolulu Community College (ASUH-HCC)

The college has made significant progress since the 2006 comprehensive visit. The Planning Council (PC) operates as the major long-range institutional planning and budget prioritization body. The PC has matured and provides a coordination place for all strategic planning and budget information. The Faculty Senate Executive Committee (FSEC) is the faculty governance committee and deals with issues and procedures affecting faculty and students. Overall faculty has significant input into the areas of governance dealing with faculty and student issues. The Kupu Ka Wai Council (KKW) and the Associated Students University of Hawai‘i (ASUH – HCC) are active and providing input into the college decision-making processes. The Staff Senate Executive Committee (SSEC) has not been as active in recent years although the new college leadership is working to bring the staff into the process through inclusion and management encouraging staff to participate.

Observations also include optimism on the campus from the faculty and staff directed at the inclusion of the different constituencies in campus in governance. The structures have been put in place for the governance and there is significant learning happening at the campus about working together to accomplish assessment and institutional effectiveness. There is a sense of hopefulness around the inclusive governance structures and dialogue and the implementation of a systematic continuous improvement cycle. The team verified the college is still developing
institutional capacity in assessment of its processes and completing the cycle for continuous organizational effectiveness. The assessment of the governance and leadership structure is not systematic nor has the current governance structure been assessed for effectiveness. There is anecdotal information that college constituencies believe the governance structure is accepted and working.

**Findings and Evidence**
The college has acknowledged and developed committee and council structures that recognize the contributions of leadership for continuous improvement throughout the organization. The committees such as the Planning Council (PC); Faculty Senate Executive Committee (FSEC); Staff Senate Executive Committee (SSEC); Kupu Ka Wai Council (KKW); and Associated Students University of Hawai‘i – HCC (ASUH-HCC) appear to be designed to incorporate wide and expansive inclusion of constituents. The college has clarified membership on the committees and revised charters to ensure a focus on institutional effectiveness, communication and inclusion.

The leadership throughout the college demonstrates ethical and effective leadership through clearly identifying values and setting goals that align to the UH system community colleges. Recent changes in leadership have provided a renewed sense of inclusion, communication, and hopefulness due to the competence and leadership styles of the new leaders. The team verified, while many of the leaders are interims they are not new to the campus and are known leaders in the organization, therefore provide leadership continuity. (IV.A, IV.A.1)

The college has worked diligently to incorporate governance roles that facilitate decisions that support student learning programs and services as well as institutional effectiveness. As an example of providing leadership that is consistent with creating an environment that allows institutional values and goals to flourish, the establishment of the Kupu Ka Wai Council focused the college on the Native Hawaiians’ values and issues.

There still appear to be some issues with the inclusion of staff on various committees as evidenced through recent surveys and participation on committees. The team verified the new leadership of the college has placed emphasis on gaining staff input into governance and decision-making, leading to a renewed sense of optimism and hopefulness. While staff has felt disengaged in the past, the new leadership emphasis has been to provide a space and dialogue for staff input into governance and to build capacity in staff leadership.

Decision making processes are documented through the development of policy HCC #4.101, “Integrated Planning, Resource Allocation, and Assessment”; HCC #1.101 “Participation in College Decision-Making Processes; and HCC #5.202, “Review of Established Programs”. Faculty and administrators have substantive and clearly defined roles in institutional governance as evidenced in the Planning Council, Faculty Senate Executive Council, Staff Senate Executive Council, and the Associated Students University of Hawai‘i.

The Board of Regents shifted community college decision making to the Vice President for Community Colleges and Chancellors of the college campuses during the reorganization of 2005. The Chancellor maintains decision-making authority for the college. (IV.A.2)
The team verified the faculty and administrators have a major role in college governance through membership and participating in the PC, FSEC, SSEC, and KKW councils. (IV.A.2.a, IV.A.2.b)

The team verified the revised governance structure provides opportunities for all constituent groups to participate for the good of the institution. The evidence supports there is ample opportunity for discussion of ideas as noted in the minutes of the various committees as well as verification interviews conducted with the committees and councils. The minutes of the Planning Council and the KKW provide evidence of wide and broad discussions. The self-evaluation identifies there are still communications roadblocks especially between the councils, and sometimes participation problems. A recent reorganization created a structure that enhances efficient and effective management, alignment of campus resources, greater ability to address operational issue impacting student performance, and meeting strategic outcomes set as campus performance measures. The reorganization was intended to improve communication within and between other units. A recent survey also provides evidence that communication continues to be an issue at the college. (IV.A.3)

The team was able to verify the College has demonstrated integrity and honesty in its relationships with external agencies as evidenced by its multiple successful partnerships with external agencies, acceptance of follow up reports by the ACCJC, and successful acceptance of substantive change reports Although the UH system has been involved in various issues over an athletic event, the College has maintained its credibility. (IV.A.4)

The systematic evaluation of governance and decision-making is still in process at the College. While the visiting team verified the maturing and institutionalization of the inclusive leadership and governance structure, the assessment of the structure has not yet been completed nor institutionalized. While much work has been done to develop systems, assessment, communication, and making improvements is still in process. The evidence reflects the lack of a systematic assessment process that would close the institutional effectiveness loop. (IV.A.5)

**Conclusion**

The college partially meets the standard. While there has been significant progress, there are measures of effectiveness that need to occur at lower levels to ensure consistency and communication across the councils. There is clear evidence the PC has matured as the major planning and resource planning council, although the process for assessing institutional effectiveness has not been implemented nor is systematic.

**Commendations**

The college leadership should be commended for creating a structure and environment where all governance voices are valued. (IV.A, IV.A.3)

**Recommendations**

*See College Recommendation #2*
Standard IVB. Board and Administrative Organization

General Observations
The University of Hawai‘i (UH) system includes three universities and six community colleges, and a 4-year degree granting community college. Honolulu Community College (HCC) is one of the two-year community colleges, and its focus is Career Technical Education (CTE) and transfer to four-year institutions, certificate coursework, and apprenticeship. The UH system has a 15-member Board of Governors (BOR). All members are nominated by a Regents’ Selection Advisory Committee, selected from the nominee list by the Governor, and confirmed by the State Senate. The BOR holds one of its meetings once a year on the HCC campus to maintain communication with the individual campus community and conduct its regular policy agenda. The BOR is also charged with authorizing new program planning and implementation.

The UH system is administered by a president; however, as of a 2008 reorganization, the seven chancellors of the community colleges report concurrently to the president and the Vice President for Community Colleges (VPCC). The President oversees system-wide policy making and decisions impacting the campuses. The VPCC functions as a leader and coordinator of community college matters.

At the same time an HCC campus shared governance structure was put in place with a Planning Council and three other committees. Roles and responsibilities were defined and an organizational chart was revised. The Chancellor is credited with encouraging inclusive participation in committee work, and a dedicated staff is generally eager to become involved. Interviews confirm that this governance structure has been a challenge and a culture change, though generally seen as positive and hopeful.

HCC’s administrative organization is still evolving. Assessment instruments have not been developed yet to measure its effectiveness. In addition, while the structure for shared or collaborative governance exists, especially the program review and budget request processes, it is clear that some members of the college community do not yet understand how to use the structure and processes to improve the cycle of course and program planning, student learning outcomes, assessment, analysis, program improvement, and follow-up to enhance the effectiveness of Honolulu Community College’s education.

This is an area where the College has done significant work to meet the recommendations. The closing of the loop of taking assessment results and making improvements is not consistent in practice and not consistently documented. The college has work to do in the area of ensuring evidence of the closure of the assessment of institutional effectiveness.

The college leadership has turned over recently for the first time in about 5 years. The domino impact of this turnover has created some leadership instability, although it must be noted that many of the current leaders had a leadership role in the institution before which provides some level of continuity for the college.
Findings and Evidence
The Board of Regents Bylaws and Policies define the duties and responsibilities of the BOR. BOR Policy Chapter 9-12, Part III “addresses recruitment and appointment of Executive and Managerial personnel.” Chapter 2 “details the evaluation of the President.” The UH Procedures Manual and Policies are on the Web: System wide Administrative Procedures. The mission of the college (Access, Learning and Teaching, Work Force Development, Personal Development, Community Development, and Diversity) was approved in 2002, and while it contains valid statements or goals, the only indication that it has been reviewed since then is to mention a focus on Native Hawaiian students. The updated 2008-2015 UHCC Strategic Outcomes and Performance Measures, Appendix B, provides “a more uniform method with which to evaluate progress.” The team verified that BOR Policy 9-12 has been implemented on a consistent and systematic basis and verified connection to various personnel actions over the past few years.

The college appears to understand the designated responsibilities of the governing board for setting policies and the chief administrator for the effective operation of the institution. As a multi college district there is clear definition between the organizational roles of the system and the college. The Delineation of Duties provides evidence of that delineation as well as the Board of Regents Handbook. (IV.B)

The BOR is responsible for establishing policies that assure quality, integrity, and effectiveness of student learning program and services, and the financial stability of the Institution. The board also has a clearly defined policy for selecting and evaluating the Chief Administrator for the College and the system office. The State of Hawai’i statutes provide guidance in this area.

The BOR has established policies and procedure to assure quality, integrity, and effectiveness for the institution as evidenced by the Board Policies and Bylaws. All meetings are conducted in accordance within the state’s Sunshine Laws. All BOR documents are easily accessible on the Board of Regents website where minutes from meetings, agendas, bylaws, and policies are accessible. (IV.B.1)

The BOR represents and advocates the public interest in their activities and decisions. There is a fair amount of political pressure as the community college system is a system within a university system. It appears the BOR usually acts as a whole, even though a recent event has created media attention in the community. (IV.B.1.a)

The BOR established policies consistent with the mission statement of the UH system to ensure quality, integrity, and improvement of student learning programs and services and resource allocation to support them as evidenced by System wide Board Policies to include Section 8-1; Business and Finance and Section 4-1; Mission and Purpose of the University. (IV.B.1.b) These are aligned to the UH system mission of:

- Access
- Learning and teaching
- Workforce development
- Personal development
• Community Development
• And Diversity

The BOR has ultimate responsibility for educational quality, legal matters, and financial integrity. The BOR has put an increased emphasis on the use of data for decision making as demonstrated in increased funding for institutional research. Policies have been implemented that require “linking of assessment, planning, and budgeting activities”. There is a system emphasis on meeting strategic goals and measuring outcomes in accordance with the educational mission. (IV.B.1.c)

The Hawai‘i University System publishes and acts in a manner consistent with the bylaws and policies specifying the size, duties, responsibility, structure, and operating procedures of the BOR, as evidenced in the published policies, bylaws and procedures on the institution’s website. The Board of Regents Reference Guide provides significant information related to the bylaws, operations, code of ethics, and structure of the entire University of Hawai‘i system. (IV.B.1.d)

The BOR does business in accordance with its policies and bylaws. It evaluates its polices and revises them as necessary. During 2010/2011, the Board completed a review of its policies. Although annual workshops are held to discuss “best practices”, the team was unable to confirm a consistent means of reviewing and revising BOR policies, as appropriate. (IV.B.1.e)

The BOR conducts board development and is working on a new member orientation in compliance with the standard. The Board’s program for development and new member orientation includes an “Annual Briefing and Workshop on Best Practices”. The BOR published the Board of Regents Reference Guide in June 2012. (IV.B.1.f)

The BOR has a policy regarding Board Self Evaluation although the evidence does not indicate the Board has implemented a regular process for this area. The Board conducted a self evaluation in 2008 and has not completed one since. (IV.B.1.g)

The BOR has a policy for ethics and uses the policy to ensure board member compliance and a process for dealing with violations of the policy as noted in Board Policy Article X, and HRS Chapter 84 (BOR By-Laws) the Board of Regents Reference Guide. (IV.B.1.h)

The BOR has a policy for hiring the President of the system and approves the appointment of the Vice President for each Community Colleges and the College Chancellor. The Board also addresses its relationship with the administration in the General Provisions of Board Policy Section 1-1.

The Chancellor has the primary responsibility for the institution and provides effective leadership in the areas of planning, organizing, budgeting, selecting and developing personnel, and assessing institutional effectiveness. (IV.B.1.j, IV.B.2)

The Chancellor plans, oversees, and evaluates the administrative structure of the College. The administrative structure is staffed and reflects the institution’s size, mission and complexity. The Delineation of Duties provides clarification of the roles to include the Chancellor and Vice
Chancellors. One of the major considerations for the college is the continued filling of administrative leadership roles. (IV.B.2.a)

The Chancellor works to improve the institution to ensure a collegial process for setting the values, goals, and priorities of the institution as evidenced in the Memorandum of Understanding on the “Collegial Relationship Among Campus Constituencies” adopted by the Planning Committee and Chancellor. (IV.B.2.b) The College has worked to ensure that evaluation and planning are based on high quality research and analysis and is integrated with resource distribution (IV.B.2.b) although there is a lack of evidence related to systematic evaluation of institutional planning.

The Chancellor implements college processes in compliance with the statutes, regulations, and board policies. (IV.B.2.c) The college budgets and expenditures demonstrate adequate controls by the leadership of the college. (IV.B.2.d)

Communication at the College between the College and UHCC system office as well as internally has not proven to be consistent. There is a need for more sharing of information by the Chancellor from the Council of Chancellor meetings. However, it appears that the College communicates effectively with the communities served by the institution. The Chancellor is an active member of several local, state, and national organizations. (IV.B.2.e)

The University of Hawai‘i System provides primary leadership in the communication of expectations of educational excellence and integrity while providing support of the effective operations of the colleges. The Board of Regents Reference Guide provides a clear structure for the roles authority and responsibility between the colleges and system. The BOR delineates its duties and responsibility and has bylaws and policies in the areas of:

- Administration
- Organization
- Planning
- Academic affairs
- Tuition, scholarships, and fees
- Student affairs
- Business and finance
- Personnel
- Land and physical facilities

The Board has established a system of decision-making and consultation bodies:

- Council of Chancellors
- Council of Chief Academic Officers
- All Campus Council of Faculty Senate Chairs (ACCFSC)
- University of Hawai‘i Student Caucus
- Puko‘a Council

The Board has also recognized the unique role of participation of the faculty in the shared governance process of the system through recognizing faculty senates and a Senate executive committee. Minutes from the consultation bodies provide evidence of meetings and
participation. These are located on the UH System Office website under meeting minutes and agendas. The Board of Regents Committee on Community Colleges has minutes reflected in 2012.

There are clear distinctions between the responsibilities of the colleges and the system as noted in the UHCC Functional Road Map that was revised in 2011-12. The budget is developed in an open and transparent manner and is managed and controlled appropriately as noted in the 5 years of audits for the entire system.

The team found proper and timely evaluation processes for top administrators and organizational leaders. (IV.A.3)

**Conclusion**
The College partially meets the standard. There is insufficient evidence that there is a systematic evaluation process for the Board of Regents.

**Recommendations**
*See College Recommendation #2*
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SUMMARY OF THE EVALUATION REPORT

Institution: UHCC System Office

Date of Visit: October 14-18, 2012

Team Chair: Dr. Helen Benjamin
Chancellor, Contra Costa Community College

Accreditation teams visited the six community colleges and the System Office of the community colleges that comprise the University of Hawai‘i Community College System (UHCC) during the week of October 14-18 for the purposes of determining whether and how well each institution continues to meet Accreditation Standards, evaluating how well the college is achieving its stated purposes, and providing recommendations for quality assurance and institutional improvement.

A different approach was taken in evaluating the UHCC. The 2006 visiting team recommended to the Accrediting Commission for Community and Junior Colleges (ACCJC, Commission) that a separate team be formed to conduct the UHCC visit rather than have one of the college team chairs serve in that capacity while simultaneously coordinating a college visit. As a result, the Commission appointed two additional persons to lead a UHCC evaluation. This team was augmented by one member from each of the college teams, forming the nine-member System Evaluation Team (SET) with the responsibility to coordinate all aspects of the UHCC evaluation, work closely with the college evaluation team chairs on system issues and write the SET report.

A few changes occurred in the University of Hawai‘i (UH) since the 2006 comprehensive visit. Maui Community College (MCC) was included in the 2006 comprehensive visit. However, effective August 2009, the accreditation of MCC was transferred from ACCJC, Western Association of Schools and Colleges (WASC) to the WASC Accrediting Commission for Senior Colleges and Universities and renamed University of Hawai‘i Maui College. Despite the change in accrediting bodies for MCC, the college remains part of UHCC for administration, organizational reporting and funding. The number of members of the Board of Regents (BOR) increased from 11 to 15. The BOR Committee on Community Colleges was re-established in 2005 as part of the reorganization that recreated the community college system. The BOR policy related to the Committee on Community Colleges was modified in 2011 as part of a comprehensive review of BOR policies.

In preparation for the visit, the chair of the SET conducted a telephonic pre-visit with the vice president for community colleges (VPCC) to arrange the details of the visit. SET members reviewed the college evaluation reports and information contained on the college and UHCC websites. The team was well prepared for the visit.
Three activities, coordinated by the SET, were held at Kapi‘olani Community College on the afternoon of Sunday, October 14. The first activity was a meeting led by the VPCC, who provided team members with a verbal update on the progress made on previous recommendations from 2006. The second and third meetings provided an orientation and reception, respectively, for the SET, college team chairs, their assistants and one additional member from each college team. The orientation, provided by Dr. Morton, gave an insightful and thorough presentation on how UHCC functions, the challenges and opportunities facing UHCC, its major accomplishments, and how it differs from the California community colleges. In attendance at the orientation and reception were four members of the BOR, the UH president, the six community college chancellors, the UH executive vice president for academic affairs/provost, the UHCC associate vice president for administrative affairs (AVPCC), and other UH, UHCC, and college employees.

On Monday, October 15, selected team members met with staff members from the UH and the Office of the VPCC to ask questions and have discussions on UHCC matters related to the Accreditation Standards. Each session was scheduled for 30 minutes in length. Meetings were held with four members of the BOR; the system president; the VPCC; representatives from academic affairs, information technology, budget and finance, research, and facilities; and members of the Council of Faculty Senate Chairs. Following the final session, the VPCC conducted another meeting to share progress made on the 2006 recommendations. After the sessions, all of the college team members departed for their assigned colleges to begin their visits. The SET began their work at the UHCC offices.

SET members had several opportunities to observe the UHCC in action through one-on-one and group interviews; attendance at a portion of the October 18 BOR meeting; and interactions with the regents, the UH president and other administrators. The three members of the SET made visits to each of the colleges located on O‘ahu and planned and implemented both audio and video conversations among the team chairs, UHCC administrators and members of the SET. On Wednesday, October 17, three such meetings were conducted: one with all team chairs and the SET; another with UHCC staff and team members at any college location, providing the opportunity for teams to get additional information; and another with the entire SET. On Thursday, October 18, the SET members attended one hour of the BOR meeting, and, at the end of the day, gave the UHCC exit interview.

The UHCC Office cooperated with the team in the completion of its work prior to and during the visit. UHCC personnel were extremely professional, courteous and helpful in meeting the variety of requests and needs of the team. The SET found UHCC to be seriously committed to the success of students in word and deed. It is against this backdrop that the following commendations and recommendations are made.
Commendations
UHCC employees are engaged in a variety of activities that distinguish UHCC and contribute to student success. The following listing represents only a few of those activities for which UHCC is commended:

- dedicating efforts to support the success and achievement of Native Hawaiian students and the preservation and study of Native Hawaiian culture;
- establishing a fund to support innovation in support of student success and for preserving this fund in the face of serious fiscal challenges;
- encouraging and supporting a spirit of “ohana” throughout UHCC;
- adopting a tuition increase schedule for 2012-17 in order to provide stability and predictability; and
- using a common student database to transition students to four-year institutions, improving articulation, and awarding Associate of Arts (AA) degrees back to students based on their coursework at four-year colleges.

Recommendations

**UHCC Recommendation 1: Institutional Mission and Effectiveness**
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, collegiate dialogue between and among the UHCC and the colleges to better assess the breadth, quality, and usefulness of UHCC analytical tools (e.g., UHCC Annual Report of Program Data (ARPD)) and planning processes through feedback from college stakeholders. In addition, the UHCC and Chancellors should provide training for the appropriate use of the tools to support on-going improvement and effectiveness.

- 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 allocation that leads to program and institutional improvement (Standards 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).

**UHCC Recommendation 2: Student Learning Programs and Services**
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 the rigor of the English and math courses needed to fulfill the degree requirements must be appropriate to higher education (Eligibility Requirement 11, Standards II.A.3, II.A.3.b).

**UHCC Recommendation 3: Student Learning Programs and Services and Resources**
In order to meet the Standard, the UHCC 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).

**UH Recommendation 4: Resources**

In order to meet the Standards, it is recommended that a comprehensive UH system wide technology plan that includes and supports distance education be developed and implemented and is integrated with institutional planning (Standards 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).

**UH Recommendation 5: Board and Administrative Organization**

In order to meet the Standards, it is recommended that the UH BOR adopt a regular evaluation schedule of its policies and practices and revise them as necessary. In addition, the UH BOR must conduct its self evaluation as defined in its policy and as required by ACCJC Standards (Standards IV.B.1.e, IV.B.1.g).
INTRODUCTION

The ACCJC evaluates multi-college systems as part of the comprehensive evaluation of accredited colleges. The UHCC is a multi-college system providing services and functions that enable the seven University of Hawai‘i Community Colleges to operate and meet Accreditation Standards. The Commission recognizes the important role a system plays in the ability of colleges to meet the Accreditation Standards and has established guidelines for visits to districts/systems. UHCC is not only a multi-college system, but a system embedded in the larger UH. In meeting the requirements set forth in the Commission Policy and Procedures for the Evaluation of Institutions in Multi-College/Multi-Unit Districts or Systems, the Commission appointed a separate team for the sole purpose of determining the extent to which the UHCC meets the Accreditation Standards established by the Commission for multi-college systems.

The UH was established in 1907 and developed into a system in the 1960s and 1970s, with the first community college becoming part of the system in 1964. The UH currently includes six community colleges accredited by ACCJC and one accredited by WASC and three four-year universities, one each at Manoa, Hilo, and West O‘ahu. The UHCC Office, led by the VPCC, is located at the UH Mānoa campus on O‘ahu.

In 2005, a major change occurred in the organizational structure of the UHCC. The BOR approved reorganization of the community colleges to include a vice president who reported to the president of the UH and provided leadership for all the community colleges in the UHCC. Responsibilities of the position include executive leadership, policy decision-making, resource allocation, development of appropriate support services for the seven community colleges, and the re-consolidation of the academic and administrative support units for the community colleges. The position and responsibilities are codified in the University of Hawai‘i Board of Regents Reference Guide. The community college chancellors serve in a dual reporting role to the VPCC for leadership and coordination of community college matters and to the UH president for system wide policymaking and decisions related to the individual colleges. The community college chancellors maintain responsibility for the daily operations of the colleges. The community college chancellors, as well as the chancellors for the UH campuses, serve on the Council of Chancellors to advise the president on strategic planning, program development and other areas. The community college chancellors meet as the Council of Community College Chancellors to provide advice to the president and VPCC on community college policy issues and other matters of community college interest.

Since the last comprehensive visit in 2006, the UHCC has made considerable progress by: dramatically increasing enrollment; moving to outcomes-based funding; enhancing its mission with a focus on student support leading to increased success for Native Hawaiian people and an emphasis on the preservation of Hawaiian language, history and culture; and becoming involved with two national programs for increasing student success, Achieving the Dream and Complete College America.
Recent Accreditation History

The last comprehensive visit to the UHCC was conducted from October 22-28, 2006, as part of the comprehensive evaluation of the seven community colleges then comprising UHCC. A Special Report focusing on one of the three recommendations given to the UHCC was to be submitted by October 15, 2007, followed by a visit. A two-person team representing the Commission made a visit to the UHCC on November 14, 2007, for the purpose of validating the Special Report on the progress of the UHCC in addressing the details required in Recommendation 1 of the 2006 report and visit. At its meeting in January 2008, the Commission took action to accept the report and commended UHCC for its work. The letter also reminded UHCC that each college was to submit its Midterm Report by October 15, 2009, requiring resolution of any team recommendations and other information. In 2009, UHCC submitted a separate Special Midterm Report responding again to Recommendation 1. The Commission accepted the report in its January 2010 meeting.

2012 Self Evaluation Document

As it had in 2006, the UHCC established a committee representing all six colleges for the purpose of responding to Standard IV.B., Board and Administrative Organization, Nos.1 and 3. The UHCC provided coordination of the effort and established the project as having two stages: the first, for the committee to write the descriptive summaries for each query; the second, for each college to complete the Self Evaluation and Actionable Improvement Plans sections. Honolulu Community College provided a brief self evaluation for most of the IV.B.1 and IV.B.3 components, but none of the other five colleges provided any self evaluation with the exception of a Standard sentence for IV.B.3.g. The Windward Community College report did not include descriptive summaries for all of the Standards.

The effort resulted in a common response that did not provide any self evaluation comments, other than a simple declaration of “meeting the Standard.” The descriptive summary, self evaluation and actionable improvement plans should have been more focused and precisely supported with appropriate evidence and documentation. More analysis would have improved the overall quality of the responses. In addition, some of the descriptive summaries provided a statement with a link to a board policy or some other reference without any description or explanatory response to the query. As a result, it was difficult to evaluate the appropriateness of the evidence referenced when reading. The document appeared to have been developed without the opportunity for dialogue that would have allowed for self reflection with an understanding of the UHCC, thereby yielding more cohesive and thoughtful responses. The development of thoughtful self evaluation responses might have resulted in actionable improvement plans where needed. The collaborative work on the report does appear to have been somewhat effective in providing college staff an opportunity to more fully understand the board and administrative structures that affect the UHCC.

Despite the weaknesses in the report and the accompanying evidence, the team was able to verify the degree to which the colleges and the UHCC meet the requirements for accreditation by the
Commission. In addition, the SET was able to validate progress since the 2009 Midterm Report on the three previous recommendations based on a verbal report given on the first day of the visit.
RESPONSE TO RECOMMENDATIONS OF THE PREVIOUS VISITING TEAM
OCTOBER 22-28, 2006

The previous visit to UHCC occurred October 22-28, 2006. That visiting team made three recommendations to which the UHCC needed to respond in the intervening six years.

2006 Recommendation 1

It is recommended that the Office of the President and the Vice President of the UH for Community Colleges conduct a systematic evaluation process to determine the effectiveness of the new community college organization and governance structure between—and among—the UHCC and its community colleges in the areas concerning:

a. Strategic Planning processes (Standard I.B.3)
b. Program review and assessment practices (Standards I.B.1, II.A.1.c, II.A.2.a,e,f, II.B.1, II.B.3.a, and II.b.4)
c. The allocation of resources (Standards I.B.6, III.D.1.a,d, IV.B.3.c
d. Facilities management, including deferred maintenance (Standards III.B.1.a,b, III.B.2.b)
e. Board and administrative leadership (Standard IV.B.3.a)

The UHCC should implement the improvements/changes that result from the review and widely communicate those outcomes (Standards I.B.3.g, IV.B.3.b, and f).

2012 Visiting Team Response

As written, Recommendation 1 was satisfied in 2008 with the completion of a systematic evaluation that included all the referenced elements, and the results of that evaluation were disseminated widely. The 2009 Midterm Report also brought current the UHCC activities regarding Recommendation 1. Since that time, however, the organizational and governance structures of the UHCC have continued to evolve. The descriptions below capture the current situation at the UHCC level and provide an updated opinion on the status of the recommendation in terms of it meeting the Standards.

a. Strategic Planning processes

The Strategic Planning Council (SPC) oversees strategic planning for the UHCC. Members of the SPC include the college chancellors, faculty senate chairs, student body president and the VPCC and AVPCC. The VPCC convened the SPC in spring 2007 to update the UHCC Strategic Plan. The goal of this effort was to align the plans of UH, UHCC, and the individual community colleges. The outcome of the review was to establish clear and measurable outcomes to assess performance and progress. The UH administration developed, and the BOR approved, the University
of Hawai’i System Strategic Outcomes and Performance Measures, 2008-2015. The UH established ten measurable outcomes from which the UHCC adopted five measurable goals with targets for 2008 through 2015. The five outcome-based funding goals are number of graduates, Native Hawaiian graduates, Science, Technology, Engineering, and Mathematics (STEM) graduates, Pell grant recipients and transfers to UH baccalaureate programs. Each goal was weighted according to the UHCC priority. Since 2008, the colleges have met or, in most cases, exceeded the targets for their goals. The STEM goal, while marginally met, is beginning to show greater progress.

The 2009 Special Midterm Report indicates that the VPCC held meetings at all the community colleges to help establish college-specific goals and to explain the planning process. The report also states, “This process will be repeated annually.” While difficult to find on the UH website, there is evidence of biannual meetings of the SPC where the VPCC can provide an overview of the UHCC planning process and progress. Evaluation of the planning process includes distribution of the community college inventory to SPC members and other college leaders.

Elements of the strategic planning system require further attention with: stronger integration of strategic planning and resource allocations; aligning program review data with strategic planning; and using data collected in the annual evaluation of the process for improvement. In essence, a more formalized evaluation process is now required for the planning process to take full advantage of evaluation data to improve the UHCC and its colleges.

This portion of the recommendation is partially satisfied.

b. Program review and assessment practices

The templates used for program review were developed by the UHCC, with input from the colleges, and are common across the colleges. The templates continue to be refined with additional benchmarks and further aligned with budget requests in the colleges. The most developed area of program review is instruction, which is overseen by the Instructional Program Review Council (IPRC). The council has developed Standard data, benchmarks and scoring rubrics to assess the health of instructional programs. The UHCC requires annual program reviews every year along with comprehensive reviews at least every five years. As of the Midterm Report, there was evidence of evaluation of the program review process. Evidence gained through interviews and review of minutes suggests that within and across colleges there is not a universal understanding of how to use the data or how results of the data are to be integrated into planning and resource allocation.

The assessment aspect within the program review process has lagged in development. The colleges have not uniformly assessed student learning and used the data on
learning to make improvements at the appropriate level to meet Accreditation Standards. In addition, the results of Student Learning Outcomes (SLOs) assessment have not been integrated into the program review process on a systematic basis. The UHCC role in providing assessment templates is noted, but the UHCC should explore other means by which the colleges can be supported in meeting Accreditation Standards in assessment.

Because of the current level of assessment practices and the use of that data in improvement of the program review process, this recommendation is partially satisfied.

c. Allocation of Resources

The UH Strategic Plan establishes the framework for the UHCC. The UH Strategic Plan, adopted by the Board of Regents in 2002, was updated by the UH community and the public in the 2007-08 academic year, and those participating in the review broadly affirmed the strategic goals and values underlying the goals.

The UHCC SPC coordinates with the colleges in developing their strategic plans to align with the UH plan and outcomes. The strategic plan provides direction for budget development. Strategic planning and budget development are closely linked processes. The colleges, through their annual program review process, evaluate assessment results and prepare prioritized lists of resources and budget requests for the improvement of college services and programs.

The president sets the budget directions for the UHCC, and the colleges develop their budget requests based on this direction. Resource allocations are based on the strategic planning goals, attainment of strategic planning outcomes, and the results of the annual program review process. The SPC works with the colleges throughout the budget process and is responsible to submit the budget document to the VPCC for inclusion in the UH budget for discussions and decisionmaking.

By basing the allocation of resources on strategic goals and on measurable outcomes established and understood system wide, the allocation is equitable and fair and based on measurable, assessed data. Competing needs of the UHCC and the three universities are discussed and prioritized through meetings with the UH vice president, the UHCC president, and the Council of Community College Chancellors. Priorities campus wide are vetted and the group agrees to what will be funded based on the resources available.

The UH-level reorganization of the community colleges in 2005 accomplishes the need to retain the integrity of the individually accredited colleges with a VPCC to coordinate the community colleges. In addition, the Council of Community College Chancellors has a direct reporting line to the UH president for system wide
policymaking and decisions impacting their colleges. The reorganization has provided the colleges a structure to collaborate and communicate in a transparent manner with each other and with the president and administrative staff at the UH level. In the reorganization, the SPC serves as the mechanism for setting benchmarks and goals for the colleges, and then the individual colleges establish individual goals and budgets to meet the overall goals set by the SPC.

Implementation of the 2005 reorganization, along with creation of the SPC, has allowed the institution to make progress in strategic planning and to drive budget development with transparent goals and measurable data. Communication and collaboration between the UH president, the VPCC, and the Council of Chancellors is positive, strong, and effective.

This portion of the recommendation continues to be satisfied.

d. Facilities management (including deferred maintenance)

UHCC has responded decisively to this element of Recommendation 1 since 2006. In 2010-11, the UHCC instituted and institutionalized facilities master planning through the Long Range Development Plan (LRDP). The UHCC developed a comprehensive maintenance and operations program under the leadership of the Facilities Planning and Services Division. Priority was placed on repair, renewal and replacement of facilities and equipment beginning in 2009. The UHCC introduced a new component in the planning process based upon “Resource and Stewardship” aimed to reduce deferred maintenance costs in the future. This addition resulted in significant resource allocation in capital improvement budgets from 2009-11. The colleges have implemented program review to assess the adequacy of facilities for education programs, and these are integrated into the budget and in the LRDP. The colleges demonstrate adequate and appropriate linkage of facilities with institutional goals. The LRDP clearly links educational programs and facility needs.

This portion of the recommendation continues to be satisfied.

e. Board and Administrative Leadership

The 2005 reorganization reestablished the UHCC within the UH under a new position of VPCC. The new organizational structure retained the dual reporting structure of the chancellors to both the UH president and the VPCC. In addition, to provide clear direction and communication, the BOR established its Committee on Community Colleges. All evidence has shown that these board and administrative structures continue to provide the appropriate level of focused attention to community college issues and serve to further the goals of the community colleges.
This recommendation required that the delineation of functions of the new organization should be described and communicated. Such a chart has been posted on the website and widely distributed. In addition, the University of Hawai‘i Board of Regents Reference Guide describes the administrative structure in detail and is posted on the website as well.

This recommendation continues to be satisfied.

2006 Recommendation 2

It is recommended that the University of Hawai‘i Community College System ensure that the financial reporting system is integrated and transparent throughout the System. (Standards III.D.2.a-b-g, III.D.3)

2012 Visiting Team Response

The UH and its community colleges are working toward common goals that are supported by transparent guidelines and financial infrastructure. The UHCC implements financial and budget directives from the UH through its strategic planning and budget development procedures. By visiting the UHCC Budget Planning and Finance website, it is possible to review budget development resources, consolidated audited financial statements, enrollment growth reports, repair and maintenance plans, state apportionments to the UHCC, tuition and fee history, annual program reviews, college inventory comparisons, and numerous other budget and financial reports.

In addition to the financial and budget reports, the website contains administrative policies and procedures covering procurement, contract management, risk management, debt service plans, general fund reserve policies, and delegation of authority policies. The fiscal biennium budgets are also available on the UH website.

The 2006 recommendation was focused on the development and utilization of the new integrated financial reporting system just begun the year before the 2006 visit. UHCC became a member of the Kauli financial management project in 2005 to design an integrated financial reporting system. In the 2006 report to the Commission, the UHCC reported that the development of the project had been slow and uneven. During the following five years, the project languished due to changes in personnel and varying commitments to making the implementation a priority. In 2011, the project was once again made a high priority.

A priority was placed on meeting the internal implementation deadline of July 1, 2012, for the Kauli financial management system; that deadline was met. The implementation is significant to the business operations and financial management and reporting systems of the UH. Basic software was implemented, which means the software will be modified to meet institutional needs. The process will be on-going to adjust the software to the specific needs of the UHCC. While still a work-in-progress, the UH vice president for administrative services reported that the
financial management system is operating to effectively support the financial management and reporting requirements of the community colleges. Staff training continues to be a need and is also ongoing.

The recommendation has been met.

2006 Recommendation 3

It is recommended that the Board of Regents adopt a regular evaluation schedule of its policies and practices and revise them as necessary. (Standard IV.B.1.g)

2012 Visiting Team Response

In the college self evaluations, it is consistently reported that the BOR initiated and completed a review and revision of its policies in 2010-11. The SET team verified that this occurred. There was a review and revision of all BOR policies which included UHCC input. UHCC reports that the evaluation and revision of policies has continued routinely to the present time. In addition, the former Community College Memoranda that guided UHCC prior to the 2002 reorganization are being converted into UH Community College Policies (UHCCP). The 2006 Recommendation 3 also required a regular evaluation schedule; this element does not currently exist. Adoption of a regular evaluation schedule will assure a timely and thorough review of all BOR policies and assure appropriate development and placement of new policies. In addition, the conversion of Community College Memoranda into BOR policies must be completed.

Based on the evidence, this recommendation has been partially met.
STANDARD I
Institutional Mission and Effectiveness

A. Mission

General Observations

Colleges within the UHCC have mission statements that are tied to the UH mission and strategic plan. Each college uniquely defines its purpose and intended student population, though there is a UHCC emphasis on supporting the educational attainment of Native Hawaiian peoples. There is evidence in the college self evaluations that college missions are tied to institutional planning and priorities.

Findings and Evidence

The UHCC has developed and published a mission statement for the UHCC that identifies the broad educational purpose of the UHCC’s collective six community colleges, identifies various student populations the UHCC is intending to serve, and conveys a commitment to achieving high levels of student learning. The programs offered by the colleges support the varied populations and geographic areas defined in the mission statement. The UHCC has expanded its distance education offerings in an effort to reach geographically remote populations and to expand offerings of high demand courses that are constrained by space during certain times of the day. These strategies align with the intent of the UHCC to provide open-access education to the people of Hawai‘i. Individual college mission statements place a particular emphasis on promoting the educational attainment of the native people of Hawai‘i (I.A.1).

The UHCC has established a routine of assessment and review of its mission that occurs every seven to eight years. The most recent revision occurred in 2010 and was orchestrated and managed by the SPC which includes as members administrative, faculty and student representation from each community college in the UHCC. The SPC was the primary venue for receiving feedback from each of the colleges, through their committee representatives, regarding the effectiveness, accuracy and quality of the mission statement. Feedback on the UHCC mission statement was captured from the individual colleges and minor changes were worked into multiple revisions of the draft until a final version was agreed upon and approved by the SPC. The colleges in the UHCC recently reviewed and revised their mission statements. In some instances, this update was prompted by the effort of the UH to update the UHCC strategic plan (I.A.2, I.A.3).

Concurrent to the development of the UHCC mission statement was the creation of an updated version of the UHCC strategic plan titled The UHCC Strategic Outcomes and Performance Measures, 2008-2015. The measures embedded within the UHCC strategic plan align rather closely with the UHCC mission and play a key role in establishing a
foundation for institutional planning at the UHCC and at each of the individual colleges (1.A.4).
The Office of the VPCC has conducted assessments of the strategic planning process to
achieve the strategic planning goal of “developing and sustaining an institutional
environment that promotes transparency and a culture of evidence that links institutional
assessment, planning, resource acquisition and resource allocation.” The 2009 survey
was adapted from the one conducted two years prior to capture the level of satisfaction
faculty and staff at the colleges have regarding the UHCC strategic planning processes.
Findings from the community college inventory survey were made available on the
UHCC web page and were reviewed by the SPC (1.A).

Conclusion

While the evaluation team finds the UHCC to be in compliance with Standard 1.A, there
are opportunities for the UHCC to improve upon the process of review and assessment of
the UHCC mission and strategic planning processes. The UHCC conducts a community
college inventory survey that examines, in part, satisfaction with the UHCC mission and
strategic planning process. However, there is no evidence that the UHCC collects
feedback or engages in dialogue with the colleges to identify strategies for improving the
processes that underlie the review the UHCC mission and UHCC strategic planning.
Some of the satisfaction scores from the 2009 community college inventory survey
indicate a need to broaden the engagement that the UHCC has with the colleges regarding
planning and priority-setting and further indicate some concern that the UHCC continues
to engage in practices that are off-mission. The VPCC has acknowledged that these
concerns need to be addressed and is intent on making changes to improve transparency.

The UHCC meets Standard 1.A.

Recommendation

None
B. Improving Institutional Effectiveness

General Observations

The UHCC provides evidence that planning is data driven with specific benchmarks tied to college allocations. UHCC and college goals consistent with the mission and purpose of the UHCC have been established in key areas. Goals are defined in measurable terms, and college chancellors understand the goals and fiscal impact to their college. Colleges are expected to respond to the UHCC goals and develop local processes for systematic evaluation and resource allocation to support the UHCC goals. The system-developed program review data and processes have provided a direction and focus for colleges to use program data and evaluation for improvement. To date, program review processes have not included student learning outcomes data. Thus, at the UHCC level, there has not been an emphasis on evidence of achievement of student learning, though at each college, SLOs assessment is at various stages of development. There is no indication that assessment of student learning is systematically tied to resource allocation across the UHCC.

Findings and Evidence

Within the last five years, the UHCC has made substantive changes to its strategic planning processes. In 2007, the UHCC embarked on a strategy to improve the institutional effectiveness of the community college system by providing greater strategic direction to each of the colleges. Under the leadership of the Office of the VPCC, the UHCC implemented a strategic planning process that includes an identification of specific goals related to student achievement outcomes and institutional performance that aligned with the UHCC stated mission. A review of actual performance against these goals is conducted annually by both the UHCC and at the individual colleges. Funding allocations from the UHCC to the college are determined, in part, by the degree to which each individual college meets or surpasses the stated goals in the strategic plan (1.B).

With the creation of the UHCC Strategic Outcomes and Performance Measures, 2008-15 report, the Office of the VPCC established a set of outcome goals for the UHCC and each of the individual colleges. Assessment of progress against the goals is conducted every year, both at the UHCC and the college levels. Each college is asked to demonstrate that it has met all five of the overarching goals highlighted in the report to be eligible to capture performance funding dollars, which, at its full value, comprises roughly 3 percent of the UHCC budget. These planning goals are broadly disseminated and largely quantitative, allowing for systematic tracking of performance and assessment of the degree to which the UHCC and each of the colleges have achieved the strategic planning goals. The Office of the VPCC also provides program review templates that include data on department demand, efficiency and effectiveness to each of the instructional departments at the colleges. The templates also provide an analytically driven
assessment of the health of the department in each of the three domains, using one of the following designations: Healthy, Cautionary or Unhealthy (1.B.2, 1.B.3).

The UHCC Office evaluates the strategic planning process using a survey instrument administered to the SPC, a group that provides oversight to the UHCC planning process. Formally established in policy, the SPC is the primary body for assuring system wide participation in the UHCC strategic planning process. Responses to the community college inventory indicate varying levels of satisfaction with the process and some concern whether "resources are consistently allocated to address the priorities identified throughout the planning process." Survey participants also indicate that there exist opportunities to broaden the depth of awareness and understanding of these department-level goals, how they were determined, how they are used to inform decision-making and how faculty, staff and administrators at the colleges can provide feedback that leads to improvements in both the template and the process. The Office of the VPCC has acknowledged that there are opportunities to improve transparency and make resource allocation processes more visibly linked to planning processes and is undertaking efforts to make improvements in these areas. Dialogue about processes at the UHCC level appears to be primarily around UHCC and college performance goals and the concomitant resources attached to the recently developed performance-based funding allocations available to the colleges. UHCC and college goals reflect the direction and purpose of the UH. These actions should be of high priority, along with efforts to sustain and expand upon current evaluation processes intended to provide reflective feedback on how to make improvements to planning processes. There is no formal process for capturing input from faculty and staff at each of the colleges at the UHCC level into the evaluation and assessment of student learning. Reflection on institutional processes is essentially conducted at the institution/college level (1.B.1, 1.B.3-4).

As noted in the general observations covering Standard 1.A, there are some important limitations to the information captured by UHCC Office from the colleges in areas related to planning. First, the inventory is primarily a satisfaction and perception survey of a small group of UHCC-level planners and college administrators. While feedback from this group is important and should be collected, it captures the perspective of one very small and biased group that has particularly close proximity to UHCC planning decisions and conversations. Second, there doesn’t appear to be a system wide evaluation tool or survey that provides faculty and staff and other end-users of the UHCC planning products at the colleges opportunities to provide feedback on how to make improvements to either the content of the information provided or the processes that determine how they are used and distributed. Absent this feedback loop, it will be difficult for the UHCC Office to capture the information needed to assure they are providing real value to the colleges and that each college is being given the information it needs and requires to achieve sustainable, continuous quality improvement with regard to institutional effectiveness (1.B.1, 1.B.2).
There is dialogue at the UHCC level, including a rich array of data, regarding progress toward achieving goals. Colleges not attaining predetermined benchmarks have the performance funding incentive to make relevant improvements; however, improvements are made absent a formal feedback loop whereby the colleges can coordinate with UHCC to develop approaches that speak to challenges specific to individual colleges. Integration of planning is not apparent as the discussion of college-level performance measures and resource needs pertaining to physical and human resources are not connected. Evaluation of outcomes uses both qualitative data (college inventory) and quantitative data (performance outcomes) (I.B.3).

Input into the UHCC planning and resource allocation process, including program review, is limited. Qualitative input is limited to a few representatives from each institution. The planning cycle is modified at times, yet it is not apparent such moves are driven from analysis of the planning and resource allocation process. The UHCC does report out on major college initiatives. While the Office of the VPCC does capture feedback to support a limited evaluation of the SPC, an expansion of the evaluation mechanisms to include broader coverage of the SPC and to possibly expand it to include the Institutional Research Cadre, would provide a more complete picture of the breadth and quality of the engagement with the colleges regarding planning and resource allocation processes and decisions (I.B.4, I.B.5, I.B.6).

Given the number of planning processes that connect the UHCC with the individual colleges and the many planning processes and structures requiring routine evaluation, the UHCC may be relying too heavily on a single survey to capture feedback intended to be helpful in guiding improvements across so many domains. The UHCC would benefit from a systematic and thoughtful expansion of existing evaluation mechanisms that includes a more in-depth assessment of process that better captures feedback beyond simple satisfaction and that includes a more comprehensive evaluation of processes and procedures in place at various planning bodies, including, but not limited to, the UHCC SPC.

Conclusion

There appears to be an unclear link between resource allocation and planning. Assessment of student learning outcomes has started, but is not fully implemented across all programs. To a large extent, the planning process is a work-in-progress, and the impact and effectiveness are not fully determined.

The UHCC does not fully meet Standard I.B.
Recommendation

UHCC Recommendation 1: Institutional Mission and Effectiveness
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 UHCC and the colleges to better assess the breadth, quality, and usefulness of UHCC analytical tools (e.g., UHCC Annual Report of Program Data (ARPD)) and planning processes through feedback from college stakeholders. In addition, the UHCC and Chancellors should provide training for the appropriate use of the tools to support on-going improvement and effectiveness.

- 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 allocation that leads to program and institutional improvement (Standards 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).
STANDARD II
Student Learning Programs and Services

General Observations

Colleges within the UHCC maintain strong and transparent communication regarding instructional and services goals and efforts. The individual colleges maintain critical independence in the development of course offerings and a schedule of services unique to the needs of community members. Nevertheless, the UHCC Office provides the colleges a breath of organizational and infrastructure support meant to simplify and ease transfer within the UHCC, coordinates program outcomes, and ensures a measure of uniformity of skills developed in career and technical education programs.

A. Instructional Programs

Findings and Evidence

The UHCC coordinates efforts that allow the colleges to meet student goals in their various academic programs in a manner consistent with that necessary to address the preparatory needs of a diverse and vibrant community. The UHCC has coordinated a variety of essential support efforts meant to provide for the improvement and uniformity of programs, including: the Placement Advisory Work Group designed to improve student assessment outcomes; the Math Summit Groups designed to improve both remedial and transfer-level course outcomes; the Writing Intensive Course Committee designed to coordinate a university and community college wide initiative meant to improve writing skills and competencies; and the Developmental Education Committee designed to align expectations and outcomes to ensure that courses continue to be of high quality and are in sync across the UHCC (II.A.1, II.A.1-a-c).

The UHCC has promoted, through its strategic plan: the inclusion of the goals and outcomes of the Achieving the Dream Initiative, including a turn to data-driven, outcome-based decision-making; a focus on enhanced recruitment, retention and success of Native Hawaiian students; improved remedial and developmental course outcomes; and increased transfer success. Measurement of the colleges’ participation and success in meeting these objectives has been codified in an annual program review process. The colleges are using student achievement data/outcomes but are not using learning outcomes data in program reviews. Within this process, the UHCC Office provides the colleges with data about student achievement outcomes which fuels campus planning and is the foundation of an outcomes-based funding initiative. This funding, along with that available through support of innovative projects, is tied to meeting benchmarks established by the UHCC in five primary categories: number of graduates, number of Native Hawaiian graduates, STEM-related field graduates, Pell grant recipients, and baccalaureate transfers to UH campuses (II.A.2, II.A.2.a, II.A.2.b).
In an effort to ensure uniformity, the UHCC Office has established processes and guidance for proper implementation and assessment of SLOs for all colleges based on a standard meant to promote continuous quality improvement in the area of SLOs development and assessment. In addition, the UHCC has promoted the development of a process in which campus annual program reviews are analyzed and scored. The UHCC has also established general education requirements that serve to define program requirements for the Associate of Arts, the Associate of Science, the Associate of Applied Science (AAS), and the General Education degrees. The colleges have all effectively aligned their curriculum and degrees with these criteria in an effort to provide students with a uniformly accessible academic experience. In an effort to promote direct and relevant career training, the UHCC has aided four of the colleges in developing the Associate of Applied Science degrees. The desire to offer students more narrowly targeted career training through this degree is a creative alternative that is clearly both appealing and relevant to students. However, the visiting team is concerned that the rigor of this curriculum may be undermined by the fact that the math and English degree requirements are below college level and not consistent with the general education requirements as outlined by the UHCC itself (ER11, II.A.1, II.A.2.c, II.A.2.f-h, II.A.2.1, II.A.3, II.A.3.a-c, II.A.4).

The UHCC has also established policies that address key Accreditation Standard issues such as academic honesty, an interdisciplinary core, career technical education program and course alignment and directives on instructional objectivity.

Conclusion

The UHCC partially meets Standard II.A.

Recommendation

**UHCC Recommendation 2: Student Learning Programs and Services**

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 the rigor of the English and math courses needed to fulfill the degree requirements must be appropriate to higher education (Eligibility Requirement 11, Standards II.A.3, II.A.3.b).
B. Student Support Services

Findings and Evidence

The UHCC priorities include the recruitment of students from diverse backgrounds, ranging from high school students, home schooled students, Native Hawaiian students and from the general service area community. The UHCC promotes accessible services for all, regardless of location, and recruits and admits students with diverse backgrounds who can benefit from the courses and programs offered by its colleges. Students are guaranteed opportunities for enrollment and access to college programs without deference. The UHCC assures that colleges have the resources to assess math and English placement using COMPASS. Testing, admissions, counseling and financial assistance services are available across every UHCC campus (II.B.1, II.B.3.e).

The UHCC provides guidance for colleges to address the needs of high risk students and ensures specialized support services and accommodations for students with disabilities through targeted and accessible programs. The UHCC and its institutions have a clear commitment to improve learning support for instructional programs linked to state wide initiatives meant to improve student performance and retention (II.B.3, II.B.3.a, II.B.3.d, II.B.4).

The UHCC supports an environment which encourages uniformity and accessibility for students regardless of which institution they attend. Efforts to develop a common UHCC application and financial aid process have positively reduced confusion and duplication. Additionally, UHCC-inspired recruitment, retention, and success goals to expand Native Hawaiian participation in higher education have been well coordinated and widely disseminated (II.B.3, II.B.3.d).

The UHCC has provided direction and assistance in training faculty in assessment techniques for student support services student learning outcomes. There have been UHCC-sponsored trainings and workshops. The UHCC Office has disseminated information regarding ACCJC expectations of institutions being at the level of continuous quality improvement for SLOs production and assessment (II.B.4).

Conclusion

The UHCC meets Standard II.B.

Recommendation

None
C. Library and Learning Support Services

Findings and Evidence

The college libraries support the information needs of students throughout the UHCC. UHCC libraries provide print, on-line, and data-base resources for students throughout the state through interlibrary loan or through computer access. Unique collections are housed on individual campuses and are made available to both the college community and the public at large (II.C.1, II.C.1.a).

College libraries all provide resources and meet the goal of the UHCC information literacy competency standard for higher education and a common library student learning outcome which requires that individual students must learn to “evaluate information and its sources critically.” In addition, the community college libraries participate in a UHCC-led agreement with University of Hawai‘i, Manoa’s Hamilton Library for Voyager program access and an integrated management system that provides students with system wide library resource access (II.C.1.b, c.1.e, II.C.2).

Conclusion

The UHCC meets Standard II.C.

Recommendations

None
STANDARD III
Resources

A. Human Resources

General Observations

The Board of Regents of the UH is the governing authority that establishes policy pertaining to all faculty and staff. Policies can be found on the university web site. The UHCC is embedded in the UH. The chancellors of the community colleges have a dual reporting relationship to the president of the UH and the VPCC. Hiring authority for campus personnel lies with the chancellor of each campus with the exception of the chancellor and those who report directly to the chancellor. The VPCC has hiring authority for those who report to the chancellor as well as for direct reports with the Office of the Vice President for Community Colleges. The VPCC and the UH president recommend the appointment of the chancellors to the Board of Regents who has final hiring authority for the chancellors. The responsibility of evaluation for the college chancellors is also two-fold. Both the VPCC and the president of the UH participate in the evaluation of the college chancellors. The evaluations are based in part on the performance measures of the college as set forth in the strategic plan and the performance funding measures. The five measures that drive the performance funding outcomes are the number of graduates, Native Hawaiian graduates, STEM graduates, Pell grant recipients, and transfers to UH baccalaureate program.

The UH president evaluates the VPCC. There are three components to the evaluation of the VPCC: comprehensive evaluation, a self evaluation, and a meeting with the president to discuss both of the above and to set goals and budget strategy. The relationship between the president and the VPCC is positive and strong as evidenced by discussions with administrators and staff.

Qualification requirements and compensation for academic positions serving in the executive and managerial classifications are established in UH Executive Policies. System wide administrative procedures for classified and administrative, professional, and technical (APT) personnel, and for civil service personnel are codified as well. There are UH wide administrative procedures for recruitment and selection of faculty, APT, and executive personnel. The UHCC is responsible to set the guidelines for contract renewal, tenure and promotion, and evaluation of faculty and staff. The BOR evaluates the UH president.

The UH is responsible to establish the statements on nondiscrimination and affirmative action as well as the statement of professional ethics. The colleges of the UHCC are obliged to operate under the policies established by the UH. The colleges have the authority to create the procedures to implement the UH policies.
Findings and Evidence

The policies and practices in place throughout the UHCC for recruitment, employment, and evaluation are numerous. Staff development opportunities with accompanying funding are embraced and encouraged starting at the UH level and passed on throughout the UHCC. The UH supports programs and activities for its diverse population of both students and staff through various policies and, in some cases, funding.

Separate evaluation processes are in place for the evaluation of faculty, APT, Civil Service and executive personnel. The current faculty evaluation process does not include the evaluation of student learning outcomes but relies on faculty assessment results and institutional performance measures. The UH BOR sets policy and procedures for the UHCC Faculty Classification Plan which sets forth the principles and goals of the UHCC assessment and evaluation of student learning. The UHCC administration and faculty adhere to the evaluation process by assessing and evaluating student learning as defined in the Faculty Classification Plan for tenure track and non-tenure track faculty as authorized by the UH BOR. Once tenured, faculty members have no continuing requirement to assess student learning as part of their evaluation.

Through the strategic planning and budget development processes, along with the annual program review process, staffing needs in all areas are addressed and prioritized. Through the SPC and the Council of Chancellors, the staffing needs and prioritization are presented to the UH president. Full-time employees are approved through these processes. Some positions are funded; others rely on reallocation of existing funds depending on the situation (III.A.1-6).

Conclusion

The UHCC is strong in the area of human resources and in using its employees to meet its broad educational program. In the case of the faculty evaluation procedure serving to improve effectiveness, the UHCC utilizes a process which contains two different evaluation methods. The process of faculty tenure and promotion includes analysis of SLOs as part of the evaluation which can occur up to three times during a faculty member's career. Evaluations for promotion occur post-tenure and include student learning outcome analysis. Once the faculty member has completed the promotion activities or elects not to submit a promotion application, that faculty member is then subject to a different evaluation procedure not requiring a detailed analysis of student learning outcomes and occurring every five years. Thus, a tenured faculty member who does not request promotion, or a faculty member who has completed all requirements of tenure and promotion, does not have the same requirement to analyze student learning outcomes for improvement of effectiveness.

While UHCC meets Standard III.A.C.1 for some faculty, it does not hold the same standard for all faculty members to analyze SLOs for effectiveness and improvement.
While the UHCC meets other portions of Standard III.A, it does not meet Standard III.A.C.1. For that reason, the UHCC partially meets Standard III.A.

Recommendation

**UHCC Recommendation 3: Student Learning Programs and Services and Resources**

In order to meet the Standard, the UHCC 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).
B. Physical Resources

General Observations

The UHCC and the colleges have placed a high priority on facilities management since the 2006 comprehensive visit. The *Evaluation Report of the University of Hawai‘i Community College System (2006)* noted several issues with the lack of a “well-crafted facilities plan” and that the amount of money awarded to the UHCC is in the control of the government. The planning processes now include a component based on resource and stewardship which resulted in significant resource allocation in capital improvement budgets from 2009-11. Legislative funding was provided and campus master plans were released in fall of 2009 and have been widely reviewed as part of the Long Range Development Plan (LRDP).

Findings and Evidence

The UHCC has institutionalized facilities master planning through the LRDP. It provides a roadmap for UHCC requests to the State Legislature to ensure alignment of funding with the campus master plans. The UHCC plans, builds, maintains, and updates its physical resources to effectively utilize its resources as well as provide support to academic programs and services (III.B.1.a). The LRDP includes the unique student learning programs and services for each college and is integrated into institutional planning (III.B).

The UHCC has developed a comprehensive maintenance and operations program under the leadership of the Facilities Planning and Services Division (III.B.1.a). Priority was placed on the repair, renewal and replacement of facilities and equipment beginning in fiscal year 2009. The UHCC Office emphasized resource and stewardship in order to reduce deferred maintenance costs in the future. The UH allocated $107 million for capital renewal and deferred maintenance in fiscal year 2010 and $62 million in fiscal year 2011. The State Legislature has provided support to the UHCC by allocating significant funding for repairs and maintenance, although not enough to address the $65 million identified, deferred repairs and maintenance as well as $68 million for modernization and renovation for UHCC.

Through programs that deal with the Americans with Disabilities Act, the UHCC emergency evacuation procedures, and the Police Services, units of the colleges have developed appropriate risk management and safety measures for providing a safe learning and working environment (III.B.1.b.). Overall, the UHCC is meeting Standard III. B through consistent facilities planning and implementation through the LRDP and continued evaluation of its facility needs as it relates to the educational master plans of the colleges.
Conclusion

The UHCC meets Standard III.B.

Recommendations

None
C. Technology Resources

General Observations

The UHCC places a strong emphasis on the effective use of technology in the support of instruction and student and administrative services, evidenced by the investment made in those areas. The UH Information Technology Services (ITS) works in conjunction with the UHCC Office and the colleges in making technology decisions. Overall, the technology for both the UHCC and the colleges operates at high capacity with a ten gigabit-per-second network to the colleges.

Findings and Evidence

Technology resources are used to support student learning programs and services and to improve institutional effectiveness. Each college provides its own local area network support and computing services. At the system wide level, UH ITS provides services for all colleges in wide-area networking, videoconferencing, help desk, site licensing, and enterprise administrative, academic, and infrastructure IT services.

The UH is part of the Kuali Foundation Project (Foundation), which pools resources to develop and sustain many of the software systems needed for higher education. The Foundation was established to “reduce costs and get systems that better fit college needs.” Licenses are procured through the UH Office along with the system help desk to provide employee and student support. Ground has been broken for construction of a new Information Technology Center, which will house enterprise information and communications technology systems and services that support modern teaching, administration and research for all ten UH campuses (III.C.1.c-d).

The Sakai open-source, course management system supports online learning for campus-based and distance learning for all ten campuses and is fully integrated into the Banner student information and the UHCC portal. ITS also operates a system wide IT Help Desk and supports a ten gigabit-per-second connection to all ten college sites, as well as a Voice Over Internet Protocol telephone system (III.C.1.a). The system-level focus on the wide-area network (WAN), enterprise resources systems, and video network operates at an effective and efficient level as evidenced in minor issues and general satisfaction at the community colleges. The colleges focus on the more localized services which appear to work well for both the UHCC and the colleges.

The college provides technology training for its faculty, staff, and students. ITS provides for the operation of a system wide-area network and Help Desk functions for all the colleges (III.C.1.b). The UH has not developed an overall plan to address UH responsibilities as delineated in the Functions Map (III.C.1). The colleges systematically plan, acquire, maintain, and upgrade the local technology infrastructure and equipment and integrate technology planning into the college planning.
Although the UH is providing excellent technology services for the colleges, the UH has not updated its technology master plan since 2000. Therefore, technology planning is not current, documented, nor integrated with overall institutional planning (III.C). While the UH has done an outstanding job of upgrading the network to ten gigabytes, how planning occurs between the colleges and the UH is not clearly evident. The vice president for information technology/information technology officer meets with the chancellors in the UH Council and discusses systems priorities. This appears to be the only linkage between the colleges and the UH Office for technology planning purposes (III.C.2).

Conclusion

Considerable progress has been made at the system wide level in technology services to support student learning and institutional effectiveness. While forward-thinking decisions are made in technology, it is done without formal planning structures in this area. The colleges are dependent on major technology services provided by the UH; therefore, these services need to be integrated into overall institutional planning.

The UHCC partially meets Standard III.C.

Recommendation

**UH Recommendation 4: Resources**

In order to meet the Standards, it is recommended that a comprehensive UH system wide technology plan that includes and supports distance education be developed and implemented and is integrated with institutional planning (Standards 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).
D. Financial Resources

General Observations

The UHCC is responsible for the fiscal biennium budget preparation process. The fiscal biennium budget compiles all components of the UH. The BOR sets the policy guidance for the preparation of the fiscal, biennial budget policy paper and budget which is submitted to the Governor and the State Legislature by the UH president. The SPC, made up of the chancellors, faculty senate chairs, student body presidents from each college, and the VPCC and AVPCC for the UHCC, oversees the UHCC budget process. SPC members set goals and benchmarks and review prioritized staffing and other funding requests. The UHCC budget development process is transparent and inclusive. Once the budget requests are reviewed and prioritized, the proposed budgets are forwarded to the UH president for final review and decision making and then forwarded simultaneously to the Governor and the State Legislature. Once appropriations are made to the UH and the UHCC, the president and VPCC make the allocations to the colleges. The annual program review process and data drive much of the prioritization for the colleges.

The UH BOR adopted a six-year tuition increase plan for the UH which includes the UHCC, expiring spring of 2012. On October 26, 2011, the BOR approved another six-year UH and UHCC tuition increase schedule to commence fall of 2012 and end spring 2017. These schedules provide stability and predictability for the students of the UH and the UHCC. The increased tuition, along with a surge in enrollment growth, has provided the UHCC some relief from the State of Hawaii’s budget cuts. The UHCC enrollments grew 30.22 percent over a five-year period while the UH enrollment grew 19.50 percent overall. UHCC enrollment growth has continued through the sluggish economy.

The UH appropriation was reduced by $205 million or 23 percent over two years, 2009-10 and 2010-11. The $57.8 million in revenue from the increase in tuition and fees during that same period has somewhat sheltered the UH from the large state revenue reductions. The fiscal biennium 2011-13 UHCC operating budget restores $12,256,561 to fiscal year 2012-13 from prior-year, legislative cuts.

Through the strategic planning processes, annual program review, college inventory comparisons, and college efficiency reports, the UHCC is provided data and assessment information to establish funding priorities. General fund allocations, including requests for new funds from the State Legislature, are reviewed at multiple levels within the UH system. The Office of the VPCC also works with the Community College Council of Chancellors to review the allocations and make adjustments as appropriate, particularly during times of budget reductions. Budget decisions are carried out by the Board of Regents Finance Committee and the Board of Regents as a whole.
Findings and Evidence

Evidence exists to validate that the financial resources of the UHCC are sufficient to support student learning programs and services and to improve institutional effectiveness. The UH and the UHCC have made much progress in this area since the 2006 accreditation visit. The UH final reorganization approved by the BOR in 2005 provides a clear line of authority within the UH and between the UH and the UHCC. The Council of Chancellors provides continuous opportunities for discussion, program prioritization and funding prioritization. The UHCC Strategic Plan and the UH strategic outcomes and performance measures outlined with each fiscal biennium budget, provide clear direction to the UHCC to follow as they create their college budgets and program and staffing priorities.

Measurable student achievement outcomes and comparison data from the college inventories support and validate the prioritization of needs. Collaboration through the work of the SPC provides the UHCC with reliable and defendable data. Improvement in many areas is evidenced by the results of the comparative college inventories over time (III.D.1.a-d).

The external audit reports are positive and without material findings. The Management Discussion and Analysis (MDA) section of the audit is detailed and communicates clearly the financial position of the UH. The UH positive working capital of $287.6 million is a good measure of both the UH efficiency and financial health. The UH endowment and other investments have increased substantially over the last two years with a balance of $719.6 million at June 30, 2011. The repayment of debt is clearly outlined with a debt-service, line-item budget in place. Long-term liabilities have been addressed and other post-employee benefits (OPEB) are being funded based on actuarial studies made at the State of Hawai‘i level. The audit also validates the strong financial position of the UH in the current fiscally challenging economic environment at the state level (III.D.2.a-e). The external audit report addresses UHCC capital projects and debt if it is specific to a particular college within the UHCC. The financial statements do not separate the transactions for the UHCC from the UH. The MDA and narrative also aggregate the data and corresponding narrative for the UH, including the UHCC. There are no comments which focus directly on the operations of the UHCC separately.

Discussion of OPEB and other long-term debt, salary settlements, benefit costs and cash reserves are addressed in aggregate at the UH level. Cash reserves are strong and available should unanticipated revenue shortfalls occur or unanticipated expenditures arise. The state continues to uphold a strong commitment to maintain and upgrade the UH core facilities. Fiscal policies and procedures are in place for the UH which establish sound financial practices and infrastructure. General obligation, bond-funded, capital improvement program appropriations for the fiscal biennium 2009-11 were approximately $350 million as compared to $308 million for the fiscal biennium 2007-09. The UH issued over $292 million in revenue bonds for the purpose of funding the costs of university projects.
Conclusion

The UHCC meets Standard III.D.

Recommendation

None
STANDARD IV
Leadership and Governance

B. Board and Administration Organization

General Observations

The UH is an integrated higher education system consisting of a research university at Manoa, two baccalaureate-granting institutions at Hilo and West O’ahu and seven community colleges (including Maui). The community colleges are embedded in the UH and are led by a VPCC and referred to as the UHCC. The UHCC Office is located at the UH Manoa campus on O’ahu. Community college chancellors have a dual reporting relationship to both the VPCC and the UH president. The UHCC is governed by the fifteen-member UH BOR appointed by the Governor and confirmed by the State Senate.

The BOR for the UH sets policy; the UH president is responsible for the execution of policies and procedures. Roles and responsibilities of the BOR, the UH president, VPCC, and the college chancellors are clearly defined in the University of Hawai’i Board of Regents Reference Guide, job descriptions, and BOR policies and procedures. These delineations provide for the smooth operation of the UHCC.

The UHCC is a multi-college system integrated with a university system. The UH/UHCC was restructured in 2005 with the UH president providing educational leadership and administration for the ten campuses in the entire system and a VPCC, reporting directly to the president. Under the structure, the community college chancellors report to both the VPCC and the president. In practice, the VPCC works most closely with the UHCC chancellors and serves as an appropriate liaison to the president and the BOR. The president meets monthly with the Council of Chancellors for the purpose of providing an exchange of views and information among all chief executive officers of the UH and the UHCC.

B. 1: Governing Boards

Findings and Evidence

Two sets of documents codify the roles and responsibilities of the BOR and the UH administrative leadership: The University of Hawai’i Board of Regents Reference Guide and the BOR bylaws, policies and procedures. All are easily accessible on the UH website.

The college self evaluation reports did not address the independence of the BOR as required by the Standard, that is, whether the BOR acts as a whole once a decision is reached or the manner in which the BOR advocates and defends the system as a whole. The expectation that the BOR is to act as a whole is clearly
stated in Section II.A.7 of the University of Hawai‘i Board of Regents Reference Guide. The team found evidence through interviews and minutes that the board does, in fact, meet this requirement. The BOR is protective of the UHCC as demonstrated in the formation of the BOR Committee on Community Colleges and its focus on the success of the UHCC. As stated in the BOR bylaws, the functions of the Committee on Community Colleges are the following:

- review proposals relative to policies pertaining to community colleges and make recommendations to the full board;
- review and evaluate the academic and vocational aims, objectives and activities of the community colleges;
- review, study and make recommendations to the board relative to the State Plan for Vocational Education; and
- review, study and make recommendations to the board relative to the evaluation report of the State Advisory Council on Vocational Education.

Further, the commitment of the BOR to the success of all students, especially those of Hawaiian descent, is seen as well in its advocacy and support of the Innovation Fund and the addition of the emphasis on incorporating student achievement metrics.

The BOR is responsible for establishing policies that assure the quality and effectiveness of student learning and services as provided by state law. The BOR establishes policies consistent with the mission of the UHCC as evidenced by the adoption of the UHCC System Strategic Plan (2002) and the updated Appendices A and B (2008). Agendas and minutes of BOR meetings clearly indicate that the regents have ultimate responsibility for education, legal, and financial matters for the UH and the UHCC. The BOR works directly with the State Legislature; the latter determines the appropriation to the UH once the BOR submits its budget. Community college allocations are determined in a process that is overseen by the VPCC. Meeting minutes documenting the fulfillment of these roles and responsibilities are available online. The BOR bylaws and policies clearly delineate membership and organization and BOR operating procedures. The size, duties, and responsibilities of the BOR are contained in the University of Hawai‘i Board of Regents Reference Guide. With 15 members, the current BOR reflects the membership, organization and structure as detailed in its policy (IV.B.1.a-d).

There is evidence that the UHCC acts in a manner consistent with its policies and bylaws for the most part and that there is a process for updating policies. Part of this process is “policy conversion” which is detailed in the UHCC Policy Conversion Analysis chart, dated October 15, 2008. No update to this chart was provided, although interviews indicated that general policy review and revision are under way. However, there is no evidence of a regular manner in which this evaluation takes place. There are annual workshops, since 2010, in which “best
practices” in general have been reviewed; however, during interviews with the VPCC and staff, there was no articulation of a mechanism to provide for and assure a regular, consistent means of reviewing and revising as appropriate BOR policies. For example, the SET discovered that the UHCC does not have a policy addressing the Commission’s requirement in its Policy on Institutional Integrity and Ethics (June 2011), Section 7, for a complaint policy “regarding questionable accounting practices, operational activity which is a violation of applicable law, rules and regulations, or questionable activities which may indicate potential fraud, waste and/or abuse.” Conducting a regular review of policies would serve to prevent such oversights (IV.B.1.e).

The BOR has a board development program, as witnessed by the SET in attendance at the October 18, 2012, board meeting. Staggered terms of office are codified and followed. The BOR Policy Sections 2-4 detail the BOR self evaluation process. However, the team found in meeting with BOR members that not all members were aware of the self evaluation process. Policy Sections 2-4 dictate a self evaluation workshop every two years which must be announced at least three months in advance and must be dedicated solely to reviewing the work of the BOR. BOR agendas and minutes indicate a self evaluation workshop was held July 2008, but not in 2010. Additionally, explicit actions as an outcome of the workshop must be provided to all BOR members in writing within a reasonable time following the workshop (IV.B.1.f-g).

Regarding the Commission’s requirement that the governing board have and adhere to a code of ethics, the BOR is bound by Chapter 84-31 of the Hawai’i Revised Statutes: Ethics Guide for Elected Officials, Employees, Members of Boards and Commissions. The statute contains a provision for dealing with violations of the code. The BOR participates in accreditation training and is well informed about UHCC issues involving same. The BOR participated in an accreditation training session facilitated by the ACCJC President on April 1, 2010. The BOR Committee on Community Colleges reviewed the 2012 self evaluation reports for each of the six community colleges, and the full board approved the reports on July 19, 2012, according to the minutes from that meeting (IV.B.1.h-i).

The BOR Policy Chapter 2, Section 2, provides a detailed description of the duties of the president as well as the method of evaluation which is conducted annually. BOR agendas indicate that the president’s annual goal review takes place each January. BOR Policy, Sections 9-12, delineates the process for the evaluation of managers at the executive or managerial level which includes the VPCC and the community college chancellors. Interviews indicated that these administrators are evaluated annually. The BOR participates in the hiring and evaluation of the UH president and delegates operational authority to the system
president for the hiring and evaluation of the VPCC. The system president and the VPCC hire and evaluate the six community college chancellors (IV.B.1.j).

B.3: Multi-college Systems

Findings and Evidence

The UHCC Campus-System Function Map was developed in 2006 and most recently revised in January of 2012. The map distinguishes the locus of responsibility of functions between each UHCC campus, the UHCC, the UH, the BOR, and the state. The UHCC Office is working to update and revise policies. This is an ongoing process with no specifically defined cycle. The last “conversion” table is dated 2008. There is no document that gives an update on the status of revised, new, or converted policies. It is reported that a significant revision process began in 2011 which, in part, resulted in an update in January 2012 of the functional map (IV.B.3.a.g).

The UHCC provides services, fair distribution of resources, and effectively controls its own expenditures. The VPCC ensures implementation and administration of BOR policies by the community college chancellors at their respective colleges and serves as a liaison to and among the colleges. The VPCC has been particularly effective in making the reorganization of 2005 work for the UHCC, in particular, and the UH in general. Colleges report that they are represented, and evidence from meeting agendas and minutes of the BOR corroborates this (IV.B.3.b-c).

The budget is developed for the UHCC as a whole following state statute and is then coordinated by the UHCC Office. The VPCC, in consultation with the Council of Community College Chancellors, differentially allocates funds among the six community colleges in accordance with strategic goals of each college (IV.B.3.d).

An action taken by the BOR on June 21, 2005, established the classification of the VPCC in which the position was described as providing “executive leadership work in directing the overall community college system and its affairs.” The document delegates supervisory responsibility of the chancellors of the community colleges to the position as well. The University of Hawai’i Board of Regents Reference Guide states that coordination of the community colleges is managed by designated associate vice chancellors under the direction of the VPCC. Stated further is that the chancellor at each campus serves as the CEO and vice chancellors and other administrators have the responsibility of administering various programs and services at each college. The VPCC assures that the UHCC chancellors have full authority and responsibility to implement and administer BOR policies at their colleges, with the chancellors reporting that this delegation
is, in fact, working in practice. Additionally, the VPCC visits each college twice per year to discuss UHCC goals, individual college performance and to provide a comparison of the six colleges. Faculty and staff are invited to engage in dialogue with the VPCC. These visits are well received at the colleges, with faculty and staff reporting that they feel they are receiving necessary information from a system level as well as being heard by the VPCC (IV.B.3.e).

The UHCC has begun to regularly conduct a survey of leadership (chancellors, vice chancellors, faculty senate chairs, and student leaders— the members of the SPC). This survey was conducted in 2009 and in 2011 with plans to continue to administer it every other year. Titled the “Community College Inventory Survey,” the results of the survey have been made public and are used by the SPC to evaluate strategic planning. This process is not codified in a formal manner but seems to be proceeding as described. This survey is the primary means by which the UHCC seeks to meet the regular evaluation and communication of evaluation results of role delineation and governance (IV.B.3.f).

Conclusion

The evidence indicates that the UHCC largely meets the Standard and functions effectively and appropriately, particularly given the fact that this is not just a multi-college system, but rather an integrated system of higher education. However, two areas require improvement if UHCC is to meet the Standard.

The UHCC partially meets Standard IV.B.

Recommendation

UH Recommendation 5: Board and Administrative Organization

In order to meet the Standards, it is recommended that the UH BOR adopt a regular evaluation schedule of its policies and practices and revise them as necessary. In addition, the UH BOR must conduct its self evaluation as defined in its policy and as required by ACCJC Standards (Standards IV.B.1.e, IV.B.1.g).