Introduction: History, Demographics and Organization

History of the Institution

In 2010, Honolulu Community College celebrated its 90th year anniversary as a comprehensive community college serving the urban Honolulu area and surrounding districts. The origins of Honolulu Community College date to 1920, when the Territorial Trade School was established in Pālama. Subsequently, the school became part of McKinley High School and was later reestablished as Honolulu Vocational School. In 1955, it was renamed Honolulu Technical School, and in 1965, it became part of the University of Hawaii (UH) as a result of the Community College Act of 1964. The legislation transferred technical schools from the Department of Education and provided for a system of comprehensive community colleges in the State of Hawaii. In 1966, the UH Board of Regents approved the name “Honolulu Community College” and authorized the institution to grant Associate in Arts and Associate in Science degrees. The focus of the College’s Career and Technical Education (CTE) programs is to prepare students for the workforce on the island of Oahu and in the State; a number of the College’s programs are not available in other areas of the State. The Associate in Arts, (Liberal Arts) program prepares students for transfer to baccalaureate programs, as well as providing general education courses for CTE program degrees. Honolulu Community College is one of seven colleges in the UH Community College system. The 1967 Apprenticeship Act made UH community colleges responsible for apprenticeship related training. The College became and remains the principal provider for such training on Oahu.

Between 1966 and 1976, the College experienced very rapid growth and evolved into a fully comprehensive community college. The UH community colleges were later authorized to expand degree and certificate offerings. Over the years, facilities have been modernized, and new buildings and nonadjacent land have been added to the campus. A highly advanced non-credit program was established in 2000 as an integrated part of the campus. The Pacific Center for Advanced Technology and Training has served various stakeholders in the delivery and ongoing education of various technology training. The College underwent another surge in credit enrollments between 2009 and 2011 due largely to the economic downturn of the state.

As a result of the College’s growth and focus, the campus underwent a major reorganization in 2011-2012. The results of these changes will allow the campus to work more efficiently and effectively serving the students, faculty and staff. In the ninety years of history, the college has evolved from a completely trade school focus to a complex institution with many layers of educational offerings, services and sources of funding. While CTE programs and advanced technology remain distinguishing features, the College is equally proud of its solid Liberal Arts program and faculty.
Located near downtown Honolulu with additional sites for aeronautics, commercial aviation, marine, automotive, and heavy equipment programs, the College offers liberal arts courses for students preparing to transfer to baccalaureate institutions, degree and certification programs in career and technical education, developmental instruction focused on basic skills, and a variety of non-credit courses and activities. It serves the Pacific region as the primary technical training center in areas such as transportation, information technology, education, communication and construction.

Enrollment at the College has held steady over the last five years. As displayed in Figure 1, the largest growth was seen in 2009 and 2010 when the College hit an all time high over the last 10 years with 4,725 students in Fall 2010. This growth was largely attributed to the growth of the unemployment rate and more residents seeking to return to school and focus on their education and skill development/training. Over the last ten years, the lowest enrollment was seen in 2007 at 4,027 students. The College is engaged in many student success initiatives which may have also contributed to the growth in enrollment, such as Achieving the Dream and Complete College America.

The College closely monitors the “going rate” of students transitioning directly from high school into a community college the following fall semester. As displayed in Table 1, the community colleges as a system have a going rate similar to that of the national average (26.4% and 26.7% respectively). Honolulu Community College, however, has a much
lower rate at 3.5% that has held steady between 3 and 4 percent over the past 6 years. The Department of Education’s public high schools located in the Honolulu district have the highest going rate to Honolulu Community College (at 7.7% in fall 2010) followed by the Central district (5.4%), Leeward district (4.8%) and Windward district (4.3%), as shown in Table 2.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>High School District by Public/Private Classification</th>
<th>2006</th>
<th>2007</th>
<th>2008</th>
<th>2009</th>
<th>2010</th>
<th>2011</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hawai‘i Public Schools</td>
<td>384</td>
<td>413</td>
<td>488</td>
<td>549</td>
<td>440</td>
<td>432</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O‘ahu</td>
<td>356</td>
<td>392</td>
<td>464</td>
<td>521</td>
<td>420</td>
<td>408</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Honolulu district</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>172</td>
<td>209</td>
<td>254</td>
<td>153</td>
<td>147</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central district</td>
<td>131</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>137</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>128</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leeward district</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Windward district</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neighbor Islands</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hawai‘i</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maui County</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kaua‘i</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hawai‘i Private Schools</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O‘ahu</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hawai‘i</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maui County</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kaua‘i</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2: Number and Going Rate of Hawai‘i High School Graduates Entering Honolulu Community College by Public/Private Classification and District, Fall 2006 to Fall 2011

Source: MAPS High School Background of First-Time Students, University of Hawaii, Fall 2011 & Fall 2010; Table 6E

The College is focused on improving this going rate through strong outreach efforts at the local high schools and through participation in activities such as the Jump Start program,
which enrolls high school seniors into CTE programs during their senior year of high school. Under this program, at the time they earn their high school diploma they have also completed one year of college credit (or a minimum of 24 credits).

The Education Goals as reported by First-Time Freshmen in Table 3 range from wanting to pursue an associate’s degree (152 students or 63% of respondents) to taking courses to transfer (46 or 19%) to another college and there is some interest in pursuing a bachelor’s degree (8 or 3%). While the data collected only represent about 33 percent of all first-time freshmen enrolled in fall 2011, the data in Table 3 provide the College with some interesting information that indicate what services are needed by this group of students.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Education Goals1 as Reported by First-Time Freshmen</th>
<th>Fall Semester</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total responses2:</td>
<td>143</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Earn a certificate</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Earn an associate degree</td>
<td>96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Earn a bachelor's degree (Maui CC ABIT)</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Take courses to transfer to another college</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Take courses, but not toward a degree</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not sure (I am not sure any of the above statements apply to me)</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of total First-Time Freshmen</td>
<td>18.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3: Education Goals of First-Time Freshmen, Fall 2008 to Fall 2011

1 Data collection on Education Goals began in 2008
2 Unduplicated responses of First-Time Freshmen

Source: IRO_BASE (2008-8 to 2011-8 CENSUS) and EDUCATION_GOALS_UH (extracted on 5/14/12)

A snapshot of the College’s 2010 Fall Enrollment data shows the largest full-time enrollment by age group falls within the 19-21 year-old group (other than recent high school graduates) and the largest part-time enrollment falls within the 25-49 year-old group (Figure 2). The enrollment data in Table 4 also shows that of the 4,725 students enrolled in the Fall 2010 semester 2,010 were female and 2,667 were male; less than 25% of these students received Pell financial aid assistance.

As shown in Table 5, international students continue to remain a small population at the College with only 68 enrolled during the Fall 2011 semester, representing only 1.5 percent of the student population. Of the 68 enrollments, the largest group (41 or 60.1%) reported being from Asia with a majority from East Asia. General enrollment projections into the out-years show a steady rise in the next few years with an anticipated growth totaling 5,102 students by 2016 (Figure 3).
Figure 2: Full-Time & Part-Time Enrollment Distribution by Age

**Fall 2010 FT-PT Enrollment Distribution**

![Graph showing enrollment distribution by age and study mode](image)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age Group</th>
<th>Full-Time</th>
<th>Part-Time</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Recent High School Graduates</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other&lt; 22 Year Olds</td>
<td>800</td>
<td>600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22-24</td>
<td>400</td>
<td>500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25-49</td>
<td>1200</td>
<td>1200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&gt;49</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**SOURCE:** IRO_BASE (2010-8, Census freeze)

Table 4: Fall 2010 Enrollment by Gender, Pell Status, and On-Line Course Taking

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Fall 2010</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>4,725</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Gender</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>2,010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>43%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>2,667</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>56%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Reported</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Socio Economic (Pell)</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Received Pell</td>
<td>1,075</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>23%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Did not receive Pell</td>
<td>3,650</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>77%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Distance Completely On-Line Courses (DCO)</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Took No DCO</td>
<td>3,963</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>84%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Took 1 or More DCO</td>
<td>762</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**SOURCE:** ODS IRO_BASE, IRO_REGS_UH (2010-8, Census freeze), MTT_ACCOUNT_DETAIL
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Nation of Citizenship Total¹:</th>
<th>2006</th>
<th>2007</th>
<th>2008</th>
<th>2009</th>
<th>2010</th>
<th>2011</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Americas</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central America &amp; Caribbean</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North America</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South America</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asia</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central Asia</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Asia</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southeast Asia</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Australia &amp; New Zealand</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Europe</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eastern Europe</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Western Europe</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle East</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oceania</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Data</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5: Honolulu Community College International Student Enrollment, Fall 2006 to Fall 2011

¹ International students identified by citizenship type and location is identified by nation of citizenship
² Enrollment data as reported at census

SOURCE: IRO_BASE (2006-8 to 2011-8, census freeze) where citizenship type = N

---

**Honolulu Community College**

**Projected Enrollment: 2011 to 2016**
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Figure 3: Honolulu Community College Projected Enrollment, 2011 – 2016

Source: MAPS Headcount Enrollment Projections, UH Community Colleges Fall 2011 to Fall 2016, Table 3 (Headcount Enrollment by Campus and Registration Status) and Table B1 (Headcount Enrollment of Credit Students by Registration Status)
As displayed in Table 6, the College’s Fall 2010 student population is ethnically diverse with nearly 26 percent Hawaiian/Part-Hawaiian, almost 20 percent Filipino, nearly 11 percent Mixed ethnicity, 10 percent Japanese/Okinawan, nearly 10 percent Caucasian and almost 10 percent for all other Asian groups combined.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ethnicity and Gender</th>
<th>Fall 2010</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>All Faculty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>161</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian and Pacific Islander</td>
<td>93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chinese</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Filipino</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indian Subcontinent</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Japanese/Okinawan</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Korean</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laotian</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thai</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vietnamese</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Asian</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mixed Asian</td>
<td>318</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hawaiian and Pacific Islander</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guamanian/Chamorro</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hawaiian/Part Hawaiian</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Micronesian</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Samoan</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tongan</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Pacific Islander</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mixed Pacific Islander</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mixed Asian Pacific Islander</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Ethnic Groups</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>African American</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caucasian</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td>72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mixed</td>
<td>512</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Response</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 6: Ethnicity and Gender Distribution – HCC Faculty and Student Population, Fall 2010

Source: 2010 DIAD, Table 4 (faculty data); ODS IRO_BASE (student data)
While the faculty is also ethnically diverse, there is an overrepresentation of Caucasians (by about 28 percentage points) and Japanese (by about 18 percentage points), and an underrepresentation of Hawaiian/Part-Hawaiians (by 16 percentage points), Filipinos (by almost 15 percentage points), and other Asians (by nearly 6 percentage points) when compared to the ethnicity of the student population (see Figure 4). However, as Figure 5 illustrates, the gender diversity of the student population closely mirrors that of the faculty.

Figure 4: Ethnicity of HCC Faculty and HCC Student Population, Fall 2010

Figure 5: Gender of HCC Faculty and HCC Student Population, Fall 2010
The College has worked very hard through the Achieving the Dream (AtD) initiative and has progressed on many fronts. A major focus of AtD was increasing the total amount of financial aid awarded to students. As shown in Figure 6, the College has increased total aid awarded to the AtD cohort students in their first year of enrollment from $671,374 in 2004-05 to $1,414,106 awarded in 2010-11. Other student success strategies that have been a major focus are dealing with students that are underprepared entering the college.

![Achieving The Dream Total Financial Aid Distributed in First Year of Cohort Enrollment](image.png)

Figure 6: Achieving The Dream Cohort First-Year Students Financial Aid Distribution

Source: ODS, OVPCC_ATD_STUDENT, MRT_AWARD_BY_PERSON

In line with the community college rates overall, Table 7 shows that over 68% of students entering the College need one or more levels of remediation in math and 56% of students entering place into one or more level of remediation in reading and/or writing from the Fall 2010 ATD cohort. This is a decrease from the Fall 2006 ATD cohort where almost 89 percent of students needed remedial math and 74 percent needed remedial reading/writing.
| ATD cohort\(^1\) year | Total Number in Cohort | Total Number Took Placement Exam | | | College Level Placement | Developmental Placement\(^2\) | | | | No. | % of Students Taking Placement Exam | % of ATD Cohort | No. | % of Students Taking Placement Exam | % of ATD Cohort |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 2006 | 1,027 | 732 | 81 | 11.1 | 7.9 | 651 | 88.9 | 63.4 |
| 2007 | 873 | 665 | 199 | 29.9 | 22.8 | 466 | 70.1 | 53.4 |
| 2008 | 925 | 727 | 116 | 16.0 | 12.5 | 611 | 84.0 | 66.1 |
| 2009 | 1,048 | 820 | 257 | 31.3 | 24.5 | 563 | 68.7 | 53.7 |
| 2010 | 984 | 785 | 249 | 31.7 | 25.3 | 536 | 68.3 | 54.5 |

| ATD cohort\(^1\) year | Total Number in Cohort | Total Number Took Placement Exam | | | College level placement | Developmental placement\(^2\) | | | | No. | % of Students Taking Placement Exam | % of ATD Cohort | No. | % of Students Taking Placement Exam | % of ATD Cohort |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 2006 | 1,027 | 683 | 175 | 25.6 | 17.0 | 508 | 74.4 | 49.5 |
| 2007 | 873 | 636 | 158 | 24.8 | 18.1 | 478 | 75.2 | 54.8 |
| 2008 | 925 | 728 | 229 | 31.5 | 24.8 | 499 | 68.5 | 53.9 |
| 2009 | 1,048 | 792 | 255 | 32.2 | 24.3 | 537 | 67.8 | 51.2 |
| 2010 | 984 | 798 | 345 | 43.2 | 35.1 | 453 | 56.8 | 46.0 |

| ATD cohort\(^1\) year | Total Number in Cohort | Total Number Took Placement Exam | | | College level placement | Developmental placement\(^2\) | | | | No. | % of Students Taking Placement Exam | % of ATD Cohort | No. | % of Students Taking Placement Exam | % of ATD Cohort |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 2006 | 1,027 | 688 | 344 | 50.0 | 33.5 | 344 | 50.0 | 33.5 |
| 2007 | 873 | 638 | 324 | 50.8 | 37.1 | 314 | 49.2 | 36.0 |
| 2008 | 925 | 723 | 383 | 53.0 | 41.4 | 340 | 47.0 | 36.8 |
| 2009 | 1,048 | 420 | 420 | 100.0 | 40.1 | 0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| 2010 | 984 | 449 | 449 | 100.0 | 45.6 | 0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |

Table 7: Compass Placement in Mathematics, Writing, and Reading, ATD Cohorts 2006 – 2010

\(^1\) ATD cohort is comprised of students who are new, first-time, and degree-seeking in fall semester

\(^2\) Placement in 1 or more levels below college level

Source: ODS, OVPCC_ATD_GENERAL; cohort years 2006-2010.
Data displayed in Table 8 from recent graduates and/or former students reveal that 75% of respondents reported working while attending college, 45% worked full-time and 29% worked part-time. Seventy percent of those working indicated that their job is related (closely or indirectly related) to their educational and training area of study at the College and 86% of those students claim the education and training they received helped prepare them for their position, with nearly 33 percent reporting that they were very well prepared by the College.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Survey of Former Students¹</th>
<th>2008</th>
<th>2009</th>
<th>2010</th>
<th>2011</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>What is your current employment status?</td>
<td>No.</td>
<td>V%</td>
<td>No.</td>
<td>V%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total respondents²</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employed</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>63.5</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>81.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employed Full-time</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>31.7</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>51.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employed Part-time</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>31.7</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>30.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unemployed</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>27.0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unemployed by choice</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>12.7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unemployed seeking work</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>14.3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Full-time homemaker/caregiver</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blank</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is your job related to the education and training you received at Honolulu CC?</td>
<td>No.</td>
<td>V%</td>
<td>No.</td>
<td>V%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total respondents indicating they were employed</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Related</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>62.5</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>77.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Closely related</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>52.5</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>55.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indirectly related</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>22.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not related at all</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>37.5</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>20.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blank</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How well did the education and training you received (at HCC) prepare you for your current job?</td>
<td>No.</td>
<td>V%</td>
<td>No.</td>
<td>V%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total respondents indicating they were employed</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prepared (very well, well, or adequately)</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>95.0</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>87.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very well prepared</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>22.5</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>20.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Well prepared</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>42.5</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>20.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adequately prepared</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>30.0</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>47.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poorly prepared</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blank</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How did you find this job?</td>
<td>No.</td>
<td>V%</td>
<td>No.</td>
<td>V%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total respondents indicating they were employed</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College Placement Services and Faculty Referrals</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>15.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College Placement Services</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>15.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College Faculty Referral</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other (newspaper, family/friends, employment agency, employment websites, apprenticeship/internship, etc)</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>90.0</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>82.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blank</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 8: Employment Data on Former Students: 2008-2011

¹ Students were surveyed approximately one year after graduating or leaving Honolulu Community College.
² Overall response rates to the survey were the following: 9% for 2008; 7.1% for 2009; 14.6% for 2010; and 10.9% for 2011.

Source: 2008-2011 Survey of Former Students
The overall average persistence rate (all students) for fall to spring (one semester) is 66%. The persistence rate has been steady between 64% and 68% over the past 5 years, with a high of 68% and 67% for AY 2010 and 2011 respectively. The average one year persistence rate (fall to fall) for all students is 45% and has ranged between 44% and 46% over the past 5 years (see Figure 7), holding steady at 46% for the past two academic years.

![Overall Persistence Rate: AY 2007 to AY 2011](image)

Figure 7: Fall to Spring and Fall to Fall Persistence Rates AY 2007 – AY 2011

Source: ODS IRO_BASE, (2006-8 to 2011-8, Census freeze)

As shown in Figure 8, the course retention rate (percentage of students completing the semester without withdrawing) for all students has been remarkably consistent over the five fall semesters between Fall 2006 and Fall 2010, always remaining at 94%-95%. However, the course completion rate (percentage of students completing the semester with a “D” or higher grade) has varied a bit more, dropping from 74% in Fall 2006 to 70% in Fall 2008 before recovering to 75% in Fall 2010.
The total number of degrees/certificates awarded in FY 2011 was 556 (Associate degrees and Certificates of Achievement), an increase of 14.6% from the previous fiscal year (Figure 9). About half (50.7%) of these degrees/certificates were earned by students between the ages of 24 and 49 years old and nearly 46 percent were earned by students 24 years old or younger. The total number of other certificates (Completion, Competence, and Advanced Professional Certificate) awarded in FY 2011 was 35, up from 22 awarded in the previous fiscal year.
**Assessment**

All instructional and non-instructional programs have learning outcomes that drive the evaluation process. For each instructional program, student learning outcomes are listed in the program catalog and on the college website. Learning outcomes for non-instructional programs are also available on the intranet. Program review of all instructional and non-instructional programs serves as the primary means of assessing that learning outcomes are being met. The college, in conjunction with the community college system office, has established online reporting formats and timelines mandating annual assessment and comprehensive reviews to take place over a five-year cycle. Instructional programs are evaluating student achievement of SLOs at the course, department and program levels; support services programs and units are carrying out assessment of student learning and service outcomes. The college has an established set of data indicators that are used consistently amongst the seven community colleges in the system. A committee on program review indicators was established through the system community college office and has representatives from each campus that work to evaluate the data sets and make improvements over the course of each year. Beginning in Fall 2012, the colleges will also be responsible for stating the student learning program outcomes in the common set of data reporting for the program reviews and link the methods of determining that assessment. The college conducts periodic surveys at the institutional level to assess student, faculty, and staff satisfaction with different areas of the College’s functioning, such as technology support and library services. Results of the program reviews help departments identify future needs and resources which can then be placed into the budget request cycle.
The College has moved away from the previous approach of tasking one individual with campus assessment and instead has created a structure that places more responsibility on the administrative deans and directors to ensure assessment has a campus-wide approach. An assessment committee, made up of a cross sectional group representing all divisions of the college, meets on a monthly basis and is primarily tasked with the review of program review assessments. As a recently developed committee, the group has developed its tasks and responsibilities to provide overall assessment guidance to campus constituents. The committee is structured into sub-committees which have specific roles. The first group is tasked with investigating how assessment data is being used across many groups of end-users. The second group is working to provide regularly scheduled workshops, roundtable and panel discussions for the Fall 2012 semester with the goal of helping the majority of faculty and staff on campus to become literate with evaluating program reviews and how those review link to future budget requests. A third group is working on revising the assessment committee charter and recommended membership and organizational changes. The fourth subcommittee will work on the publication of assessment data and a central easy-to-use interface. The goal is to design a comprehensive system for making assessment data available easily and quickly to constituents. The college currently maintains a website on the college intranet that contains all of the assessment committee information as well as links to all the college wide assessment activities, including reports on the regular assessment reports such as the Community College Survey on Student Engagement (CCSSE) and program review reports.

Evaluation of student achievement of learning outcomes is being done in a number of ways: embedded assessment, exit exams, competency checklists, portfolio evaluation and knowledge surveys (pre- and post-tests). Identified assessment strategies are required for all curriculum actions, as well as certification of all General Education courses. Some instructors are carrying out a combination of course assessments – for example, complementing knowledge-survey findings with embedded assessment of student performance on midterm and final exams. Some departments have required that multi-section courses carry out coordinated assessment. Assessment results have led to individual adjustments in treatment of material and improvements in courses, as well as departmental level adjustments in and greater alignment of curricular focus. Departments that have carried out coordinated assessment report productive discussions regarding course content and pedagogical methods and greater alignment of assignments and exams.

**Distance Education and Off-Campus Sites**

The College offers a number of course through distance education. Two degree programs have gone through the substance change process with the accrediting commission as distance education programs. The liberal arts degree and the FIRE program both offer more than 50% of the course requirements via an online environment. The College offers over 70 approved DE courses. They are delivered in three different ways: on-line over the Internet, cable TV, or a combination of cable and online. The College’s cable TV
courses also provide DVD disks through the Library for missed broadcasts, to allow students more flexibility in their schedules.

The campus has recently completed a comprehensive reorganization of the management structures of the campus. As part of this reorganization, a focused Educational Technology department was established. This unit’s focus is to support faculty and students in Distance Education. The unit is made up of two full-time faculty members who have an educational background in educational technology. The department also has two full-time support personnel as graphic designers and other distance education support. The unit serves two populations. Firstly, the group supports the development of distance education courses though one-on-one work with instructors. Secondly, they organize brownbag lunches, Town Hall meetings and other informal gatherings to share best practices and showcase emerging technologies.

The college participates in system-wide committees working on improving system-wide coordination and integration of DE offerings throughout the community colleges, including addressing issues of scheduling, assessment, enrollment and funding. The campus has a designated Distance Learning Coordinator who serves on the UH community colleges Campus Distance Coordinators (CDC) group, which addresses a variety of DE issues. Given the fluidity of student enrollment, a system allowing students to enroll in any community college, the system group is an important recommending body.

Since 2005, the campus uses a formal process to review and approve all DE instructors and DE courses. This committee titled the Distance Education Review Board (DERB) reviews on a monthly basis courses that are being proposed to be offered by Distance Education. Close evaluation of the course syllabi, instructional activities and planned assessment methods are key in having a course approved to be offered by distance. Criteria for approval include evidence that SLO’s mirror in-class versions of the course and that policies and practices are in place to ensure integrity of student work and credits earned.

Twenty-five programs are offered by the College located at different sites. The main campus is on Dillingham Boulevard in the Kalihi-Palama district. In addition, a number of technical programs are located on off-campus sites: Aeronautics Maintenance Technology located at Honolulu International Airport, Commercial Aviation located at the Kalaeloa Airport, Automotive Mechanics Technology and Diesel Mechanics Technology both located near the main campus on Kokea Street, and the Marine Education and Training Center located on waterfront land on Sand Island Road. The College shares space at the Marine Education and Training Center with the Polynesian Voyaging Society which offers cultural learning opportunities for the College’s students. The Polynesian Voyaging Society has lent itself well in the consultation of the College working to develop Voyaging courses and other activities that were previously funded through the most recent Title III grant received by the College.
As a member of the Service Members Opportunity College Associate Degrees program (SOCAD), the College is structured to enable those in the armed services to achieve associate degrees. Delivery sites for SOCAD courses include Hickam Air Force Base, Naval Station Pearl Harbor, and Moanalua Community School for Adults. Off-campus classes are open to those in the military, their dependents, and all Hawaii residents. The academic year includes four ten-week terms. All credits are in semester hours. The College also offers its Associate of Science degree in Applied Trades through a special contract with the Pearl Harbor Naval Shipyard in preparing their future workforce of apprentices. Through this contract, the College offers the courses included in the degree program on the Pearl Harbor Naval Base. This requires logistical management and oversight of the instructors delivering the credit courses. The students utilize their work hours and assignments to provide the needed hands-on training in the specific departments which folds into the co-operative education element of the degree.

Quality assurance in terms of facilities and equipment are covered in the same way programs on campus are evaluated; instructional faculty and staff maintain day-to-day operations, and technical programs have a member with explicit responsibilities for Health and Safety. Maintenance and repair for all facilities, except for those at Pearl Harbor Naval Shipyard, Hickam Air Force Base and Moanalua High School are the responsibility of the Vice Chancellor of Administrative Services (VCAS). Many of the technical programs have support personnel assigned to the program which help evaluate and maintain the facilities. Technical support is provided by the College’s Information Technology department. Oversight of curriculum and program outcomes for classes taught in all of these sites is addressed by existing College policies.

Fiscal Accountability

UH is audited annually by independent auditor Price Waterhouse Coopers, LLP. This audit is an “A-133 Financial and Compliance Audit.” This audit is in compliance with the single audit act and is recognized by our Federal cognizant agency, the US DOE. In accordance with an agreement between the UH community colleges and ACCJC/WASC, College-specific financial statements are to be included with the system-wide consolidated financial statements in these annual audits. Grant funds are administered through the Office of Research Services. The use of these funds is audited and reviewed on a regular basis. The College’s fiscal office complies with UH system fiscal-management practices, utilizing UH oversight when appropriate, and complies with all reporting requirements for Federal grants.
Abstract of the Report

Institutional Commitments

The College is demonstrably committed to providing high quality education by integrating its Mission Statement as a guiding document in its assessment, planning and decision making.

The College has a clear statement asserting the mission and goals of the institution; these are aligned with the mission and goals of the UH community college system and the UH system. The College’s mission and goals are to provide quality educational opportunities and a comprehensive array of programs and to serve as an affordable, flexible, learner-centered, open door institution meeting the post-secondary educational needs of individuals, businesses, and the community. College goals explicitly include, in support of this mission, the need to integrate systematic institutional assessment and measurement of SLOs. The College has also identified a set of core values that underlie campus culture and priorities. The College operates in accordance with Board of Regents policies, which are the bases for administrative and Chancellor’s policies; these policies are consistent with the College’s mission and goals.

The College uses a number of methods to identify student populations and needs, as well as the needs of the community and the State, to better fulfill this institutional mission. Information comes from system demographic data (MAPS, System Dynamic Reporting), ongoing assessment of student needs and performance (e.g., College-created engagement and satisfaction surveys, CCSSE, program and annual review results, Achieving the Dream Cohort success data), data available from the student registration system (MyUH Portal, STAR, Banner), as well as State employment data and national employment reports. This information is shared with the Faculty Senate Executive Committee (FSEC), the Campus Leadership Team (CLT), the Planning Council, and the College community through campus wide communications using email message, townhall meetings, newsletters and blogs.

The College’s mission and goals are directly linked to key College processes, including assessment, planning, prioritization, and improvement activities. There are a number of ways the College has created or strengthened direct link between the College’s Mission and Goals and key College processes and decisions.

Strategic Planning: The College has a standing procedure as identified by the Planning Council’s charter to formally review on an annual basis the College Strategic Plan. The College recently adopted an Integrated Planning, Resource Allocation, and Assessment Policy (HCCP #4.101) in 2012. The purpose of this policy is to establish a planning, resource allocation and assessment process that integrates the various components into a system that assures that academic and facilities planning is consistent with the Board of Regents established mission for the College, that planning takes into consideration the evolving economic, educational, and social needs of the community; that program design and improvement efforts are consistent with priorities and detailed in the currently approved University system and College Strategic Plan; that resources allocation
decisions are consistent with the implementation of the College Strategic Plan and the improvement of established programs and services; and that the outcomes of a regular assessment programs, services inform the planning, budgeting and program design and delivery. The purpose extends to implementing a transparent planning, resource allocation, and assessment process that has established tasks and milestones to ensure systematic participation from among the established college governing bodies as well as program faculty, staff, and administrators; and is able to be completed in time to meet established University system budget making deadlines.

Requests for new positions, additional fiscal resources, equipment needs, technical needs and/or facility needs must be included as a requirement of meeting the strategic planning outcomes, outcomes of program review or health and safety needs. Assessment-based justification narratives, and projection of consequences if the activity is not implemented, must be submitted as part of the funding request.

**Budget Decisions:** Based upon the Integrated Planning, Resource Allocation, and Assessment Policy, prioritization of activities, supported by and based on evidence from ongoing assessment activities directs budget decisions in two ways: guiding the creation of requests for additional funds (biennium and supplemental requests to the State Legislature) and determining ongoing operations budget decisions (i.e., equipment and supply budget). Fiscal planning and budgeting is communicated through the campus five-year budgeting plan which is updated on an annual basis and shared with the campus community.

The College’s fiscal resources are directed towards supporting efforts to fulfill the College’s mission. Fiscal management of the College in maintaining operations, determining reallocations, and in generating and utilizing other sources of funding (e.g., non-credit or grant funds) is carried out with transparency and integrity. To ensure the integrity of resource utilization, the College undergoes audits and complies with all reporting requirements.

**Assessment:** All program, department, and unit mission statements on campus must be in alignment with and clearly linked to the College’s mission and goals. This includes all instructional programs, as well as support services programs and departments. For example, Student Services has developed a mission statement that is in direct alignment with the College’s mission and goals and reflects an emphasis on meeting student learning and service outcomes. Each of the individual units in the Student Services division has developed unit mission statements with direct links to the College’s mission and goals.

Instructional and support services programs have identified the program student learning or service outcomes that must be met for the program to fulfill its mission. The program missions for all instructional programs are included in the College catalog and posted on the College’s web site.
Five-year Program Review reports and Annual Assessment reports, required for all instructional and support service programs, include a requisite narrative explaining of how the program’s mission and outcomes (learning and/or service outcomes) are linked to the College’s mission and goals. Program SLOs or support unit service outcomes are measurable indicators of whether the program’s mission is being accomplished. The future program review process will also require the programs to link their assessment methods to how they determine the SLOs are being met. This process will begin in Fall 2012.

Curriculum processes are directly linked to fulfillment of program and the College’s mission and goals as indicated in the Curriculum Reference Manual. As part of formal review and decisions on curriculum actions, the CPC ensures that recommended changes are aligned with maintaining the integrity of the program’s mission. To enable the CPC to make this determination, all course proposals (including those offered via DE delivery) must indicate course SLOs and methods of assessment. The College’s Mission and Goals Statement was revised in 2012 through an inclusive and participatory process. The College adopted a formal process and timeline for campus-wide review of the mission statement; implementation of the review process is the responsibility of the Planning Council.

**Evaluation, Planning and Improvement**

**Evaluation:** The College has implemented substantial changes in policies and practices around ongoing institutional evaluation, improvement and budget allocation. Evaluation efforts emphasize assessing student achievement of program learning outcomes. Academic, student and institutional support service units are more versed in how to evaluate achievement of learning and service outcomes. Processes are in place to ensure that identified steps needed to improve institutional functions and outcomes are the basis for planning and resource decisions.

The College uses a variety of sources to identify students being served to better meet their educational needs, as well as the needs of the community and state. This effort includes compilation of student demographic data supplied by the UH system, surveys conducted by the College, individual units, and programs, state and national employment data, and fiscal data. The College determines and reviews the institution’s, and program’s missions and goals based on consultation with advisory boards.

The College has established a cycle for assessment activities and resulting reports for systematic review of instructional programs, student support services, and other learning support services. All instructional programs have developed and posted program SLOs, as well as course SLOs for all courses currently taught. Program success in meeting these program and course goals is evaluated through Annual Assessment and cumulative Program Reviews.

All instructional programs are required to produce an Annual Assessment in the Fall of each academic year. Resulting information is used to prioritize equipment, personnel,
and budget decisions made in the Spring to determine activities included in the annual update of the Implementation Plan, which is the document that guides the activities needed to meet the Strategic Plan Outcomes, as well as the budget priorities.

**Planning and Improvement:** There are clearly established links between the College’s mission and goals, program missions (linked to student learning or service outcomes), evaluation of how well these program outcomes are met, and program improvement planning; prioritization and implementation of budget decisions are based on this information.

The College has clearly established processes and an institutional structure that directly links results from ongoing assessment to planning decisions. The College has a flowchart indicating how information is generated from Program Review and further utilized. Needed changes in curriculum are carried out through existing curriculum processes. Activities requiring funding or redirection of resources are included in the annual budget prioritization process.

**Student Learning Outcomes**

The College has continued to work to ensure that student learning and service outcomes are articulated and published, that achievement of these outcomes is measured, and that results are utilized to inform planning and improvement activities. These activities have been undertaken by all instructional programs, as well as by support services at the unit and division level.

All programs and all courses currently being taught have explicit and published student learning outcomes; this includes courses being taught as part of Distance Education, off-campus offerings, developmental education, ESL, and most non-credit program offerings. The CTE programs established program and course learning outcomes in consultation with advisory committees. All curriculum actions and decisions made by the Committee on Programs and Curricula (CPC) require SLOs and identified methods of assessment. DE courses are reviewed to ensure that alternative delivery systems impart the same SLOs as in-class formats.

Program and course SLOs are posted online; program SLOs are also printed in the College Catalog, and course SLOs are included in all course syllabi. The College has also recently drafted institution-level SLOs that will be reviewed by the campus and its governance bodies in Fall 2012.

The College has renewed its efforts to engage faculty in two mapping projects. The first, begun several years ago, makes clear the alignment between course- and program-level SLOs; this enables programs and the College to make explicit the links between student achievement of SLOs, resulting credit earned for course completion, and degrees earned. The second, not yet begun, will clarify the alignment between General Education course SLOs and program SLOs for both Liberal Arts and CTE programs.
Support Services units have identified unit missions and identified learning and service outcomes, as well as assessment at the unit levels. Continuation and expansion of program outcomes will enable the different units to identify areas that need to be improved to fulfill the program and College missions. Other academic, student, and institutional support services programs have established program missions and outcomes that include learning and/or service outcomes.

Course SLOs within a specific degree-granting program are required to be assessed over a five-year period in preparation for the cumulative Program Review. Ongoing assessment results are reported each year in the Annual Assessment, and the College faculty and staff continue to explore different methods of assessment.

Annual Assessments and the five-year cumulative Program Reviews enable faculty and staff to identify areas of potential deficiency in a program’s ability to facilitate student achievement of program and course SLOs; these may include material as well as curricular issues. If curriculum changes are needed, they go through an established multi-level process of review, and clearly stated SLOs and methods of assessment are integral to the evaluation of course or program proposals.

Organization of the Self-Evaluation

After submission of the Focused Midterm Report in Fall 2009, Honolulu Community College began organizing for preparation of its Self Study in Spring 2010. In response to an expressed concern that the 2006 Self Study had not had broad-based participation by members of the administration, a decision was made to proactively engage them in providing collaborative leadership for the Standard teams.

The Vice Chancellor of Academic Affairs (VCAA) and the Accreditation Liaison Officer (ALO) served as overall Co-Chairs of the Self Study. Under the aegis of the Accreditation Oversight Committee (AOC), a general call went out to the campus for volunteers to work on the 2012 Self Study, with substantial response from the campus community across units and programs, including some who had worked on previous Self Studies as well as those new to the endeavor. Respondents were asked to indicate which Standard(s) they wished to work on. Based on responses as well as individual discussions, Co-Chairs were selected for each Standard (or section of a Standard) and committees were formed. The VCAA, ALO, and the Co-Chairs for each Standard section, along with several members who would provide support (e.g., institutional researchers) constituted the Accreditation Steering Committee. In Spring 2010, orientation and various reference materials were provided to committee members and a timeline for the Self Study was developed.

From Fall 2010 through Spring 2012, the Steering Committee met monthly to share progress, and review and discuss issues of common concern. One of the first tasks, at the recommendation of the Chancellor, was to conduct a “stress test”—an early assessment of those issues that should be addressed and if possible resolved prior to the completion of the Self Study. In their subsequent research, team members sought broad participation and input from College constituents. In Fall 2011 and early Spring 2012, a series of
“office hours” was created for key resource people to ensure that they would be available for consultation as needed. In order to keep the College informed about the work being done, the ALO instituted an occasional newsletter that was sent to the campus via email and posted on the internal Intranet site. The College community was also kept informed through other email updates, governance and other committee meetings, and Town Hall meetings. The campus also had opportunities to provide input in response to several surveys that were administered in academic year 2011-2012, and to near-final drafts of the Standard reports posted in Spring 2012. In early Spring 2012, an internal “public relations” campaign was launched to further inform the campus in general about the process of accreditation, the Self Study, and the team visit that would follow in Fall 2012.

**Timeline**

**Spring 2010**

- VCAA and ALO identified as overall Co-Chairs of the Self Study
- Questionnaire distributed to campus for volunteers to work on Self Study
- Standards Co-Chairs and committee members identified
- Standards Co-Chairs and support personnel form Steering Committee
- Orientation and training provided for Steering Committee

**Fall 2010**

- Steering Committee meets monthly
- Steering Committee conducts “stress test”
- Standards committees engage in major period of research and evidence-gathering

**Spring 2011**

- Standards committees continue with research and evidence-gathering
- Steering Committee meets monthly
- First drafts completed in April

**Summer 2011**

- VCAA and ALO review first drafts and prepare comments and questions

**Fall 2011**

- VCAA and ALO meet with individual teams to provide feedback on first drafts
- Standards committees continue to work in response to feedback
- Standards committees begin to post evidence
- Steering Committee meets monthly
• Second drafts completed in November
• VCAA and ALO review second drafts and prepare written comments

Spring 2012

• VCAA and ALO meet with individual Co-Chairs and/or teams to discuss feedback
• Standards committees continue to work on final or near-final drafts
• Comprehensive Faculty/Staff Survey administered
• Steering Committee meets monthly
• Third/final drafts completed in March
• ALO compiles preliminary list of Planning Agenda items
• Working draft prepared for submission to office of the Vice President for Community Colleges and the UH Board of Regents in May

Summer 2012

• Planning Agenda draft sent to Standards Co-Chairs for review
• All links to evidence posted online double-checked
• Final document (bound copies and electronic files) prepared for submission to ACCJC in August
• Campus begins to prepare for team visit in October

Fall 2012

• Final check of evidence online and in print; addendum prepared as needed
• Preparation of team room and other logistics
• Campus welcomes visiting team in October

**Campus Organization**

*Re-organization process and recommendations*

Honolulu Community College’s primary focus is ensuring student success. As part of the college’s mission, “the college is committed to providing the academic and student support to assist students as they progress through their respective courses and programs.” In order to effectively manage the student support services needed to facilitate a student-centered focus the campus undertook a major re-organizational effort beginning in Fall 2010. At the present time the proposed re-organization has been shared with the labor unions associated with the University of Hawaii. As part of any reorganization, the unions are provided a time for consultation with their members. The College administration is expecting the re-organization to be completed and implemented by the start of the Fall 2012 semester.
The purpose of the proposed reorganization is to create a structure that would allow for efficient and effective management and clear alignment of campus resources. The goal is to create a structure to help address the operational issues impacting the overall student performance rates and help meet the strategic outcomes set as campus performance measures. The proposed reorganization will also assist in better communication within and between other units, as described below.

Honolulu Community College held numerous campus-wide reorganizational meetings during the Fall 2010, Spring 2011, Summer 2011 and Fall 2011 semesters. The recommendations that came forth in these meetings have helped shape the proposed reorganization outlined in this document. The major organizational changes include:

**Creation of a Dean of Academic Support position and realignment of resources under the current Academic Support Division:** The new organization structure calls for the dissolution of the Pacific Aerospace Training Center (PATC). The two academic programs, AERO and AVIT, previously housed in PATC, will be moved under the Tech I Division which includes all Transportation and Trades programs. It is proposed that the Dean’s position be reassigned as the Dean of Academic Support position. The responsibilities of this position will include the leadership of the proposed Academic Support Division which includes the Library, the proposed Education Technology coordination, (previous DE support through the EMC), the proposed Student Success division, the proposed Design Center (currently the print shop) and the current Management of Institutional Research (MIR) personnel, excluding the transfer of three technology specialists positions that will be moved into the proposed ITC and Design Center divisions.

**Creation of a Student Success Division:** Major educational issues confronting the college are the growing number of underprepared individuals who enroll, and the relatively small percentage of students who successfully complete the requirements for graduation and/or transfer. After many meetings regarding student success, the campus has worked to best organize itself to ensure students receive the needed support services to be successful in college. In conjunction with the discussions along the lines of how best to aid and support the underprepared student population, a current working group is defining the necessary services to support student success. This division will serve as a coordinating function that will draw on the College Skills Center, student services, English and Math departments, the TRIO program and other student retention activities. As part of a plan to deal with the English and Math success rates on campus, the Chancellor changed the locus of tenure for remedial Math and English faculty from the College Skills Center to the appropriate Math and English departments. The previously named College Skills Center is redefining its role, personnel and major functions as a result. The newly formed Student Success group will include a faculty lead as Division Coordinator to report to the Dean of Academic Support. This Student Success Center will provide tutoring, supplemental instruction, assessment testing, proctoring, and other support services including early alert, mentoring, coaching and retention, as well as coordinate the delivery of appropriate instruction in English and math.
**Consolidation of the Information Technology Personnel, Resources and Responsibilities to support all campus activities:** Under the current structure, Information Technology (IT) personnel, resources and responsibilities are segregated and separated into various divisions which report to several supervisors. This current structure creates an environment which does not allow for consolidated IT efforts which need coordinated and consistent communication and assignment of duties. This proposal calls for bringing together all IT personnel under a Director of Information Technology. The Director of IT will report directly to the Vice-Chancellor of Academic Affairs. Positions supporting Distance Education, previously within the EMC department, will remain in the Academic Support division and will work collaboratively.

**Consolidation of Non-Credit operations under the Director of the Pacific Center for Advanced Technology Training (PCATT) and Continuing Education and Life-Long Learning:** The last re-organization of Honolulu Community College decentralized the non-credit activities, placing them under the responsibility of the designated Dean. This structure does not allow for concentrated efforts as a campus to elevate non-credit activities, as well as taking advantage of non-credit resources such as registration systems, non-credit award systems, fiscal accounts, physical space and human resources. Unfortunately, this organizational approach was not as successful as was hoped. This proposal calls for the reconsolidation of all non-credit activities under one management personnel. The Director of PCATT will leverage and utilize the limited resources available to grow the non-credit programs while focusing on the PCATT activities. The current structure requires the PCATT director to oversee the Information Technology Resources that support the campus. As described in the previous section, this proposal calls for the transfer of the IT management resources, which will be relocated under the responsibility of the Vice-Chancellor of Academic Affairs.

**Establishment of the Native Hawaiian Programs Division within University College:** Under the most recent Title III grant, the college established the currently titled “Native Hawaiian Center.” This center has been instrumental in providing support for students through financial aid counseling, computing center resources, mentoring and peer tutor assistance. A major recommendation proposed through the campus reorganizational meetings was to create a new Division for Native Hawaiian Studies. This proposed Division would allow for the combination of Hawaiian Studies, Voyaging, Hawaiian Language and the student support resources currently delivered by the Native Hawaiian Center.

**Placement of the Music Entertainment and Learning Experience (MELE) on the organizational chart under the Dean of Communications and Services:** The MELE program was born out of a Title III grant in Fall 2007. The program has now grown to over 100 majors and must be institutionalized and placed officially on the organizational chart. Through campus-wide discussions with various constituents and the faculty and lecturers of the program it was decided the best placement of the program would be under the Dean of Communications and Service in the Tech II program.
Creation of two divisions within the Transportation and Trades Division: The Tech I – Transportation and Trades Division is the largest academic division at HCC. The programs are diverse and are physically scattered among the main campus and four other off-campus sites. To provide better management and communication among the programs within this Division, this proposal calls for two sub-divisions within Tech I that would be separated into the Trades programs and the Transportation programs, each having a designated Division Chair. The change to the current structure would increase the Division Chair positions from one to two. This structure will also allow for the alignment of the Construction Academy and apprenticeship faculty and coordinator under the Trades sub-division.

Creation of an Admissions and Records Department reporting to the Dean of Student Services: The current reporting structure defines the Records functions reporting to the Academic Affairs division and the Admissions functions reporting to Student Services. To adequately provide a seamless structure to support student needs, these two offices must work closely together. This is the case within the system at all other campuses having the two offices reporting to the same supervisor.

Alignment of Security Personnel directly under the Vice-Chancellor of Administrative Services: Given the elevated concern of managing the campus’s non-violence workplace policy, it is necessary to align the campuses security office directly with the Vice-Chancellor of Administrative Services, instead of the current structure reporting to operations and maintenance. It is necessary for the point to point communication contact between these two offices, as the administration works to implement the campus non-violence policy and further improves the responsiveness of the new Crisis Management Team (CMT).

The Design Center: Personnel that are responsible for the “print shop” have been traditionally located in the Educational Media Center (EMC). Given the separation of ITC, EMC and Print Shop functions, the employees of the current print shop prefer to name themselves the Design Center. The dynamics needed within the Design Center include moving the current campus webmaster.

Committees

The College has created new committees and an established system of communication to create an institutional culture based on assessment, and to ensure College activities are directed towards facilitating student achievement of learning outcomes and achieving support service outcomes. The College’s governance structure makes it possible for people to have input and be informed regarding important College initiatives, decisions, and directions.

The Faculty Senate Executive Committee remains the principal voice of the faculty and has fulfilled an important leadership role in encouraging the College’s implementation of
methods and processes that promote a culture of student success, assessment and improvement.

The Staff Senate Executive Committee serves as the primary voice of the staff level employees of the College. Their role is also important in encouraging the College’s implementation of methods and processes that promote a culture of student success, assessment and improvement.

The Assessment Committee, recently revisited for charter updates and membership, has the explicit mandate to facilitate and promote assessment activities. The committee helps instructional and support services faculty and staff become conversant with Program Review reporting requirements, identifying and measuring instructional SLOs and service SLOs, and educating the campus community by sharing different assessment methodologies.

The Committee on Programs and Curricula ensures that curriculum is updated and that curriculum changes enable programs to promote student achievement of program SLOs. All curriculum actions submitted to the CPC must include discussion of the SLOs and how these are to be met. All DE courses must undergo specific review by a subcommittee of the CPC to ensure SLOs are met regardless of the delivery method. The General Education Board ensures that all courses certified as meeting the General Education core requirements for the College (including CTE programs as well as transfer to UH Manoa and other campuses in the UH system) explicitly enable students to meet SLOs and measure student achievement of these SLOs.

The Planning Council carries the responsibility of communicating and responding to budget priority requests and decision making regarding planning for ongoing institutional improvement. The duties and responsibilities of the Council ensure that campus decisions are based on fulfillment of the mission, reviewing and updating the Strategic Plan, evaluating program and unit needs for improvement based on assessment findings and (based on all this input and input from other governance committees) identifying budget priorities.

The College has a Faculty Development Committee and a Staff Development Committee that provide necessary faculty and staff development and training opportunities, in particular, in support of assessment and evaluation activities. These committees carry out evaluations to ensure that they are meeting campus needs sufficiently to contribute to program improvement.

**Dialogue**

The College has worked consistently to facilitate broad-based communication on campus, so that members of the campus community feel that they are informed participants in ongoing campus dialogue, perceived as a genuinely two-way process. The College has in place the structures and processes to support ongoing, inclusive and intentional dialogue regarding key college issues, including student readiness and retention, improvement of
services for native Hawaiian students, development of more substantial IT capability, and general improvement of the institution.

There are a number of methods by which all constituent groups on campus are able to be informed and to provide input regarding discussions and decisions on institutional change and growth. These include:

- Email for announcements and committee minutes, and as a forum for providing feedback to committees and campus leaders on specific issues;
- Internet posting and sharing of documents;
- Committee meetings (including cross-committee liaisons as ex officio members);
- Town Hall meetings for the campus at large;
- Department or division meetings;
- Annual campus professional development days (e.g., Excellence in Education day);
- Campus-based or system-based workshops and panels;
- Campus representation on system-wide committees (e.g., governance, articulation).

There have been a number of important issues that the campus has dealt with through participatory discussion by all members of the campus community. Topics on which there was an emphasis on participatory campus-wide discussion include:

- Review and updating of the College Mission;
- Structural reorganization of the College;
- Updating and implementation of IT policy and procedures;
- Review and revision of General Education requirements for CTE programs;
- Drafting and revision of accreditation reports.

The College has made improvements in identifying and codifying the groups that have a structural role in discussion and decision-making on campus. This information is available in updated committee charters and in flowcharts illustrating relationships between committees or governance bodies and sequential relationships in decision-making. These charts also outline the essential steps in decision-making involved in the Program Review, budgeting and strategic planning cycles.

The College also receives critical input from community constituents, including potential employers through advisory committees. Through regularly scheduled meetings, CTE programs engage in dialogue with representatives from their respective fields. Such communication has informed curriculum modifications, program changes, and even the development of new programs. Other groups, such as support services, utilize external feedback in the form of focus groups.

Governance committees are the primary venue for input on institutional decisions. The Faculty Senate Executive Committee (FSEC) represents the faculty and is an important forum for faculty to remain informed about and provide input on issues of direct relevance to faculty. The Staff Senate Executive Committee (SSEC) has been important in providing a comparable venue for staff members to participate in decision-making, as
well as serving as an important conduit for transmitting information to the staff. The Kupu Ka Wai Council (KKW) represents the interests of native Hawaiian faculty, staff and students in helping the college to fulfill those aspects of its Mission and Strategic Plan that focus on improving educational opportunities and resources for native Hawaiians. The Planning Council (PC), which reports directly to the Chancellor, addresses longer-range planning and budgeting issues as well as general campus policy matters; the Campus Leadership Team (CLT) addresses short-term operational issues. Both the PC and CLT include representatives from faculty, staff, administration and students.

Students have a visible role in the ongoing dialogue on campus. The Student Senate President meets regularly with the Dean of Student Services and is an ex officio member of both the FSEC and PC. Members of the student government are also asked to serve as representatives on other major campus committees, including the Committee on Programs and Curricula (CPC.)

An important aspect of meaningful participation in dialogue is having the information necessary to provide informed commentary and to make informed decisions. Members of the College community have access to necessary data and reports. Committee minutes are posted on the campus internal Intranet, as are Annual Assessment and Program Review Reports, documents related to campus budgets and budget requests, and strategic planning tools. Information relevant to more specific topics such as Distance Education of faculty development is also posted online. More recently, the campus has developed a presence in various forms of social media including a campus blog. While such venues for information sharing may not be directly related to institutional decision-making, they do contribute to a more open and multi-faceted climate of communication, and increase the visibility of the campus in general.

**Institutional Integrity**

The College has policies, procedures, and structures in place to ensure the integrity of the College’s functions in its communication with the community, treatment of students, and policies related to administrators, faculty, and staff.

The College communicates truthful and relevant information to the public. This includes the publishing of College’s comprehensive mission and goals, as well as program course SLOs.

The College Catalog is printed and updated annually and is available on the Web. The College has established a process for ongoing review to correct errors and outdated information. The Catalog clearly identifies important College policies related to transfer of credits, academic freedom, student conduct, and grievances. The College has clearly defined policies it follows in other areas such as directly stopping out of a program when a program undergoes substantive curriculum revision or is eliminated. The policies are either included in their entirety in the Catalog, or information is provided indicating where hard copies are located. Expectations of students and consequences of breaching
these standards are made clear in the Catalog, including behavioral expectations under the Student Conduct Code, and explicit expectations regarding student academic honesty and consequences for dishonesty. The College’s employees are made aware of and follow established policies to maintain privacy of student records.

Through Intranet posting of College information, access is ensured for the community at large, students located at different physical locations, or DE students. This includes information regarding academic support, support for distance learning, and available disabilities services. There are also accessible counseling information and increased access to self-advising tools. The College manifestly demonstrates its commitment to diversity in terms of its campus personnel, student body and educational programs and activities.
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CERTIFICATION OF CONTINUED INSTITUTIONAL COMPLIANCE WITH ELIGIBILITY REQUIREMENTS

1. Authority

The University of Hawai`i Board of regents, under the authority of State of Hawai`i Law, Chapter 305, Hawai`i Revised Statutes, is authorized to develop and administer a system of community colleges. In 1966, the Board authorized the College to operate and to award degrees.

2. Mission

The College’s mission is clearly defined, adopted and published. The College’s mission is consistent with the purposes set forth in State law for the UH community college system, and is in alignment with the University of Hawai`i Community College’s Mission Statement (approved by the Board of Regents in 1997). The College’s Mission Statement was reviewed and approved by the Board in 2012.

3. Governing Board

The University of Hawai`i Board of Regents is a fifteen-member body responsible for the quality, integrity and financial stability of all University of Hawaii campuses. The regents are nominated by the Regents Candidate Advisory Councils and are appointed by the governor and confirmed by the legislature. The board formulates policy and exercises control over the university through its executive officer, the university president. The Board has exclusive jurisdiction over the internal structure, management and operation of the university. The number of members and composition of the Board is sufficient for it to fulfill its responsibilities. This ability has been enhanced by the increased number of members on the Board. Based on Hawaii law, the Board has the final responsibility for ensuring that the financial resources of the institution are used to provide sound educational programs.

In accordance with Hawai`i State law, a 2000 constitutional amendment granting greater autonomy to the University of Hawai`i, and as articulated under Board by-laws, the governing board is an independent policy-making body. Its primary duty is to serve the public interest and UH constituent needs, and this purpose directs its activities and decisions. An overview of the background and professional affiliations to the Board members verifies that a majority of the Board members do not have employment, family, ownership or personal financial interest in the institution. Board by-laws, Article X, articulate a clear conflict of interest policy, including disclosure requirements. Board members adhere to this policy. Board member interests do not interfere with the impartiality of governing body members and do not outweigh their primary duty to secure and ensure the academic and fiscal integrity of the institution.

4. Chief Executive Officer
The University of Hawai‘i Board of Regents appoints the Chancellor, who is the chief executive officer of the College. The Chancellor’s full-time responsibility is to the College; this officer has the requisite authority to administer Board policies. The Chancellor has the necessary authority to provide leadership to the College in areas of planning, establishing priorities, managing resources and ensuring the institution’s implementation of statutes, regulations, and policies.

5. Administrative Capacity

Based on the findings of the Standard committees, the College has sufficient staff to provide administrative services necessary for the College to fulfill its mission and purpose. Personnel processes ensure that administrative officers are qualified by education, training, and experience to perform administrative responsibilities.

6. Operational Status

The College is fully operational, offering Fall, Spring, and Summer-session classes designed to meet the varied educational needs of degree-seeking students in CTE and Liberal Arts programs. These programs graduate students receiving certificates and degrees. The College offers classes at several sites and in alternative scheduling options, and it supports an active DE program.

7. Degrees

Programs leading to degrees make up the substantial portion of the College’s educational offerings. The College attracts students to its degree programs due to the diversity of instructional programs offered, and the fact that the College is the only institution in the State to offer many of the unique programs located at Honolulu Community College.

8. Educational Programs

The linking of program missions to the College’s mission and goals reflects the fact that all degree programs offered by the College are in alignment with the mission of the institution. The curriculum and requirements of these programs are based on recognized standards of higher education field(s) of study. Programs review and revise as necessary curriculum and program currency based on evaluation of student work, in consultation with advisory committees and in accordance with required program review and annual assessments. Programs are of sufficient content and length and students receive education at the level of quality and rigor appropriate to the degree offered. These fields of study culminate in identified program SLOs. Degree programs are at least two years in length.

9. Academic Credit

As documented in the College’s Catalog, the College awards academic credits based on criteria that reflect generally accepted practices in degree-granting institutions of higher
education. The awarding of credit is in compliance with clearly stated criteria and processes also published in the College Catalog.

10. Student Learning Achievement

The College has identified—and has published in its Catalog and on the Web—expected SLOs for all instructional programs. The College has adopted processes and timelines to ensure that regular and systematic assessment of these outcomes takes place. Annual Assessment and periodic Program Review reports require programs to demonstrate that students who complete instructional programs achieve these outcomes, regardless of where or how they are delivered.

11. General Education

A review of degree-granting program requirements confirms that the College incorporates into all of its degree programs General Education requirements designed to cultivate a breadth of knowledge and encourage intellectual inquiry. The General Education component for all programs includes demonstrated competence in writing and computational skills, and an introduction to some of the major areas of knowledge. General Education courses, as reviewed and certified by the General Education Board, are required to have comprehensive learning outcomes as well as clearly identified assessment strategies. Degree credit in General Education is consistent with levels of quality and rigor appropriate to higher education.

12. Academic Freedom

The College is committed to creating and maintaining an atmosphere of inquiry and intellectual freedom. Faculty and students are guaranteed the right to examine and test all knowledge appropriate to their discipline or area of study. The College has made this commitment explicit in the form of an Academic Freedom statement included in the College Catalog’s Policies and Procedures.

13. Faculty

The College has a substantial number of qualified faculty members whose full-time responsibility is to the institution. The faculty is sufficient in number and professional training and experience to ensure achievement of the College’s mission and to support all of the institution’s educational programs. The University of Hawai‘i Board of Regents’ Classification Plan of Faculty in the Community Colleges provides a statement of faculty responsibilities as well as the basis on which specific positions are advertised and filled. Expectations of faculty include maintaining currency in their program, and continual professional development in their respective areas of effective instruction. These requirements ensure that faculty are actively involved in the development and review of curriculum, and in the assessment of student learning.

14. Student Services
The College has a strong and multi-faceted Student Services program, which provides appropriate and comprehensive student support services. In addition, the College’s Academic Support units, as well as instruction in developmental English and Mathematics and English as a Second Language, provide necessary and effective support of student learning. The missions of all these instructional and service programs are in alignment with the College’s Mission; their effectiveness is documented with various forms of assessment. The various forms of support for students meet students’ needs and are consistent with the College’s Mission. All of these programs are required to conduct Annual Assessments and complete Program Reviews to ensure continued program effectiveness.

15. Admissions

The College operates based on admission policies that are consistent with its open-door mission. A review of the College Catalog, the information posted on the Internet, and all program specific publications makes clear that admissions policies explicitly and clearly communicate the appropriate qualifications of students for specific programs.

16. Information and Learning Resources

The College has built a robust program of Information Technology services that provides long-term access to information and learning resources necessary to support the College Mission and the missions and SLOs of its programs. This applies to those courses offered in classrooms, as well as courses offered at other sites or via distance education.

17. Financial Resources

The College has the necessary funding base, financial resources, and financial development plans to effectively support student learning programs and services, to improve institutional effectiveness, and to assure financial stability. The College relies primarily on public funding by the State general fund. The College receives additional financial resources through tuition, fees, grants, and contracts. The College adheres to the two-year State budget cycle and budget guidelines and controls of the UH system. In addition to State regulations, in the case of contracts and grants, the College also complies with the rules of the funding organization.

18. Financial Accountability

UH’s consolidated financial statements are prepared in accordance with Government Standards Board principles, which establish standards for external financial reporting for public colleges and universities. The financial audit is part of the A-133 audit required by the federal government (US Department of Education.) Furthermore, the College’s Financial Aid office is audited annually as part of the A-133 audit. The University also reports as a combined balance sheet and income statement for the community colleges as a whole. By virtue of State law, the College is prohibited from accruing, and does not operate under, a deficit.
19. Institutional Planning and Evaluation

The College has created the infrastructure and processes necessary to ensure systematic evaluation of all programs and College functions. Ongoing evaluation and improvement activities have as their focus assessment of SLO’s fulfillment of service outcomes. The College has in place mechanisms for publicizing results of institutional research and assessment. The College has significantly improved methods of integrating assessment, planning and decision-making to increase the effectiveness of institutional structures and processes, promote enhanced student achievement of educational goals, and continually improve student learning. As a result of the integration of assessment activities and governance bodies and processes, the College has in place a system that ensures decisions on resources and strategic activities are based on how best to improve the institution. Evidence for these links are development of a new Strategic Plan, development of the integrated planning and budgeting policy, and minutes of major governance committees.

20. Public Information

The College Catalog is published in hardcopy and on the Web. Review of the College Catalog indicates that the College publishes accurate, current, and necessary information for its constituencies. Information provided includes the College’s address and contact information, the mission and goals statement, and relevant and up-to-date information about course, program, and degree offerings (e.g. program SLOs, program requirements, program length, and other necessary information). The Catalog includes an academic calendar with all crucial deadlines indicated. Under the headings “General Information”, “Student Services”, “Academic Regulations”, “Tuition and Fees”, and “Degree and Certificates”, the Catalog contains all the information outlined in these eligibility criteria. In the case of documents and policies too lengthy for inclusion, the Catalog indicates where this documentation is available.

21. Relations with the Accrediting Commission

The College affirms that the institution strictly and in good faith adheres to the eligibility requirements and accreditation standards and policies of the Commission. The College describes itself in consistent terms; however, at present it does not have any relations with other accrediting agencies for any of its degrees. A review of past correspondence and ACCJC/WASC actions confirms that the College communicates any changes in its accredited status, and readily and immediately discloses information required by the Commission in carrying out its accrediting responsibilities. The College complies with all Commission requests, directives, decisions, and policies, including complete accurate and honest disclosure.
CERTIFICATION OF CONTINUED INSTITUTIONAL COMPLIANCE WITH COMMISSION POLICIES

Honolulu Community College certifies that it is in compliance with the following specific policies of the accrediting commission, as follows:

Policy on Distance Education and Correspondence Education: HCC offers a substantial range of courses delivered online or as cable courses and submitted Substantive Change requests when the FIRE program and the AA degree began to include more than 50% of courses offered through distance education modalities. See Standard IIA, IIB, IIC.

Policy on Institutional Compliance with Title IV: HCC’s Financial Aid office is subject to annual audits as well as other forms of fiscal review that serve to minimize student loan defaults. See Standard IIB (Financial Aid), IIDD.

Policy on Institutional Advertising, Student Recruitment, and Representation of Accredited Status: HCC continues to monitor and update the information provided to both prospective and enrolled students and to the community about all aspects of its programs, including its accredited status. The College catalog is updated annually in print, and information is also kept current online. See Standard I, IIA, IV.

Policy on Award of Credit: HCC adheres to generally accepted norms in higher education in the awarding of credit, understanding that assessment of the meeting of clearly defined SLOs is the primary criterion for determining a student’s eligibility to receive college credit. See Standard IIA.

Policy on Institutional Integrity and Ethics: HCC adheres to a high standard of expectations with regard to institutional integrity that governs both internal and external relations, and has policies in place to ensure academic honesty and integrity, as well as clear policies of remediation and resolution. See Standard I, IV.

Policy on Contractual Relationships with Non-Regionally Accredited Organizations: HCC currently has no such relationships, but would abide by the stated policy, were it to enter into such agreements. Credit courses offered at remote sites (e.g., through the SOCAD program) are reviewed by the same criteria as are courses offered on-campus, and the same standards would apply to non-credit offerings. See Standard IIA.
RESPONSE TO RECOMMENDATIONS

Honolulu Community College submitted its Institutional Self Study in Fall 2006; this submission was followed by a visit from an ACCJC accrediting team. The Accrediting Commission for the Community and Junior Colleges – Western Association for Schools and Colleges (ACCJC – WASC) reaffirmed Honolulu Community College’s accreditation in January 2007. The visiting team identified six (6) major recommendations for the College to address. These recommendations are identified in full in the report that follows.

The College was directed to submit a Progress Report in March 2008, with a visit to follow. For that Progress Report, the college was asked to report on the progress made on three of the six major recommendations (numbers 1, 2, and 5.)

The College submitted the Progress Report in March, and hosted the visiting team in April 2008. The ACCJC accepted the College’s Progress Report in June 2008, and requested the College submit a Focused Midterm Report in Fall 2009. In this Focused Midterm Report, the College was directed to respond to progress made in addressing all six major recommendations, as well as the College’s Planning Agenda items, with particular focus on progress made in response to Recommendation No. 2. The Focused Midterm Report was submitted in October 2009; the ACCJC accepted that report in January 2010.

Recommendation 1: (a) 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. (b) The team encourages the Chancellor and the Planning Council to focus the Council’s agendas on its primary purpose as stated in its Charter, (c) develop a commonly agreed-upon definition of collegiality, and (d) establish specific timelines for accomplishing the self study Planning Agenda.

(a) Governance Committee Charters and Minutes:

The College has fulfilled this recommendation. The four committees identified as participants in campus governance include the Planning Council (PC), the Faculty Senate Executive Committee (FSEC), the Staff Senate Executive Committee (SSEC), and the Kupu Ka Wai Council (KKW.) Committee charters and meeting minutes are posted on the campus internal intranet site for ready access by the College community. Committees are expected to review their charters annually, and revise if and as needed to ensure (1) broad-based and equitable representation of appropriate constituencies and (2) appropriate response to assigned responsibilities. The College continues to work to ensure that staff members in particular have the support needed to participate fully in the SSEC, and as ex officio representatives on other campus committees.

Committee minutes are posted on the College’s internal intranet site; the expectation is that they will be posted in timely fashion (usually right after they are approved by the
committee in question.) It is expected that committee chairs will notify the campus when minutes are posted; in some cases the minutes are sent via e-mail to the campus as well as posted online.

(b) Planning Council Focus:

The College has fulfilled this recommendation. As stated in the Planning Council Charter (last revised in April 2008), the primary responsibilities of this committee are the periodic review of the College Mission and Goals, the coordination of the Strategic Action Plan and Budgeting Process, provision of additional supervision of the accreditation process, coordination of communication with and between campus governance bodies, and the monitoring of processes related to institutional research and effectiveness.

By the time of submission of the College’s Focused Midterm Report, the Planning Council had matured substantially, clarifying its purpose and increasing its effectiveness in meeting its responsibilities by (1) clarification of members’ roles and PC processes; (2) clarification of primary focus on strategic planning activities; (3) improvement of the Annual Budget Implementation Planning Process; and (4) revision/updating of the Strategic Plan. The College now differentiates between its Strategic Plan (a broader narrative plan, now covering the years 2008-2015, that identifies internal and external forces impacting the College, goals and mandates, and broad academic objectives, aligning with both the Community College system and the University of Hawai‘i system as a whole) and its Annual Budget Implementation Plan (specific action steps identified by different campus constituencies as those needed to achieve strategic goals and objectives.) The latter now has a clearly articulated timeline that allows for input of items based on Program Reviews and general operational imperatives (e.g., health and safety.) Items are prioritized by the four major governance committees, with the Planning Council having responsibility for compiling a final recommendation to the Chancellor. The Planning Council has continued to inform and educate the campus community about changes and refinements in the planning and budget implementation process, a process increasingly enhanced by greater awareness on the part of faculty and staff of the annual assessment and Program Review process. Periodic reports from the Vice Chancellor for Administrative Services on current and projected campus budgets have also helped to provide a larger context for resource allocation.

(c) Collegiality:

The College has fulfilled this recommendation. In March 2008, the Planning Council adopted and the Chancellor signed off on a Memorandum of Understanding on the “Collegial Relationship Among Campus Constituencies.” This explicitly states expectations and responsibilities of all parties on campus, specifically administration, faculty, staff, and students, in terms of expected communication, respect, and participation in decision-making processes.

(d) Planning Agenda:
The College has fulfilled this recommendation. The College has in place an effective process and annual cycle for updating the Planning Agenda. The Accreditation Oversight Committee (AOC) is responsible for this yearly update, usually done in the spring and summer. Responsible parties identified in the Planning Agenda report to the AOC regarding actions taken, current status of the recommended action, projected needed action for completion, and any adjustments to the timeline for completion. The AOC then provides an updated Planning Agenda to the campus and responsible parties. The AOC revised the Planning Agenda template to include an indication as to whether the recommended action step is (a) necessary to address a deficiency where the College does not meet or only partially meets an accreditation standard, or (b) intended to improve already adequate College functioning. This differentiation helps the College community better understand priority and urgency in implementing Planning Agenda action items.

**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.

The College has fulfilled this recommendation, but continues to work to broaden the scope of understanding of and participation in the three major components, as follows:

(a) Program Review Process:

The College has implemented changes ensuring Sustainable Continuous Quality Improvement in its implementation of program review reporting, ongoing discussions of how to refine the process, and utilization of program review results to (1) achieve improvements in the institution’s ability to promote student learning, and (2) to provide justification for requests for resource allocations in the College’s Annual Budget Implementation Plan (see above.) Programs (instructional and non-instructional) are expected to complete annual assessments and a comprehensive Program Review every five years. The University of Hawaiʻi’s Community College (UHCC) system office provides data based on a standard set of parameters at the beginning of the academic year in August, with program reports due in December. Those reports, posted for public review, also include narrative commentary on the data, and are subsequently used in the following spring term as part of the budgeting process. The Program Review Process has undergone continuous assessment and refinement, as more faculty and staff become knowledgeable participants in preparing these reports and understanding the role they play in ensuring accountability for all college programs.

(b) Student Learning Outcomes:

There has been significant progress on the part of the College community in the area of identifying programs and course SLOs, assessing those SLOs, and responding to findings
for improvement of student learning. The College has achieved the level of “Proficiency” in its identification and assessment of SLOs, and in the use of this information to improve facilitation of student learning, and is in transition to meet the criteria for “Sustainable Continuous Quality Improvement.” All courses have identified SLOs and these are included on course outlines and syllabi. All programs have identified SLOs and these are included in program information in the college catalogue. The college has recently identified institutional learning outcomes that have been circulated to the campus for dialogue and comment and will be discussed and finalized and early Fall 2012. Work has been done to show the alignment of course-to-program SLOs (e.g., CTE “mapping”) and to strengthen articulation across campuses. The understanding that enhancing student learning and the achievement of identified SLOs is the clear focus of all College activities has been supported by emphases in program review activities, faculty development efforts, and by curriculum review and various certification/re-certification processes that are based on clearly defined SLOs and documented ongoing assessment activities.

(c) Assessment (SLOs, Institutional Effectiveness)

Assessment of SLOs for instructional programs at both course and program levels has taken several forms. An earlier initiative in the CTE programs to map course to program SLOs has been revived and refined. This has resulted in fruitful discussion within programs as well as between programs and advisory boards; as a result of this process, some programs have worked on refining their Program Learning Outcomes, while others have reworked the language and degree of specificity of course SLOs. Due to a recent change in the General Education requirements for CTE programs, additional work will be done to ensure that programs fully meet those requirements as well.

Mapping within the Liberal Arts program is more complicated, since there are many course choices and curricular pathways a student can take to fulfill requirements for the Associate in Arts (A.A.) degree. However, various forms of assessment that are course- or discipline-based, within specific subsets of the General Education requirements for the A.A. ensure that all such requirements are met, regardless of course choice.

Instruments of course-SLO assessment for CTE programs may include portfolios, performance exams, knowledge surveys as well as written examinations. Instruments of course-SLO assessment for Liberal Arts include knowledge surveys, written examinations (which may include embedded items that link to program level SLOs) and portfolios. Many faculty also administer general end-of-semester student evaluations (which may include items that link to general liberal arts program SLOs), and are required to use student evaluations that target specific requirements designated as Focus areas (e.g., Writing-Intensive, Contemporary Ethical Issues, Oral Communication, and Hawaiian, Asian and Pacific Issues.)

Assessment instruments for Student Support services range from in-house surveys of student satisfaction to bi-annual CCSSE reports. Assessment instruments for Academic Support Services also utilize both quantitative and qualitative measures that gauge both
degrees and kinds of use of facilities and services as well as user satisfaction with those offerings.

The College’s senior Administrative team has recently approved a plan for administrative assessment that was developed at the request of the Chancellor by a faculty group. That instrument will be implemented in early Fall 2012.

The College is also engaged in several other campus-wide and system-wide initiatives intended to support and improve student learning, all of which include some form of assessment. These include the following:

- Achieving the Dream (AtD) – a five-year system-wide project to create and evaluate strategies to improve student completion and retention rate;
- Running Start – a program that allows high-school students to take college courses for dual credit;
- Summer Bridge Initiative – a program designed to help first-time and/or persisting eligible students get a head start on their academic career;
- Learning Communities – projects designed to enhance student learning success through team-teaching and clearly-defined cohorts;
- Passport to College – mandatory orientation, advising and placement testing for new students designed to create a better foundation for college-level work.

The College continues to provide support for professional development for faculty and staff in the area of best practices for assessment at both course and program levels. It has also monitored the success of various forms of assessment and is working to develop more effective means of online access to various instruments, which will make data collection and analysis more efficient and effective.

The integration of assessment as standard practice across the campus, in instructional and support service areas, has increased significantly. In general, questions about a component of assessment arise early in the discussion of any new/proposed initiative, so that appropriate measures of success or effectiveness can be developed at the beginning. There is, however, still not universal engagement of faculty and staff in assessment activities, and the degree of involvement may vary significantly from one division or unit to another. In this context, several of the action steps identified in the 2009 Focused Midterm Report are still relevant, as follows:

- 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;
- Implementation of the plan for Administrative Assessment.

A newly reconstituted Assessment Committee has taken the initiative to conduct an audit or inventory of assessment practices across the campus, which will help significantly in making various forms of assessment both more visible and intelligible for the College as a whole.
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.

The College has fulfilled this recommendation, but continues to work to refine or improve its management of distance education in the context of both internal and external factors.

Distance Education (DE) courses at the College are offered by department or programs housed in five instructional units: Communications and Services Programs (Tech I), Trades and Transportation Programs (Tech II), Liberal Arts Program (University College), the Off-Campus Education Program, and the College Skills Center. Distance Education, while not a formal program per se and with no specific budget allocation, depends on the coordinated efforts of instructional faculty, support faculty and staff, and administration, to meet the needs of students state-wide (and beyond) across several degree programs. The College has a dedicated faculty position serving as Distance Learning Coordinator (DLC), who serves as the central contact point and liaison for all units and positions supporting DE in instruction in the areas of teaching faculty, student services, academic support services, IT, production areas, and administration. The DLC also coordinates with other colleges and with a system-level committee as needed.

Distance Education is also guided and assessed by two committees: (1) the Distance Education Advisory Committee (DEAC), a subcommittee of the Faculty Senate Executive Committee, provides a forum for dialogue about effective management and best practices in distance education. Priority issues for this committee, chaired by the DLC, have included assessment measures to ensure that DE courses meet academic standards, including parity with face-to-face offerings, and that appropriate technical support and professional development for faculty is available. The College is aware that this is an area of particular and current concern to our accreditors; (2) the Distance Education Review Board (DERB) is a standing subcommittee of the College’s Committee on Programs and Curricula (CPC) and functions to review and approve all applications for DE course offerings. DERB is also coordinated by the DLC, who organizes smaller subcommittees to review and certify new course proposals in specific disciplines. DE courses must also be re-certified periodically. This process of peer review ensures that all DE courses will have clear and explicit SLOs and an indication of assessment methods to be used.

Assessment of DE courses in terms of their mode of delivery is carried out by means of a survey that students are asked to complete at the end of each semester (in addition to other surveys that might be required.) The results of these surveys are periodically reviewed and discussed by DE providers (faculty and support staff) in order to provide a basis on which to plan for improvements in content, delivery, and provision of support.
services. DE providers are also surveyed periodically to provide another perspective on ways in which DE can be improved.

The College has monitored enrollment data for DE to determine its market share in comparison with other UHCC campuses. This will help the College plan for managed growth of DE. As noted, DE is not a formal program per se, but in many ways functions like one. DEAC intends, for example, that DE be included in the Program Review cycle; further, the College submitted two Substantive Change proposals in the 2008-2009 academic year, when it became evident that both the Fire and Emergency Response Program (FIRE) and the Associate of Arts (A.A.) in Liberal Arts program offered more than 50% of program courses via distance delivery.

The College has in place several methods for communication and sharing among those responsible for providing distance education. Internal communication options include the campus DE list-serve (intended primarily for DE providers) that extends the forum provided by DEAC, a website on the campus internal Intranet (including a link to a comprehensive DE Manual), minutes from the DEAC, and scheduled meetings for providers. External communication is channeled through the College’s public website, with a link to the DE page for students. That page also provides links to other information available at the UHCC- and UH-system levels.

Assessment of DE courses offers a particular challenge in that it is more difficult for instructors to ensure that students will complete the various surveys or other forms of evaluation that may be required. This, along with plagiarism, has been a recurring topic of discussion at the various meetings of DE providers and others. In this context, knowledge surveys have proven to be relatively effective for DE assessment per se as well as comparative assessment of DE vs. face-to-face sections of the same course.

The College utilizes its own resources as well as those available across the UH system to provide faculty and staff development and technical support of distance delivery classes. Technical training and other development opportunities are available on a one-to-one basis as well as in workshops offered by various campus and system sponsors. Ongoing training for UH system faculty members to develop, offer, and maintain online courses via Laulima, the delivery platform for UH online courses, is available at different times in multiple venues. (Laulima is also a significant resource for instructors of DE cable classes, as well as those who teach in conventional classroom settings.)

In terms of technical support, the College is also involved in the production of cable courses, which it has done since 1997 with grant support from the local public access station (‘Olelo.) The College also provides enhanced academic computing support for DE faculty and staff, including more robust hardware and software required for the development and upgrading of online course delivery. The College’s recently developed and instituted IT plan should ensure that DE students and providers continue to receive necessary and sufficient support. A number of the action steps outlined in the 2009 Focused Midterm Report should remain under consideration, but may need to wait for resolution until the IT plan and the plan for campus reorganization are fully implemented.
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.

The College has fulfilled this recommendation with respect to the development of a comprehensive facilities master plan and the acquisition of funding to plan for significant new construction on campus. The campus master plan, supported by legislative funding released in Fall 2009, was presented for extensive campus review in the 2010-2011 academic year, and identifies several phases of campus growth and consolidation, including the construction of the long-awaited Advanced Technology and Training Center (ATTC). While that project has not been allocated CIP funding, planning is now underway, and the project has first priority in the UH system budget. In the meantime, the campus has continued to address its list of Repair and Maintenance (R & M) projects, and a major renovation of one of largest buildings, which houses the college library as well as a large number of faculty offices and classrooms, is underway.

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 fulfilled the recommendation to clearly delineate the roles of the Chancellor and the Vice Chancellor of Academic Affairs (VCAA). The VCAA drafted a chart outlining the responsibilities of these two senior positions based on official job descriptions. The Accreditation Oversight Committee (AOC) provided additional input to clarify differences in responsibility and duties, communication processes, and authority for final decision-making. The resulting matrix is comprehensive and clearly defines the two positions, providing specific actions or examples for further clarification. Based on feedback from the AOC, this matrix was expanded to include comparable profiles for two additional administrative roles: The Vice Chancellor for Financial and Administrative Services (VCAS) and the Executive Assistant to the Chancellor.

With respect to the stability of the administration, the College had made significant progress in stabilizing and securing an effective administrative structure at the time of submission of the Focused Midterm Report, but once again finds itself in transition. The Chancellor, appointed on an interim basis after the retirement of his predecessor, and retained after an unsuccessful search for a permanent replacement, retired at the end of the 2011-2012 academic year. A search for his successor culminated successfully in the appointment of the current VCAA to the position of Chancellor. Currently, all but two of the senior management positions (Chancellor, and Dean of Tech II) are thus vacant or filled on an acting or interim basis: VCAA, VCAS, Dean of Student Services, Dean of Tech I, Dean of University College. Searches for permanent replacements are at various stages of progress, and the positions may be filled on a short-term basis until those searches are successfully completed.
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.

The College has fulfilled this recommendation, substantially expanding opportunities for more inclusive sharing and discussion of ideas related to the College’s vision, goals and activities. Town Hall meetings provide a broad-based forum for discussion of major campus initiatives, including technology, reorganization, accreditation, general education. Notes and/or PowerPoint documents are typically posted for subsequent information and reference. E-mail continues to serve as a primary means of more dynamic dissemination and discussion; various list-serves also focus on specific constituencies as well as the campus as a whole. Use of social media has increased and the campus has developed a newsletter and a blog, in addition to maintaining a presence on Facebook and Twitter. The College’s internal Intranet site, recently updated, continues to serve as the primary repository of many important documents, from committee minutes to long-range planning documents. The College’s public website has also been redesigned to be more user-friendly for both students and the general public. The Executive Assistant to the Chancellor has also served as media liaison and has consistently developed ways to promote College activities and achievements. The College also participates with UHCC system initiatives to provide publicity for the community college system as a whole.
STANDARD I:
INSTITUTIONAL MISSION AND EFFECTIVENESS

Co-Chairs

Kara Kam-Kalani
Instructor, Speech

Fumiko Takasugi
Assistant Professor, Sociology

Committee Members

Linda Buck
Professor, Early Childhood Education

Jeannie Shaw
Assistant Professor,
Pearl Harbor Naval Shipyard Coordinator

Guy Shibayama,
Assistant Professor, Apprenticeship
Standard I: Institutional Mission and Effectiveness

The Institution demonstrates strong commitment to a mission that emphasizes achievement of student learning and to communicating the mission internally and externally. The Institution uses analyses of quantitative and qualitative data in an ongoing systematic cycle of evaluation, integrated planning, implementation, and reevaluation to verify and improve the effectiveness by which the mission is accomplished.

I.A. Mission
The Institution has a Statement of Mission that defines the Institution’s broad educational purposes, its intended student population, and its commitment to achieving student learning.

I.A.1.
The institution establishes student learning programs and services aligned with its purpose, its character, and its student population.

Descriptive Summary

Honolulu Community College (HCC) has a Statement of Mission that defines the Institution’s broad educational purposes, its intended student population, and its commitment to achieving student learning. [Mission Statement]

HCC’s current Mission Statement, now posted on the campus website and available elsewhere, is as follows:

Honolulu Community College serves our community, the city, the state of Hawai`i, and the Pacific region as an affordable, flexible, learning-centered, open-door, comprehensive community college. We meet the post-secondary educational needs of individuals, businesses, and the state by:

- Offering high quality courses and programs in the liberal arts and career and technical fields;
- Maintaining unique educational partnerships with state-registered apprenticeship programs in diverse career fields;
- Supporting our Native Hawaiian community and its language, history, and culture;
- Delivering continuing education and training to meet the demand for a competitive workforce; and
- Providing diverse educational opportunities for personal enrichment.

As a learning-centered, open-door college, Honolulu Community College is committed to providing the academic and student support to assist students as they progress through their respective courses and programs, and to facilitate the important work of our faculty and staff. The college will acknowledge, promote, and maintain a
multicultural environment where gender diversity and other aspects of personal identity are appreciated and respected.

To accomplish this mission, the goals of Honolulu Community College are to:

1. Provide two-year transfer educational programs that offer students the general educational component of the Baccalaureate Degree;
2. Provide two-year, four-year, short-term and apprenticeship occupational-technical curricula for employment, skill-upgrading and career advancement, and transfer to four-year technical programs;
3. Ensure general education competency in communication, problem-solving, ethical deliberation, cultural diversity and global awareness;
4. Provide developmental instruction to build skills necessary to pursue educational objectives;
5. Maintain flexible educational delivery systems to enhance student access by providing affordable education when and where it is needed;
6. Establish a systemic institutional effectiveness program that regularly assesses expected student and program learning outcomes to ensure the highest quality education;
7. Develop activities to increase resources for programs and operations;
8. Provide co-curricular programs and activities to promote student learning and development and to prepare students for leadership roles and responsibilities in a global community;
9. Contribute to the support of the community’s economic and social growth;
10. Maintain a multicultural environment where ethnic and gender diversity is appreciated, respected and promoted; and
11. Provide an opportunity for students to gain an understanding and knowledge of the host culture of Hawai‘i, and the Native Hawaiian language, culture and values.

Honolulu Community College seeks to fulfill its mission by determining the needs of its intended students and community, as well as the business and technical needs of the State of Hawai‘i and the Pacific Rim, using both quantitative and qualitative data. Data sources include reports, studies, and surveys, as well as input derived from a continuous dialogue among all stakeholders.

The College’s intended student population is determined by our purpose of being an affordable, flexible, learning-centered, open-door institution, and by our mission of offering both a comprehensive community college education and serving as the primary technical training center of the Pacific Rim. The College’s intended population is also determined by its unique location in the Kalihi-Kapālama section of the city of Honolulu on the island of O‘ahu in Hawai‘i, and by our specific role in the University of Hawai‘i system. In addition to providing workforce training and development as required by legislative mandate, the College also 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 and eventually transfer to a four-year degree-granting institution.
Our students are enormously diverse. They come from a wide range of cultures and ethnicities. They range from high-school students to senior citizens. Many are the first in their families to attend college. Many are the first in their families to attend college. Honolulu Community College, like many colleges across the nation, is deal with a large student population entering college with insufficient Math and English skills to complete college-level work. Eighty percent of entering students are unprepared for college level Math, while 70 percent are unprepared for college level English. The College identified this issue as its utmost priority in its efforts to promote student success. Data made available by the UH Institutional Research Office on the UH system website provide information on student demographics, full- vs. part-time enrollment, graduation and persistence rates, in addition to other relevant student characteristics. Currently, there are 4,253 students enrolled in credit courses on the HCC campus. Of those students, approximately 60 percent are student who goal is to earn a certificate or degree in Career and Technical Education (CTE) fields, while 40 percent are enrolled in the Liberal Arts program. In terms of ethnicity, the majority of student (approximately 75 percent) are of Asian/Pacific Island descent; Native Hawaiians represent nearly 25 percent of the student population. Approximately 92 percent of students are residents of the state. Basic summary data for Honolulu Community College, including enrollment, student demographics, and course information, are available on the web.

The needs of our students, community, and statewide workforce, as identified in our Mission Statement, provide an essential rationale for the creation, support, and continuous improvement of programs, curricula, courses, and services. The current and future needs of Hawai‘i’s businesses and community members, as well as future employment opportunities for our students, are determined using a variety of sources. The reports and studies utilized include Department of Labor and Industrial Relations forecasting reports [Employment Projections for Industries and Occupations 2008 - 2018] that project the employment growth by industry; UH Community College Graduate and Leavers Survey [Graduate/Leaver Survey - 2006]; and Occupational Surveys done by the Honolulu Community College Career Readiness and Job Placement Center. On the whole, the data gathered by the College strongly indicate that the College’s Mission and goals are appropriately aligned with the needs of our student population.

Relevant data and input derived from all these sources are shared with the College’s Planning Council, summarized in the Chancellor’s monthly report to the Faculty Senate on which he sits as an ex-officio member, published by e-mail and on the web in committee minutes, contained in Chancellor’s presentation at General College meetings in the fall semester, detailed in Chancellor’s Updates to the College online, and explained at town hall meetings. All reports and studies cited are available in print or electronic form.

Student needs are assessed regularly with the biannual administration of the Community College Survey of Student Engagement [2008 CCSSE Institutional Report], the Graduates and Leavers Survey, and the Graduation Survey. The surveys provide meaningful information from current students, soon-to-be alumni, and former students.
The surveys attempt to gauge general satisfaction, student engagement, and any student needs that are unmet by the College. Other quantifiable data such as student retention and success rates, persistence and transfer rates, course completion/success rates are reviewed regularly as part of the UHCC Annual Report of Program Data (ARPD) (Program Reviews) and the annual Strategic Plan updates [Strategic Planning Annual Performance Data]. Students have the opportunity to get involved in a variety of student leadership positions and are able to serve as student representatives on various decision-making bodies. Committees such as the Planning Council (PC), Faculty Senate Executive Committee (FSEC), the Committee on Programs and Curricula (CPC), and the Committee on Student Affairs have student representatives as part of their committee make up [Committee Assignments].

All areas in Student Services focus on identifying and meeting the needs of students. Each area now has a Mission Statement accompanied with Student Learning Outcomes (SLOs), all designed to meet the College’s Mission and goals and constantly improve student learning. Program review processes are firmly in place for Academic, Student, and Institutional Support Services [ASI Program Review Plan], with assessments done on an annual basis [Annual Student Support Program Review].

In addition, faculty and staff engage in this dialogue through a number of forums including participation on committees; email publication and discussion of committee minutes; town meetings on major issues; program, division, department and college meetings; and in a yearly “Excellence in Education day,” which is set aside for all faculty and staff to discuss college-wide concerns. Faculty and staff surveys are also conducted.

To meet its mission, HCC offers twenty-five Career-Technical Education and Liberal Arts programs leading to a certificates or degrees. Faculty and staff in all these areas work closely with Student Services to meet students’ needs, support student learning, aid students in the achievement of personal and professional success, and ensure that the College meets its stated goals. Procedures designed and implemented over the past few years now explicitly require that Program outcomes and course SLOs guide campus decisions and actions, and that these are directed toward meeting these goals. Success is measured utilizing a variety of assessment tools. Assessment data are employed in designing and implementing improvements to maximize student learning.

A number of systemwide academic initiatives were the result of collaborative efforts among the UH-system community colleges and the four-year institutions to facilitate a more unencumbered articulation process for student seeking to transfer from two- to four-year institutions. The automatic admission and reverse transfer procedures were implemented in Spring 2010 to improve degree attainment in the state, and allow the UH campuses to work together to help students achieve their academic goals. The automatic admission procedure grants a graduate from one of the seven community colleges automatic admission to one of the three UH baccalaureate campuses, while waiving the application fee and allowing for priority registration. [Automatic Admission] The reverse transfer procedure identifies students who transfer from one
of the UH system community colleges to one of the three UH baccalaureate campuses before receiving their Associate degree, and allows them to retroactively obtain their two-year degree. [Reverse Transfer] In the even that students do not complete their Bachelor’s degree, they will still have obtained an Associate degree. Both initiatives have encouraged student achievement and success in completing their academic goals. [Auto Admission Report] The Multi-campus Articulation Agreement was put in place to ensure that students complete their Diversification general education requirements. According to this agreement, the UH-Manoa campus pledges to honor the Diversification designation with a particular course that is offered at one of the UH system campuses. [Multicampus Articulation Agreement] A Common Course Numbering initiative is currently being undertaken to eliminate course alpha and numbering discrepancies among the UH baccalaureate and system campuses. All initiatives represent a substantive move toward creating a seamless articulation process to provide better service to students.

**Self Evaluation**

The College meets the standard.

The current mission is meeting the needs of the community, business/industry, and the intended student population. The long-term job outlook indicates that there will be growth in the next ten years in education, construction, and the large trade, transportation, and utilities industry.

Students appear to be satisfied with their experience at HCC based on their responses to specific questions from the Community College Survey of Student Engagement (CCSSE) [2008 CCSSE Institutional Report] on how attending HCC contributed to their knowledge, skills, and personal development.

**Actionable Improvement Plans**

No action is required.

*I.A.2. The Mission Statement is approved by the governing board and published.*

**Descriptive Summary**

The College, led by the Planning Council, actively worked to review and update its Mission Statement beginning in January 2011, although some discussion had taken place during the previous academic year. [Minutes, Planning Council – May 14, 2010] An early draft of a revised Mission was approved by the Planning Council in January 2011, but underwent significant revisions based on input from the Chancellor and others. A new draft was reviewed by the Planning Council and the other major governance bodies, and was formally approved by the Planning Council in November 2011 [Minutes, Planning Council – November 18, 2011] and posted for campus review. The revised Mission
Statement was subsequently approved by the UH Board of Regents at its May 2012 meeting.

The current Mission Statement is published in several college documents including the catalogue, the campus website, the Strategic Plan, the College’s Annual Report, and accreditation reports, and will be incorporated, as needed, into any new documents and publications.

Self Evaluation

The College meets the standard.

The current Mission is published in official college documents directed toward students, prospective students, external constituencies, and the general public. The faculty/staff survey conducted in January/February 2012 indicates they are aware of the Mission and feel that it is appropriate for the college; responses indicate, however, that it could be better or more consistently communicated to the public. [Accreditation Survey-Executive Summary]

Actionable Improvement Plans

While the College meets the standard, it should continue to ensure that the Mission Statement remains a visible part of campus communications.

I.A.3 Using the Institution’s governance and decision-making processes, the Institution reviews its Mission Statement on a regular basis and revises it as necessary.

Descriptive Summary

As documented in the College’s Institutional Self-Study 2006, a Mission Statement was approved in August 2005, by campus leadership bodies (FSEC, SSEC and CLT) after extensive review by all-campus committees, faculty, and staff. The then newly-formed Planning Council was charged with conducting periodic review of the Mission Statement based on Institutional/program assessment and strategic planning goals. The Planning Council passed a resolution adopting a timeline and process for this review. [Strategic Plan Archive 2001-2009] The timeline called for a review every three years, to be synchronized with the Strategic Plan cycle. In 2008, the Planning Council established a Strategic Planning Subcommittee, which was charged with updating the plan, including reviewing the College's Mission Statement and Strategic Goals. In Spring 2010, the Planning Council initiated a Mission review process and reviewed an initial draft that included input from faculty, staff, and Chancellor Rota. [Minutes, Planning Council – May 14, 2010] In Fall 2010, the Council formed a Mission Review Subcommittee, as called for in the Mission Statement Review Process, to complete the revision process. At its meeting on January 14, 2011, the Council approved a Mission Statement draft for circulation to the campus for review and comment. [Minutes, Planning Council – January 14, 2011] At the May 15 Planning Council meeting, the Chancellor announced that
completion of the Mission review process would be moved to Fall 2011, with a goal of approval of the revised Mission by the Board of Regents by January 2012. [Minutes, Planning Council – May 13, 2011] The Chancellor’s revision of the draft Mission Statement was approved by the Planning Council at its meeting in October 2011, and distributed to the Chairs of the Faculty Senate Executive Committee (FSEC), the Staff Senate Executive Committee (SSEC), the Kupu Ka Wai Council (KKW), and the Associated Students of the University of Hawai-HCC (ASUH-HCC)—the other campus governance bodies. Final campus approval of the revised Mission Statement took place, as noted above, in November 2011.

Self Evaluation

The College meets this standard.

The Mission review and revision cycle has again been completed. The procedures laid out by the Mission Statement Review Process document were, in general, followed. Although the Campus Leadership Team (CLT) did not play a formal role in this process during the latest review and revision of the Mission, most CLT members do serve on the Planning Council and/or other governance committees and were thus afforded an opportunity for input. With the distinction clarified between regular and periodic review, and revision only as and if needed, it should be easier for the Planning Council to reaffirm the timetable for Mission review linked to Strategic Planning cycles.

Actionable Improvement Plans

The Planning Council should revisit the Mission Review process and timeline adopted in 2005 and update it to ensure that the process and timeline are institutionalized in the work cycle of the Council and its strategic Planning subcommittee.

I.A.4 The Institution’s Mission is central to institutional planning and decision-making.

Descriptive Summary

The College’s current Mission Statement is embedded in most institutional planning documents. For example, the Strategic Plan and Program Reviews include the Mission Statement. However, the link between the Mission and the goals and strategic outcomes is not explicit. The recent Information Technology Plan, on the other hand, not only references the Mission Statement but also links it specifically to the Information Technology Goals identified in the plan. The updated Strategic Plan (2009) clearly links the goals and outcomes to the UHCC’s System Mission, and the HCC Mission Statement is also incorporated into the College’s 2008-2015 Strategic Plan document. [Strategic Plan 2008-2015]

Self Evaluation
The College meets the standard, but should continue to work to ensure that the connections between Mission and Planning are explicit, and that the current Mission Statement is cited in all relevant contexts.

**Actionable Improvement Plans**

The College should ensure that the Mission remains the focus for planning and decision-making and that the link to the College Mission is made explicit in institutional planning documents and program reviews.

The Planning Council should
- Review the Mission Review Process and update it to reflect current procedures for updating the Strategic Plan and to ensure that it includes all recognized campus governance bodies.
- Communicate clear policies and procedures regarding the Mission review and revision to all stakeholders.
- Monitor full implementation of the policies and procedures to ensure that the Mission is current and integrally linked to institutional planning and decision-making, and that it clearly reflects institutional learning outcomes that are linked to program learning outcomes and other measures of student success.

**I.B. Improving Institutional Effectiveness**

The Institution demonstrates a conscious effort to produce and support student learning, measures that learning, assesses how well learning is occurring, and makes changes to improve student learning. The Institution also organizes its key processes and allocates its effectiveness by providing 1) evidence of the achievement of student learning outcomes, and 2) evidence of Institution and program performance. The Institution uses ongoing and systematic evaluation and planning to refine its key processes and improve student learning.

**I.B.1. The Institution maintains an ongoing, collegial, self-reflective dialogue about the continuous improvement of student learning and institutional processes.**

**Descriptive Summary**

Honolulu Community College engages in a multi-layered, cross-campus, self-reflective dialogue regarding student learning, institutional processes, and the continuous improvement of the College as a whole. Significant dialogue has taken place and continues to occur related to the Mission Statement, institutional outcomes and strategies, accreditation, Student Learning Outcomes (SLOs), the curriculum development process, program review, the budget and planning process, and other aspects of College life that affect student learning.

These discussions occur in many forms, and include the faculty, staff, students, businesses, and the community, as well as other community colleges in the System. The
dialogue includes the presentation of new ideas, discussion of concerns, objections, review of documents, revisions, and specific outcomes. Although some of these forums may not be seen conventionally as a place where dialogue may occur, they do promote discussions, foster a sense of collegiality, and encourage development of new ideas, new procedures, and processes—all in an effort to achieve the College’s Mission and improve student learning.

Education about Assessment: One important part of the process has been to first educate the campus community about the assessment model focusing on student learning, institutional outcomes, and institutional effectiveness. One way that faculty and staff have increased their understanding of student learning and assessment is by attending workshops sponsored by the Faculty Development and Assessment Committees [Faculty Development Committee], Excellence in Education Day, and the General Education Board [General Education Board]. The knowledge gained from these workshops has been used to increase the dialogue across campus about Student Learning Outcomes (SLOs), and to develop course and program SLOs and program review reports. Attendees have had the opportunity to discuss student needs, share ideas, create plans, and write measurable outcomes, all with the goal of increasing Institutional effectiveness. The College’s assessment process addresses Student Learning Outcomes through pre- and post-knowledge surveys, diagnostic testing in the classroom, surveys and other instruments.

Intranet: The College Intranet [Honolulu CC Intranet] continues to be an important source of information for College faculty and administration. It is in part an electronic archive of information on College structure, policy and procedures, committee work, reports, memos, flow charts, and organizational charts. It is continually revised and updated, and postings are quick to go online for College access and review. While this is a one-way type of communication, it is still a good place for Intranet users to find the information needed to participate in dialogue regarding campus issues. Increasingly, the College Intranet site is the primary resource for information and the official posting site for a variety of assessment evidence, from course SLOs to completed Program Reviews.

Social Media: Now that we are past the first decade of the 21st century, we cannot ignore the power of social media in communicating programs and events to faculty, students, and the community at large. The college has a presence on YouTube, Facebook, and Twitter, and has its own website. Currently, the College is launching its own personal website to engage with alumni as well as currently enrolled students.

Email: Email is another form of communication used to facilitate dialogue across all areas of the campus. Many committees use the College email system to announce the posting of minutes, introduce new issues at hand, to ask for campus feedback, and to inform the College of meetings or voting that will be taking place. Committees also send out drafts and then revised versions of reports, surveys, and policy documents so that the College faculty and staff may offer comments and suggestions. Recent examples include the Mission Statement revisions, the accreditation progress report, and the student engagement survey. There is often feedback to these announcements as people respond
with their concerns and suggestions. However, the feedback generally goes directly to the committee, and not to the College at large. This limits the discussion, so the sender or committee knows the College response to the issue, but the College as a whole is sometimes not aware of all the feedback. Since 2011, the minutes have reflected that most of the committees are posting feedback on the Intranet.

**Campus Committees:** The committee structure at Honolulu Community College creates another forum for dialogue regarding SLOs and institutional processes, both within the committees as well as across committees. Several committees are directly concerned with improving student learning at the College, and with developing or institutionalizing processes that will achieve that goal. There are also several committees that regularly discuss the Mission Statement, College goals and strategies, research on student learning and student learning outcomes, program review, and student learning and budget decisions. [Committees]

Cross-committee discussion continues and expands the dialogue process. This is defined as members who are also members of other committees and introduce information from one committee meeting into another committee meeting for the purpose of further discussion of the issue, to spread the information across divisions and to staff and student members, and to garner feedback and new ideas. Most committee members participate or serve on several committees. In fact, the overlapping membership is often mandated and institutionalized to ensure that important issues are discussed from multiple perspectives and given different levels of review. [Org Charts]

Committee meeting minutes are usually posted on the HCC Intranet. Over the last five years, most of the committees have greatly improved their communication with the College at large by consistently and quickly posting their minutes after each meeting. A College-wide email is usually sent to announce the posting of the minutes, to give a summary of the minutes, and to include a direct link to the minutes on the committee webpage. Emails are a source of information as well as an officially recorded document of any dialogue that has taken place. [Committee Minutes]

Among the key campus committees involved in planning, governance, and assessment are the Faculty Senate Executive Committee (FSEC), the Staff Senate Executive Committee (SSEC), Campus Leadership Team (CLT), Committee on Programs and Curricula (CPC), Division Curriculum Committees (DCCs), the General Education Board, and the Planning Council.

**Other Forums:** There are several other forums for dialogue across the College, including department and division meetings. Dialogue regarding student learning, measurable outcomes, program review, and institutional effectiveness are often key agenda items at these meetings. Each division usually holds a meeting at the beginning of each semester and may meet more frequently to deal with division concerns. These division meetings are generally informal in nature, though a specific agenda may be set, and are not always documented with minutes.
**Town Hall Meetings:** Campus-wide meetings provide another forum for open discussion on issues and concerns pertinent to the College. Open to the entire campus community, they offer an opportunity for the broad-based communication of information and for dialogue with a broad spectrum of participation. Town Hall Meeting notes are posted on the campus internal Intranet.

The College has engaged in the dialogue process regarding several key issues related to student learning and institutional processes. These include revising the College Mission Statement, chartering a College Planning Council, writing new Curriculum Proposal Flow Charts and a Curriculum Reference Book, creating the General Education and Articulation Process Reference Book, developing the Strategic Planning/Budget Process, the Program Review Schedule, program review templates, writing new department and course SLOs, and designing assessment tools to measure the SLOs. As of 2011, the Student Learning Outcomes were placed in the HCC catalog for each major. Many of the HCC Program SLOs are in Instructors’ syllabi. Other topics or forums that provide a focus for dialogue include the following:

**Curriculum Reference Manual and Curriculum Proposal Flow Charts:** The Curriculum Reference Manual contains policy and instructions related to curriculum and program development at HCC. It is intended to provide information to anyone involved in the design, modification, or evaluation of programs and curricula. As part of the effort to ensure that all involved understand how the curriculum process proceeds for each type of curriculum action, the CPC also has developed a Curriculum Proposal Flow Chart. [Curriculum Proposal Flow Charts](#). Career and Technical Education (CTE) still has to be added to the Manual and the Flow Chart, particularly in the light of recent revisions to the General Education requirements for the CTE programs.

**Curriculum Central:** In 2004, Curriculum Central was developed at Leeward Community College, and is now being coordinated through the UH system. It is a digital repository for curriculum actions and approvals. Currently, Kapi‘olani (KCC), Maui College, and Windward Community College (WCC) are more advanced in their use of Curriculum Central than HCC. However, HCC is moving along in the process by scanning paper-based documents, a process that is scheduled to be completed in 2012. Once the scanning is completed, it will take another four to six months to enter all the scanned documents into the database. The goal is to have a database with existing hard-copy files as backup. The first testing phase for full implementation is planned for Fall 2013, with some preparatory work done in Spring 2013.

**Honolulu Community College Strategic Planning/Budget Process:** Through extensive dialogue across campus, the College also developed another institutional process called the Strategic Planning/Budget Process, which links student learning and program outcomes together with the College’s planning and budget decisions. The various components were put into a timeline/flow chart that provides the College with a specific timeline and deadlines for assessment, planning, proposals, and decision-making. There are also allotted times in this schedule for Town Meetings and formal College-wide
discussion regarding all these issues. [Strategic Planning; The Strategic Planning Cycle, Program Review, and Budgeting at Honolulu Community College]

Program Review: The Program Review schedule, which includes use of a uniform template and process, the customized review of individual programs, assessment, and program revisions, was developed to guarantee linkages between 1) course, department, and College SLOS and the Mission Statement; 2) course-based Student Learning Outcomes and Program Learning Outcomes; and 3) program planning and budget decision-making. The FSEC discussed and revised the Program Review schedule during 2004-2005, then posted it on the Intranet and sent it to other committees and the College for review, discussion, and feedback. The process of Program Review, which includes both Annual Assessments and a cumulative five-year Program Review, is now fully implemented. [Program Review Report; Program Review]

As an essential part of the Program Review process, the campus has focused on the identification of Student Learning Outcomes (SLOs) beginning at the individual course level and expanding to the program and unit levels. Attention has also been paid to developing consistency with a core group of SLOs, where needed, between institutions in order to facilitate the articulation of courses. There continues to be extensive dialogue regarding SLOs at various levels within the campus community.

All programs have SLOs that are published in the catalog and elsewhere; the mapping of course-level to program level SLOs is underway in all programs. The CPC also approved the decision that all proposals for new courses and the courses applying for recertification would have to include SLOs as well as assessment tools and student evaluations. SLOs for College programs are currently listed on the Intranet [Honolulu CC Intranet], on the HCC Website [Honolulu CC Website], and in the College catalogue [College Catalog].

Self Evaluation

The College meets the standard.

Honolulu Community College has been able to differentiate between the transmission of information (one-way communication) and genuine dialogue in which multiple perspectives may be brought to bear on the issues at hand. Dialogue broadens the base of participation in planning and decision-making and makes more transparent those processes as more members of the campus community, including lecturers and part-time faculty, are informed and engaged.

The College has also been able to utilize dialogue in the context of key issues of concern to the campus. As a result of discussions and assessment activities, changes indicated as necessary have already been implemented at various levels, including courses, and program and institutional operations. Such discussions, while engaging various committees involved in governance and other aspects of campus life, have also created an awareness of the need to coordinate more effectively the work of committees, their areas of responsibility, and their lines of communication.
The College’s conceptual foundation for an assessment-based cycle of planning, review, refinement, and modification has been laid and fully implemented. It has made strides this past year through the inclusion of research, and the gathering and analysis of data, to guide further growth and the continuing improvement of the Institution. In general, the College recognizes the need to engage in ongoing dialogue as a key component of the process of improvement of student learning. It generally encourages that dialogue by supporting various venues for the exchange and discussion of ideas. It continues to work on institutionalizing that process, most notably in getting feedback from all areas of the College and in recording the dialogue process.

HCC is committed to achieving its Mission Statement and improving student learning, and recognizes that engaging in College-wide dialogue is one way to improve institutional processes. HCC has always engaged in dialogue regarding these issues, but realizes that it can always improve the quality of that dialogue and the ways in which it is documented.

In 2011, dialogue led to a collective understanding of the meaning of data and research used in the evaluation of student learning as 1) some programs and units of the College have completed a full cycle of planning and assessment; and 2) assessment at the institutional level has been conducted to measure the breadth of that collective understanding.

**Actionable Improvement Plans**

While the College meets the Standard, it should continue to reaffirm its commitment to robust communication and dialogue about all aspects of college life. Specifically:

- The Planning Council must work to ensure transparency in discussions regarding major campus initiatives, including review of the Strategic Plan and budget cycles, so that all members of the campus community are informed about and have an opportunity to participate in those discussions. The Planning Council has developed and should continue to implement an assessment of the extent to which a comprehensive understanding of the new cycle of research, planning, implementation, and assessment has become part of the Institutional culture.
- The College must ensure that dialogue about other matters of interest and concern to the campus is as broad-based as possible, encouraging active participation and timely opportunities for feedback. This may involve more department- and division-level projects that would improve participation in and feedback on College-wide projects.
- The College should continue to make an effort to include lecturers, part-time faculty, and staff in more dialogue and decision-making, and ensure that they are included in channels of communication. Through the FSEC, a lecturer has been assigned to broadcast messages and minutes to the lecturer community at HCC. The lecturers are beginning to feel that they are part of the process.
- The FSEC and other bodies involved in campus governance should review committee structure to enhance cross-committee communication while avoiding
counterproductive redundancy. This should also ensure that opportunities for participation in campus governance and decision-making are open to as many interested faculty and staff as possible.

1.B.2. The Institution sets goals to improve its effectiveness consistent with its stated purposes. The Institution articulates its goals and states the objectives derived from them in measurable terms so that the degree to which they are achieved can be determined and widely discussed. The Institutional members understand these goals and work collaboratively toward their achievement.

Descriptive Summary

The College Institutional Goals are included as part of the Mission Statement. [Honolulu CC Mission Statement] As described in Section I.A., the College recently completed a review of the Mission and revision of institutional goals and reaffirmed a systematic Mission Review Process, which should be fully implemented and adhered to.

The Strategic Goals of the College (Institutional Outcomes) are linked to the strategic themes of the Strategic Plan of the UH Community Colleges. [UH System Strategic Plan] The pathways to achieving Strategic Goals are defined by strategies and activities. Activities are sometimes but not always stated in measurable terms, e.g. “increase,” “expand,” “collect,” and “create.” None of the activities have quantitative or qualitative benchmarks or indicators attached to them. Institutional Goals are also generally stated, e.g., “provide,” “insure,” and “maintain,” without benchmarks or indicators.

In Spring 2005, an annual Strategic Plan review cycle was approved. [Timeline for Annual Review of Strategic Plan] A revision of the Strategic Plan was completed in February 2006 during the first year of implementation of the complete integrated planning, budgeting, and review cycles. Subsequent revision and refinement of the Strategic Plan and associated budget processes are now more detailed and include additional requirements: Proposed activities, such as those generated and justified by Annual Assessment or Program Reviews, must specify their relationship to system CC Strategic Planning goals and HCC Mission and Goals, provide justification and supporting data, and address possible consequences if the activity is not implemented.

The Planning Council is charged with “ensuring integration of results of Annual Assessments and Program Reviews into the College Strategic Plan and decision-making processes.” [Planning Council Charter] The Planning Council is responsible for ensuring broad-based understanding of the Institutional and Strategic Goals and the processes to implement them through the following responsibilities as outlined in the charter: “developing, publicizing and utilizing criteria to prioritize planning and budgeting initiatives; . . . coordinating communication with and between governance bodies; . . . discussing, and convening forums for campus-wide discussion of key College issues.” In 2011-2012, the Planning Council has overseen the full implementation of the budget review and planning cycle, with participation from the other governance bodies.
Self Evaluation

The College meets the standard.

Requiring connection between the Institutional Goals of the Mission and the Strategic Goals of the Strategic Plan was an essential first step. The College has experienced a complete cycle through Annual Assessment, Program Review, and Strategic Planning and Budgeting cycles and processes. The current Strategic Plan revision does reflect the planning and analysis that completion of the cycle will yield for future revisions. The Planning Council is on track in ensuring that goals are consistent with the Mission and in giving the campus community many opportunities to contribute to the plans, strategies, and activities that will be used to achieve the goals. The College continues to determine short-term, intermediate, and long-term outcomes as well as benchmarks and/or progress indicators at the institutional level that will allow the College to track the extent to which the goals have been met. Action plans emerging from Program Reviews and Annual Assessments already incorporate outcomes and benchmarks at the program level as the result of analysis of data elements and assessment of student and program learning outcomes.

There is good use of the College Intranet and email to disseminate information about the Institutional and Strategic Goals. Division Chairs are charged with working with instructional program faculty, and faculty and staff development activities have been helpful for those who are able to attend them. Currently, there are standard policies and procedures that would help to ensure equitable opportunities for faculty and staff members’ participation in the integrated planning cycle. Additional strategies may be needed to help all College units truly understand the relationship between their activities and the Institution's goals. Evaluation of the effectiveness of these approaches could strengthen future implementation of the Strategic Planning and Budgeting Process.

The Planning Council now establishes short-term, intermediate- and long-term measurable outcomes, along with progress indicators for each Strategic Goal, along with a method for tracking progress. The Planning Council and the Campus Leadership Team work together to develop policies and procedures to ensure that all members of the campus community have formal and informal opportunities to give input to the development of outcomes and indicators as well as to any changes in Strategic Goals.

Actionable Improvement Plans

While the College meets this Standard, it should continue to work to ensure, through continuing dialogue, that all participants understand the process and the integrated nature of its essential components—Program Review, Budget, Planning and Assessment.)

Standard 1B3: The Institution assesses progress toward achieving its stated goals and makes decisions regarding the improvement of the institutional effectiveness in an ongoing and systematic cycle of evaluation, integrated planning, resource allocation,
implementation, and reevaluation. Evaluation is based on analyses of both quantitative and qualitative data.

Descriptive Summary

The College has fully embraced ongoing planning and is functioning as a community, constructing a shared understanding of the processes and outcomes that will result in planning to improve institutional outcomes for students, programs, and the community. The process links program assessment (through Annual Assessments and Program Reviews) to the Strategic Plan and Budgeting Process, which is designed to fulfill the Mission and Institutional Outcomes. The cycle calls for annual review of the Strategic Plan and Budgeting Process, annual program assessments, and five-year cumulative program reviews to determine trends. The Planning Council takes care to ensure that all components of the College are meaningfully assessed and the results of assessment are incorporated in the planning process.

The Community College System has agreed upon a common data set for Annual Assessments and Program Reviews. For the College, Management Information and Research (MIR) and Administrative Services provide the data and technical assistance in data interpretation. Institutional and system level data are also available on the Assessment web site and in Management and Planning Support reports. Qualitative data is available through a number of forums. Minutes of Town Hall meetings, Advisory Committee meetings, and extended discussion on Laulima provide voluminous data for the purpose of evaluation.

Other sources of information both quantitative and qualitative provide the College with the means to develop a multi-faceted and integrated perspective on the factors that contribute to (or impede) student success. For example, the data sets used reveal areas that require attention. The average persistence of first-time freshmen students (first year to second year) is 43%; Fall to Spring persistence for HCC-based students is 74%, compared to 31% for students whose home campus is other than HCC. With greater attention now paid to the remedial/developmental needs of entering students, data indicate that 76% of them place into developmental Math and nearly 70% into developmental reading and writing. The issue of students entering college academically unprepared is not an issue unique to HCC, but must be addressed. [Achieving the Dream Goals; VPCC Campus Visit - Spring 2011]

The College has also participated in the biannual Community College Survey of Student Engagement (CCSSE) since 2006. The most recent survey data (2010) reveals that both full-time and part-time students appear to be integrated well with career counseling services, participated in community-based projects, and work with instructors on activities other than coursework. However, based on benchmark frequencies, there were areas in need of improvement, including low usage of skill labs (e.g., writing, mathematics) by part-time students, and low usage of computer labs by full-time students. These latter issues were addressed by the plan for campus re-organization and
changes to the delivery and content of the developmental Math and English curricula. [Campus Reorganization Proposal - November 15, 2011]

Self Evaluation

The College meets the standard.

The College has established a systematic cycle of evaluation, integrated planning, resource allocation, implementation, and reevaluation as evidenced in the completion of scheduled Program Reviews, and the ongoing dialogue and decision-making in the Planning Council as processes and procedures are fine-tuned. The breadth and depth of quantitative and qualitative data available to support evaluation and planning is further evidence of the College’s commitment to improving Institutional Effectiveness. Specific processes and procedures for assessing progress and decision-making based on such assessment can be seen in a number of measurable outcomes and indicators, as well as procedures for incorporating assessment outcomes in the decision-making process.

The Planning Council has developed criteria and procedures to integrate results of Annual Assessments and Program Reviews into the Strategic Plan and decision-making process. The intended outcome is for the integration of assessment results in planning and decision-making to be rational, systematic, and understood by all members of the College community. To achieve this, a Planning and Assessment Guide was created. [Assessment and Planning Guide (December 2008)]

The Planning Council also created the Budget Request and Proposal Form (Program Outcome Requests AY 2010-2011). This directly links requests for Strategic Plan budget items to program review and annual assessment reports. The relationship of budget items to the Honolulu Community College Mission and Goals is specified on the Budget Priorities Excel sheet. [Budget Priorities]

The Planning Council and Strategic Plan have developed measures for assessing Institutional progress. The intended outcome is that the assessment of the overall effectiveness of the College be understood by all members of the College community, and that the assessment be used to create planning agendas for the improvement of Institutional effectiveness. Goals have been set forth in the Strategic Plan, and the indicators have been developed to measure these goals. [Honolulu Community College Strategic Plan 2008-2015; Honolulu Community College Strategic Outcomes 2009]

The Planning Council has developed guidelines for making recommendations to the Chancellor for decision-making and resource allocation purposes. The intended outcome is for the Chancellor to make decisions affecting the Institution and to allocate resources based on comprehensive, well-documented information derived from the institutional assessment process. The Planning Council established a criteria list to use in evaluating budget implementation plan items. This was completed and sent to the campus. Posted on the College Intranet, it is easily accessible by the campus community. [Criteria for Budget Requests & Proposals]
Actionable Improvement Plans

While the College meets this Standard, it should continue to monitor the process of planning and budgeting it has instituted, assessing the efficacy of the process itself, and ensuring that program-level impact is also assessed for improvements in student learning.

Standard 1B4: The Institution provides evidence that the planning process is broad-based, offers opportunities for input by appropriate constituencies, allocates necessary resources, and leads to improvement of Institutional effectiveness.

Descriptive Summary

The Planning Council composition—including ex officio representation of other governance bodies on the Planning Council—guarantees representation of all College units and constituencies in the planning process. Broad-based participation of faculty and staff in College planning is also supported through the Campus Leadership Team’s (CLT) oversight of short-term planning and decision-making, for example in the determination of the allocation of resources among programs such as operating budgets and student assistant positions. In addition, all campus units participate in Annual Assessments and five-year Program Reviews, and the incorporation of their results and recommendations for action into the Strategic Plan and Budgeting Process. The planned overlapping membership on College committees, such as is noted above, is another mechanism that facilitates broad participation.

Priorities identified in the Strategic Plan are incorporated into the budget submitted to the Board of Regents for approval as part of the University’s budget. The Planning Council recommends priorities to the Administration, which finalizes the budget. When resources to fully fund priorities are not received through the University or legislative budgeting process, the College may reallocate resources internally or seek external sources of funds through expanding revenues for noncredit workforce training, obtaining grants from government agencies or private foundations, or establishing partnerships with private businesses or nonprofit entities. Examples include short-term funding of an Assessment Officer through the Perkins grant; non-credit training offered through the International Students Program and the Pacific Center for Advanced Technology Training (PCATT); Native Hawaiian programs developed through a Title III grant; a partnership with the Polynesian Voyaging Society and the Marine Education and Training Center; and initial development of a 2+2 program in Early Childhood Education through a P-20 Innovation Grant.

Self Evaluation

The College meets the standard.

The planning process guarantees broad-based participation from all College constituencies. Resources are allocated or sought based on planning priorities. There is
evidence of systematic tracking of the implementation of plans and the results that document the improvement of institutional effectiveness.

Numerous efforts to inform and involve all members of the campus community in developing policies and procedures have been made. For example, the Campus Communication page lists the agendas and minutes from General College Meetings, Town Hall Meetings, and Vice President for Community College visit meetings. The site also has Marketing documents and shows the work done by the Underprepared Student Task Force. The Campus Leadership Team site includes committee meeting minutes and relevant supporting documents.

The College has also addressed the issue of the development, by the Planning Council and MIR, of a system for tracking the results of plan implementation in order to document and measure progress in achievement of Institutional and Strategic Goals.

As the intended outcome is documentation of improvement of Institutional Effectiveness, the College updated its 2008-2015 Strategic Plan in 2009, and after several presentations to the campus, this plan has been made accessible to the campus community on the Honolulu Community College Strategic Planning website. Under the HCC Strategic Plan is an Implementation Planning Framework, which outlines various planning areas and responsible parties. [Implementation Planning Framework]

Perhaps most significantly, Campus Reorganization planning has involved all campus constituencies and efforts have been made to make the process transparent and information about reorganization accessible to the entire campus. This is noted in the Executive of the Summary Reorganization Proposal Request. [Campus Reorganization Proposal - November 15, 2011]

The process of organizing, communicating, and soliciting feedback and advice on this topic from campus faculty and staff has been an ongoing process. Beginning in Fall 2010, the campus started with large re-organization meetings with all parties involved. All meetings were open and meeting minutes have been posted on the campus Intranet. Most of those involved in the proposed changes have been directly involved in the development of the organizational structure needed to ensure the College can meet its mission, strategic goals, and outcomes. Stated throughout the “Reorganization Proposal Request” are explanations of how Campus Reorganization will lead to improvement of Institutional effectiveness. [Campus Reorganization Proposal - November 15, 2011] Data from the survey administered in Spring 2012 indicated that 70% of respondents agreed or strongly agreed that “there is sufficient opportunity to participate in decision-making in my unit/division,” and 62% agreed or strongly agreed that “there is sufficient opportunity to participate in campus-wide decision-making.” [HCC Accreditation Self-Study Spring 2012 Executive Summary]

**Actionable Improvement Plans**

No action is required.
I.B.5. The Institution uses documented assessment results to communicate matters of quality assurance to appropriate constituencies.

Descriptive Summary

Various sources of assessment data are collected on a periodic basis by the UH System Institutional Research Office (IRO) as well as by the College. Assessment data pertaining to student graduation and retention, in addition to various markers of student success, are collected by the UH System IRO. Data sources include Banner, a computerized student registration system utilized by the State’s institutions of higher education; the Department of Education (DOE); private high schools; student and course data; the UH Office of Human Resources; and UH Central Accounting as well as other federal and state sources. The data are summarized in Management and Planning Support (MAPS) Reports [MAPS Reports Release Grid] which describe trends in academic crossover, courses, curriculum, enrollment, finances, planning, projections, and characteristics of faculty/staff and students. MAPS data each semester, and reports are generated annually. These reports are accessible to the College community and the general public through the UH system website, and are current through the 2009-2010 academic year.

The College also performs various internal assessments for tracking student persistence, retention, and success. The STAR (Student Tracking and Auditing Report), used to certify that students have met their degree requirements, also generates reports on low-enrolled courses, class fill rates, persistence, and retention. The Community College Survey on Student Engagement (CCSSE) [2008 CCSSE Institutional Report] is also administered once every two years by the College’s Assessment Specialist. CCSSE measures key areas of student engagement such as active and collaborative learning, student effort, academic challenge, student-faculty interaction, and support for learners. Results of the survey as well as explanations for interpreting the results are publicly accessible on the College’s intranet website.

Program Review data are also collected by the College each semester for both instructional and non-instructional programs, and reports are generated annually. Assessments of these programs specifically address the areas of demand, efficiency, effectiveness, and overall health of the program. For instructional programs, demand indicators include the number of program versus non-program majors in program courses. Efficiency indicators include average class size, fill rate, and low-enrolled courses. Effectiveness indicators include information about the number of degrees and certificates awarded, and transfers to four-year institutions. Non-instructional programs also report on various quantitative indicators for assessing program effectiveness and overall health. Assessment data are accessible to the college community and the general public on the College’s Intranet website. Beginning in the 2009-2010 academic year, instructional program review data for the College has been made accessible on the UH system website. This University of Hawai‘i Community Colleges Annual Report of Instructional Program Data is readily accessible to the College community and the general public. [UHCC Annual Report of Program Data (ARPD)]
The College also conducts in-house surveys on an annual basis to assess student satisfaction and success [Survey Instruments/Results]. A Graduate Leaver Survey [Graduate/Leaver Surveys] is conducted to assess the general level of satisfaction that students have with their experiences at HCC and their overall satisfaction with the quality of education and programs offered. A New Student Survey [New Student Survey - Fall 2004] is conducted to assess factors such as reasons for attending HCC as well as factors that may contribute to their success as a student. A Returning Student Survey [Returning Student Survey - Fall 2004] is used to assess the factors that have caused students to leave the College and the reasons for their return. These satisfaction survey reports are accessible to the community on the College’s Intranet site.

The Vice President of Community Colleges (VPCC) visits the campus each semester to summarize MAPS reports and make assessment results available to the College community [VPCC Campus Visit - Fall 2009; VPCC Campus Visit - Spring 2010; VPCC Campus Visit Spring 2011; VPCC Campus Visit Fall 2011]. Town Hall meetings are also held throughout the semester to raise awareness among the College community regarding the overall effectiveness and success of the College based on assessment results [Town Hall Meetings]. General College Meetings are held at the start of each semester to inform faculty and staff of student enrollment numbers, strategic planning and budgetary restrictions, recruitment and retention initiatives, and the need for student engagement [General College Meetings].

Based on the strategic marketing plan, the College is currently working on designing an attractive pamphlet, to be distributed to the community, containing assessment data regarding the effectiveness of the College. The pamphlet will contain assessment data taken from the MAPS report as well as the College’s internal assessments. Annual report pamphlets, as well as a pamphlet on the College’s Long Range Development Plan, communicate information about the College’s Strategic Plan, as well as sources of funding, including revenues and grants received. Those documents are available to the community on the College’s website.

Other initiatives are in place to further the College’s marketing efforts. The College contributes funding to the VPCC’s office to help fund the UHCC System marketing efforts. A detailed Marketing and Communications Outreach Plan was put together by the Executive Assistant to the Chancellor, in order to increase public awareness of the general mission and effectiveness of the College. [2009 Strategic Marketing Plan]

To assess the effectiveness of the College in communicating information about its quality to the public, a campus communications audit was conducted Fall 2007-Spring 2008 by the Dean of University College. As a result of the communications audit, a college e-newsletter and blog were launched in Fall 2008 to increase the visibility of the College’s mission and the quality of programs and services to the community at large. [Ka Lono]

Self Evaluation
The College meets the standard.

The College has made considerable progress in becoming an assessment-based institution, and in communicating those findings to the campus and the community. Assessments are systematically and regularly being conducted at the institutional, program, and course level on either a semi-annual or annual basis. Results of those assessments are publicly available on either the UH system website or on the College’s own website. Regular visits to the College by the VPCC, the institution of campus Town Hall meetings, and the General College Meetings have also helped to communicate assessment results and campus initiatives to the College community.

The creation of attractive college publications containing assessment data also helps to cultivate the public face of the Institution as a whole. The pamphlets serve to cultivate awareness in the community of the College’s full mission, Strategic and Long Range Development Plan, budgetary and resource allocation process, and the quality and effectiveness of its instructional as well as non-instructional programs.

The culture of assessment has clearly taken root at the College, and provides an essential tool for evaluating the effectiveness of programs and services as well as for identifying areas of further growth and improvement.

**Actionable Improvement Plans**

While the College meets this standard, it should continue to work to ensure that assessment is a required component of any plan, and that the results of such activity, however conducted, be communicated to the College community.

The College should consider conducting a current audit of its modes of communication and marketing, and their relationship to such goals as enhancing recruitment and retention.

*I.B.6. The Institution assures the effectiveness of its ongoing planning and resource allocation processes by systematically reviewing and modifying, as appropriate, all parts of the cycle, including Institutional and other research efforts.*

**Descriptive Summary**

In response to campus concerns and input, the Planning Council has undertaken many actions to improve the planning process. The PC actively sought input from the campus in its efforts to revise and refine the annual budget implementation and planning process. Town Hall meetings were a valuable part of imparting information to the campus. Notes from the Town Hall meetings were also posted on the College’s Intranet for those in the campus community. Significant improvement in the annual implementation and budgeting process enacted by the PC occurred as a result of campus discussions and assessments. Explicit and clear criteria for evaluating budget priorities were also firmly
To assess the effectiveness of the cycle of evaluation, integrating planning, resource allocation, implementation and re-evaluation, the Planning Council (PC) conducted a survey of the campus to solicit input regarding the Strategic Planning process [Planning Council Strategic Planning Survey]. Survey questions addressed the clarity, effectiveness, and inclusivity of the Strategic Planning and Budget implementation process. Results from the survey were discussed at a Fall 2008 Town Hall Meeting. The results provided justification for the PC Chair’s recommendations to the PC for revising the planning and implementation process.

The Community College Inventory (CCI) was also used to assess the process of strategic focus, planning, and resource allocation. Faculty and staff rated items such as the degree to which the Strategic Plan is linked to the implementation plan, the extent to which institutional assessments are used to improve programs and student services, and the degree to which resources are consistently allocated or re-allocated to address priorities identified through the planning process. [Community College Inventory]

Town Hall meetings provided another means for assessing and improving the planning and budget implementation process. A Town Hall Meeting was held in Fall 2008, facilitated by the Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs and the Chair of the Planning Council [Town Hall Meeting - October 27, 2008]. The purpose of the meeting was to share the requirements for submitting items to be included in the Budget Implementation Plan with the campus community. The process of submission and the prioritization of items for inclusion in the budget were explained. The PC Chair also outlined goals for improving the strategic planning process and shared the results of the campus survey. Attendees asked questions about and offered suggestions for how the process could be improved. A PowerPoint presentation for this meeting was posted on the Intranet for those who were unable to attend [Town Hall Meeting - Strategic Planning Process - October 27, 2008]. The information gathered from this meeting was incorporated in the revision of the Assessment and Planning Guide [Assessment and Planning Guide (December 2008)]. Thus far, many of the planning actions for improvement have been enacted.

A Strategic Plan Review Report was presented to the Planning Council by the PC Chair in Spring 2008 [Planning Council Assessment of Strategic Plan Review Process]. The report contained recommendations for improving the process of annually updating planning and implementation activities and the means for prioritizing items for funding decisions. These recommendations were agreed upon and incorporated in the revised Assessment and Planning Guide (December 2008). The campus community was made aware of the changes via email, Town Hall Meetings, and documents posted to the campus Intranet.

**Self Evaluation**
The College meets the standard.

The effectiveness of the cycle of planning, implementation, and review has been assessed indirectly through surveys completed by faculty and staff regarding their perceptions of the role of the Planning Council. Town Hall meetings have also given the campus community a forum for discussing changes that need to be made to the planning process. The evaluation design that includes gathering information throughout the cycle has provided not only an assessment at the conclusion of the cycle, but also the opportunity to make adjustments that have improved effectiveness of the process along the way. The College will continue to implement the campus survey on an annual basis, and the Chair of the PC will make an annual report to the PC of the assessment results. These results will also continue to be communicated to the College community via Town Hall meetings.

**Actionable Improvement Plans**

While the College meets this Standard, it should refine and continue to administer the survey for systematically assessing the planning and resource allocation process model as a whole. Specifically, items should address 1) the degree to which the strategic plan is reflected in the implementation plan; 2) the degree to which the implementation plan affects the allocation of resources; 3) the effect of available resources on attainment of student success (as assessed through program review); and 4) the degree to which assessment results affect the strategic planning process. A robust assessment of the process now in place will allow the PC to more accurately gauge its effectiveness. The PC is currently in the process of designing such an instrument.

*I.B.7. The Institution assesses its evaluation mechanisms through a systematic review of their effectiveness in improving instructional programs, student support services, and library and other learning support services.*

**Descriptive Summary**

The evaluation process employed by the College has been conducted at various levels with peer evaluations as well as student evaluations. The feedback provided faculty with information to measure the effectiveness of their courses and the levels of student learning. This information was also used to assess probationary faculty in the process of contract renewal. More recently, the College has proceeded to identify program and course Student Learning Outcomes, has created instruments to assess those outcomes, and has used this information to improve student learning. The College has also implemented a Program Review process that is used to assess student learning and institutional effectiveness. The data gathered through Annual Assessments and comprehensive Program Reviews are expected to initiate improvements at the program level, and to provide information for the planning of program revisions and the allocation of resources at the institutional level, e.g., through the Planning Council.

**Self Evaluation**
The College meets the standard.

The program review process is well established, and has begun to generate evidence that the information has been used to improve programs and to allocate resources to update multi-media teaching resources, consumable supplies, personnel or equipment. Division Chairs, program faculty, unit heads, the Planning Council, and assessment committees increasingly evaluate information gathered through the program review process as part of the preparation of Annual Assessments and comprehensive Program Reviews; such evaluations provide an important part of the rationale for new or ongoing requests for allocations. The College increasingly understands that assessment is essential to evaluate program effectiveness as well as all processes by which decision-making and planning occurs.

**Actionable Improvement Plans**

While the College meets the Standard, it should continue to ensure that effective means of assessment remain an essential component of all programs and processes, and that all methods of assessment provide the information necessary to ensure that the College is able to continue to meet its Mission.
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II.A: Instructional Programs

II.A. The institution offers high-quality instructional programs in recognized and emerging fields of study that culminate in identified student outcomes leading to degrees, certificates, employment, or transfer to other higher education institutions or programs consistent with its mission. Instructional programs are systematically assessed in order to assure currency, improve teaching and learning strategies, and achieve stated student learning outcomes. The provisions of this standard are broadly applicable to all instructional activities offered in the name of the institution.

Descriptive Summary

Honolulu Community College (College) offers high-quality instructional programs in recognized and emerging fields of study. The College has made significant structural, policy and procedural changes to meet the new Accrediting Commission for Community and Junior Western Association of Schools and Colleges (ACCJC/WASC) Standards and to systematically assess Student Learning Outcomes (SLOs) to improve the teaching and learning strategies and to maintain the high quality of its instructional programs. New committees were formed to enhance the ability of the College to monitor and control the quality of its programs and courses, and ensure that funding issues related to quality improvement are properly addressed. New research data is being retrieved and included in the University of Hawaii (UH) system database that will assist program personnel in determining the future educational needs of the community, as well as the viability, and general health of the College’s programs.

College policy requires that each instructional program perform an Annual Assessment to ensure currency, improve teaching and learning strategies and achieve stated SLOs. The results of all assessment activities are to be published in the program’s Annual Assessment Report. Since 2006, the process of assessing instructional programs has undergone and is still going through some procedural changes. However, all seven community colleges in the University of Hawaii system follow a common policy called UHCCP #5.202 – Review of Established Programs. The aim of this community college system policy was to standardize certain elements of program assessment in order to provide a way for comparison across the seven community colleges. It is also there to ensure that all programs, both instructional and non-instructional, annually look at their program data, assess their progress, and use that data to make informed decisions for program improvement.

To further assist the programs in their Annual Assessment, all will be provided newly approved research data that will allow them to better determine the currency, cost efficiency, market demand, and overall viability of the program. This quantitative research data is largely provided by research specialists from the CC system office and is supplemented with specific data (such as program costs, SLO assessment, etc.) from each individual campus. This quantitative research data is distributed by August 15th in the fall semester via a website to all seven community college campuses. Career and Technical Education (CTE) programs are also expected to meet with their Advisory Committees
during the assessment process to ensure the committee members’ expert observations and analysis of the assessment results are taken into consideration as well as get their expert feedback on new or changing workplace skills that need to be incorporated into the program’s instruction.

If it is found that SLOs are not being achieved, the programs are expected to take steps to improve teaching and learning strategies or propose changes to their curriculum that will remedy the deficiencies. To ensure quality is maintained, recommended curriculum changes are reviewed by several committees. All proposed curriculum changes are first reviewed by the Division Chairs, followed by the Division Curriculum Committee (DCC). The change will then be reviewed, if appropriate, by the General Education Board and/or the Distance Education (DE) Committee. The Committee on Programs and Curricula (CPC) is the final reviewing committee and forwards its recommendation to the administration.

In addition to curriculum changes the program may find other deficiencies during the Annual Assessment such as outdated shop or laboratory equipment, or shortage of qualified instructors. If the assessment reveals curriculum, equipment, or personnel deficiencies that cannot be fixed internally with annual College funding, recommended changes will be included in the Budget Implementation Plan, the College’s primary planning and budget document. Items in the Budget Implementation Plan are reviewed by the Planning Council, the Faculty Senate Executive Committee (FSEC), the Staff Senate Executive Committee (SSEC), the Kupa Ka Wai Council and the Associated Students of the University of Hawaii–HCC. [ASUH-HCC] The Planning Council is made up of major campus constituencies; the FSEC represents the entire faculty while the SSEC represents all of the staff. The Associated Students of the University of Hawaii – HCC represents the student body. The Kupa Ka Wai Council is a newly formed governing body whose focus is on Native Hawaiian issues. All five of these governing bodies provide input on the prioritization of budgeting priority items and make recommendations to the Chancellor.

In addition to the Annual Assessment, each program is required to administer a comprehensive analysis of their program every five years. Since 2006, the community college system has become very cognizant of how to perform program review, so much that every Annual Assessment now contains those same data elements that a pre-2006 comprehensive Program Review report would have. In effect, all programs are conducting a mini-comprehensive review of their program every year because all programs are required to look at both quantitative data (majors, fill rates, persistence rates, graduation rates, etc.) and qualitative data (SLO achievement, advisory council meeting notes, prior year action plans, etc.) that is compared to at least one prior year’s worth of data. With the programs being able to compare one or two years’ worth of prior data to current year data allows the programs to make better informed decisions for program improvement. The comprehensive report, covering five years’ worth of data, simply allows the program to look at trends across a five year period and to determine if the program changes that have occurred in the last five years (student learning through SLO assessment, course mappings, program requirements, etc.) have been beneficial to
improving the program overall and allow for long term programmatic planning. The College is confident that the existing committee structure, along with the new policies and procedures, will lead to a higher quality of instruction and better meet the needs of a wider range of students. [Review of Established Programs - UHCCP # 5.202; UHCC Annual Report of Program Data (ARPD)]

II.A.1. The institution demonstrates that all instructional programs, regardless of location or means of delivery, address and meet the mission of the institution and uphold its integrity.

Descriptive Summary

The College is confident that all of its instructional programs, regardless of location or means of delivery, meet the College’s mission and maintains its integrity. [Mission Statement] As a learning-centered, open-door college, Honolulu Community College is committed to providing the academic and student support to assist students as they progress through their respective courses and programs, and to facilitate the important work of our faculty and staff. The college will acknowledge, promote, and maintain a multicultural environment where gender diversity and other aspects of personal identity are appreciated and respected.

Every program must reflect its commitment to the College’s Mission through its own program mission statement. To ensure that the integrity of the College mission is upheld, the Annual Program Review reports are required to include both the College Mission Statement and each program’s mission statement with a descriptive analysis of how each program’s mission is compatible with the College’s mission.

The integrity of a program’s mission is also ensured by the Committee on Programs and Curricula (CPC), the final reviewing committee of all new and revised courses and programs. The CPC, guided by the [Curriculum Reference Manual], reviews each proposed course or program change to ensure that the change is within the program’s mission. For example, if a Career Technical Education (CTE) program requires a special math course to support its curriculum, the CPC will not allow the program to create and teach its own math course. Instead, the CPC will ensure that the Mathematics Department creates and delivers a math course within the requirements requested by the CTE program. Although some programs are located off the main campus, and although some programs offer different means of delivery such as DE by Internet or cable TV, they all are required to be reviewed for mission integrity during the Annual Assessment or Program Review [Program Review] or by the CPC when changes occur within the curriculum.

The integrity of the College’s mission is maintained because of the commitment made by all personnel to adhere to its Core Values. [Core Values] As a learning-centered institution, the College continually strives to reach the highest levels of quality in its academic, student, and administrative programs and services through ongoing analysis, assessment, and improvement. The College’s institutional Core Values are at the heart of
everything the College does and help ensure mission integrity. The main themes of the College’s Core Values are:

- Student-Centered Philosophy
- Respect
- Quality/Excellence
- Community

The themes of the Core Values are prominently displayed within the title banner of each of the College’s Intranet Web pages, which link to a full description of each Core Value. Core Values related to integrity and accountability found under Quality/Excellence are:

- Be accountable for the quality of program and learning environment
- Commit to rigorous academic standards
- Emphasize and cultivate strong work ethic and personal accountability
- Gather and share program information with all constituencies
- Use information for ongoing improvement of program quality
- Strive for excellence in all endeavors

**Mission Statement**

**Core Values**

**Program Review**

**Curriculum Reference Manual**

**Self-Evaluation**

The College meets the Standard.

Policy and procedures to ensure mission integrity are in place to meet the Standard. The mission of each program is reviewed during Annual Assessment and Program Review; the resulting reports include both the College’s Mission Statement and the program’s mission statement, which can be easily reviewed for compatibility. All Annual Assessments are completed during the fall semester.

**Actionable Improvement Plans**

No action is required.

*II.A.1.a. The institution identifies and seeks to meet the varied educational needs of its students through programs consistent with their educational preparation and the diversity, demographics, and economy of its communities. The institution relies upon research and analysis to identify student learning needs and to assess progress toward achieving stated learning outcomes.*

**Descriptive Summary**
The College continually analyzes research data to identify the varied educational needs of the diverse ethnic, cultural, and economic population of our community. Special programs have been established to meet these needs.

**Educational Preparation:** The College makes every effort to meet the varied educational needs of its students through programs consistent with their educational preparation. The College has an open-door policy where anyone eighteen years of age or older can apply. New students who have not taken college English or math courses must take a placement test to determine their level of math and English competency. Because many applicants score below program entrance requirements, the College provides a structured sequence of English and math courses that gradually brings the student up to an acceptable level to enter the varied CTE and Liberal Arts (LBART) programs. From 1981 to 2010, the College Skills Center (CSC) provided the College with all its remedial and developmental English and math courses, as well as the tutoring associated with these courses. However, in 2009, the College created an Under-Prepared Student Task Force to assess the needs of students at the remedial and developmental English and math levels, and to determine whether the College could improve its services for the under-prepared population. In April 2010, the FSEC approved the recommendation of the task force, which involved the relocation of the remedial and developmental English and math faculty, as well as the tutoring services associated with their courses, from the CSC to the Language Arts and Mathematics Departments. The ACCESS program, which serves students with disabilities, was also relocated from the CSC and placed under Academic Affairs. A total of seven educational instructors, specialists, and lecturers were relocated as a result of this organizational change. The new sequence of Math courses was implemented in fall 2010 and a new sequence of English courses was implemented in Spring 2011, as shown in the College catalog. As of this date, assessments conducted would be premature to determine the efficacy of the new English and math programs, but annual assessments will be completed.  

As a result of its reorganization and a shift in its program outcomes, the CSC has worked to improve its existing programs and to develop new initiatives for educational support at all levels. While the College Skills Center continues to provide a special learning environment for students who need extra instruction with entry-level math and English, it has expanded its academic support for LBART and CTE students at upper-levels of math and English courses. In addition, the CSC now supports distance learning, COMPASS preparation courses, service learning, and tutoring in various disciplines such as chemistry, philosophy, and speech. Since 2008, the CSC has provided training for its tutors to receive certification by the College Readiness and Learning Association (CRLA). This practice helps to ensure the effectiveness of the tutoring services provided at the Center.

The CSC continues to provide a Learning Skills course (LSK 30) that covers essential college skills such as note-taking, time management, and test-taking. The CSC staff is acutely aware of the different learning styles of its students and attempts to accommodate them with different course materials including special self-learning computer software.
The on-going goal of the CSC is to develop the student’s skills, confidence, and motivation so they become responsible, self-directed learners.

Cultural Demographics and Diversity of the Community: The College serves many immigrant students from Asia and the Pacific islands, whose English skills are not at the college-entrance level. A recent student survey revealed that over 25% of the College applicants are non-native speakers. To accommodate these students, the College has established a highly structured sequence of English as a Second Language (ESL) courses. Figure II.3 in the college catalog shows the sequence of credit and non-credit courses delivered in the ESL program. The College established the Honolulu English Language Academy (HELA) for international students who do not meet the minimum Test of English as a Foreign Language (TOEFL) for admissions. HELA provides non-credit ESL courses leading to certificates for each level the students complete.

Because of the unique cultural demographics of Hawai‘i, the College established the Native Hawaiian Center in 2001. The Native Hawaiian Center is a Title III federally funded program designed to assist in the educational improvement of Native Hawaiian students. The program establishes three main goals for Native Hawaiian students: college-readiness skills, program retention, and graduation from the College or transition into higher education. The Native Hawaiian Center houses faculty, student tutors and peer mentors, academic, career, and financial aid counselors, a computer laboratory, and a cultural assembly area or halau. The Center expands the appreciation of the Hawaiian culture to students, the College, and the community.

The NHC initiated the First-Year Experience (FYE) Program, which is an institutional commitment by the College for the success of first-year and Native Hawaiian students. In 2008, the FYE established the Learning Community (LC) Program. The LC aimed to fulfill the Native Hawaiian Center’s objectives to: increase recruitment, retention and graduation of Native Hawaiian students; foster a Hawaiian “Sense of Place”; integrate the Hawaiian language, culture, values and history into curriculum and campus activities; provide faculty development to assist integrating a Hawaiian perspective into curriculum; innovate and implement new technologies for student success and retention; and provide opportunities for faculty and staff to research and develop successful student retention strategies. The FYE supported its LCs with a comprehensive package of services. LC students had access to: peer mentoring and tutoring, guidance counseling, career and academic advising, financial aid assistance, computer training, and cultural enrichment activities. To ensure its effectiveness, the LC program completed annual assessments based on knowledge surveys, student evaluations, instructor evaluations, and focus group discussions. These assessment tools were used to improve the next generation of LCs. Data collected from 2008 to 2010 showed that the LCs had a positive effect on the targeted population. The College decided to institutionalize the FYE program and the LC program in 2012. This data was shared at the Achieving the Dream (AtD) Conference held at Kapiolani Community College in Spring 2010.

The Title III funding for the FYE program, and the LCs, ended after its five-year cycle, in Fall 2011. The College, however, continues to offer, and expects to expand, its LC
program. In Spring 2012, the College created the Retention and Recruitment Coordinator position, through general funds, to replace the FYE Coordinator’s position and to oversee the LCs. The Retention and Recruitment position, however, not only provides student support services for the LCs, but was created to expand the services, which were first piloted in the LCs, to the underprepared students throughout the College.

The Center’s Title III grant also supports the Hawai‘i Ocean Studies (HOS) program, which develops curriculum in traditional Polynesian vessels, seafaring, and navigation. This program will undergo review for institutionalization and will eventually be called the Kuhololoa Center for Ocean Exploration.

An additional federal grant supports the Po‘i Na Nalu program, which was established in 1994 to provide special support to Native Hawaiians who major in CTE programs. Po‘i Na Nalu provides college and career development and advising, referral services, cooperative education, student stipends opportunities, peer assisted gateway courses, transfer connections to four year degree career paths, and cultural enrichment opportunities such as Malama ‘Aina Days.

The TRIO-Student Support Service (TRIO-SSS) is another federally funded program at the College that was established to provide services and supports to students who meet one or more of the following criteria: first-generation in college, financial need, or documented disability. The program offers academic support, career guidance, transfer planning, and professional development opportunities to qualified students. In 2010, PRIDE underwent a program review by the Department of Education and was funded for another cycle until 2015.

Student Learning Needs Related to the Demographics and Economy of its Communities:
The College maintains awareness of changing community needs through the Bureau of Labor statistics and other Institutional Research (IR) data provided by the College’s Management Information and Research (MIR) office and the UH System’s IR Cadre. Some examples include the following:

The Computer, Electronics, and Networking Technology (CENT) program was developed in response to the explosive growth of the Internet and the subsequent need for an information technology workforce. In the development of the program, the College established partnership with Cisco Systems, Inc., Microsoft, and other companies, which provide instructor training, curriculum, and laboratory equipment. CENT students at Honolulu Community College now have options to continue their education for a bachelor's degree in programs related to CENT at Hawaii Pacific University (HPU) or at the University of Hawaii at West Oahu (UHWO).

The successes of the CENT program lead to the realization that there was a growing demand for established profession technicians to learn advancing technologies and gain the related certification. The College initiated the establishment of the Pacific Center for Advanced Technology Training (PCATT), which offers non-credit, continuing education informational technology courses. Headquartered at the College, PCATT is a University
of Hawai‘i Community Colleges (UHCC) consortium with training offered at all the Community Colleges within the UH system. The technology courses offered are comprehensive and varied and many include new innovated technology.

PCATT has established industry partnerships with Cisco, Microsoft, Oracle, Red Hat, Sun Microsystems, and others. These partnerships ensure that PCATT’s customers are trained in the latest industry technologies and use the most current training materials developed by the industry. The College is an authorized VUE Testing Center for certification examinations; therefore, students are able to take the training as well as the examination for certification at the College.

Another example of the College reacting to the needs of the community is its Fall 2005 response to the demands of the construction industry. When the State’s Department of Labor (DOL) research data indicated that up to 8,000 construction workers would be needed within six years, the College reacted quickly to allow expansion to its existing Apprenticeship and Journey worker program. In addition, a United States DOL expansion grant was approved for the creation of a Construction Academy, which provides training for high school teachers and students. The College manages the program and provides quality control of the instruction, which is provided by the State Department of Education (DOE). In March of 2012, the University of Hawaii Board of Regents approved the College’s Associate in Science (AS) degree in Construction Management (CM). Stimulus funding, rail, and the current interest rates affecting the State of Hawaii were factors in support of this program. HCC saw a need to prepare not only construction tradesperson but well-educated construction leaders with experience to meet the new challenges of Sustainable Construction. The program provides students a comprehensive academic background based on construction management principles and concepts that incorporates both traditional and sustainable construction methods. Currently, Federal contracts require a Construction Manager with a 4-year degree. With ongoing assessment of student needs and industry demand, the College hopes to expand the CM program, in partnership with West Oahu, to include the Bachelor of Applied Science (BAS) degree.

To meet the needs of the growing aviation industry, in 1998 the College formed a partnership with the University of Dakota (UND) Aerospace Center to institute the Commercial Aviation (AVIT) program. The program provides students with the opportunity to obtain training and certification leading to careers as professional pilots with commercial air carriers. The five-semester program offers an Associate of Science (AS) degree and prepares students to continue in aviation academic fields to obtain a baccalaureate degree. The partnership with University of North Dakota has been replaced and a new partnership with Galvin Flight Services Hawaii has been instituted to better serve the needs of the students. Additionally, the program secured funding for PC-based flight simulators. These have been integrated into the training program as a mid-point between academic learning and flight lessons in actual airplanes. Also, the FAA exams are given at the end of each (appropriate) semester in which the corresponding course of instruction was given in order to keep students better engaged in their studies.
The Marine Education and Training Center (METC) recently formed a partnership with the Polynesian Voyaging Society (PVS). This partnership will enable the College students to study traditional Polynesian canoe building and voyaging as the METC provides a home and repair facility for the Hokule’a, the Hawai‘iloa and other canoes built and maintained by the PVS. The PVS will use the College’s METC facilities for meetings, formal classroom and dockside study, crew training, youth programs, and a variety of other learning opportunities. Additionally, the METC will be the headquarters of the upcoming 4-year long World Wide Voyage by Hokule’a. This voyage will stress the importance of sustainability and education for future generations. At this time, the Hokule’a is undergoing a major refit, executed in part by students enrolled in the Small vessel fabrication and Repair program. The synergy developed by the two organizations demonstrates how community and college can positively work together. In the past year, the METC has been granted the title of Marine League School, through the American Boat and Yacht Council (ABYC), a nationally recognized standards organization for vessels.

When a major bank and the largest automotive dealership in Hawai‘i were seeking to upgrade high school automotive training, the College demonstrated that it could provide National Automotive Technology Education Foundation (NATEF) training as well as offer NATEF certification exams. An agreement for a summer academy was established where high school students take introductory Automotive technology (AMT) program courses and work half time as dealership interns, all funded through the bank and the automobile dealerships. Though the funding source has changed, The Automotive Summer Academy is still offering high school students the opportunity to enroll in introductory automotive courses.

The LBART program has been a key force in support of the CTE programs by providing the needed General Education courses to ensure that the culturally diverse students achieve the reading, writing, speaking, cultural awareness, critical thinking and problem solving skills required in today’s modern high tech world. In 2010, the College began to revisit the courses and categories that satisfy the General Education requirements for the CTE programs. Changes to the categories and courses were deemed necessary to adapt to the changing work force, which has become increasingly dependent on information technology. Currently, a General Education subcommittee formed under the CPC is working to augment the General Education requirement for all CTE programs in order to keep its students relevant and competitive in today’s workforce. The LBART Department has the largest student population and endeavors to satisfy the demand of students that seek the Associate in Arts (AA) degree and continue on to a four-year institution. Articulation agreements allow the student to complete all General Education requirements and enter UH-Manoa at the junior level. The LBART Department also provides pre-professional courses to prepare students for specific majors including Business Administration, Education, Nursing, and Social Work. Additionally, Honolulu Community College’s diverse Liberal Arts program offers courses to students within the technical trades programs in order to meet their 2-year degree requirements. [College Catalog] The LBART program at Honolulu Community College has been a key supporter of the CTE programs. The LBART program provides the needed General
Education courses to ensure that the diverse CTE students acquire the reading, writing, speaking, cultural awareness, critical thinking and problem solving skills that employers seek in new hires. In 2010, the College’s Committee on Programs and Curricula (CPC) revisited the courses and five categories that satisfied the General Education requirements for the CTE programs. The CPC concluded that two additional categories (i.e., Computing and Information Literacy, and Oral Communication) were necessary to adapt to the changing work force, which has become increasingly dependent on information technology. A General Education subcommittee, created under the CPC and comprised of liberal arts and CTE instructors worked on the logistics of the changes. Currently, the committee is addressing concerns whether added categories would negatively affect the enrollment and graduation rate of CTE students wanting to complete the A.A.S. degree.

A finalized list of the General Education categories and their hallmarks for the CTE program is expected to be implemented by Fall 2012. Through annual reports, the College will assess whether the finalized categories keep its students relevant and competitive in today’s workforce.

The interest for a music business program in the state of Hawaii led to the College’s introduction of Music & Entertainment Learning Experience (MELE) courses through a federally funded grant under Title III in 2007. The success and growing popularity of the courses resulted in the institutionalization of the program and its Associate of Science degree in Music Business or Audio Engineering. MELE degrees have been approved by ACCJS-WASC, and were initially a part of the Liberal Arts program. In 2011, MELE, due to its workforce-related courses, was moved to the Tech II division.

Honolulu Community College has established itself as a premier career and technical training center in the state of Hawaii. The programs above represent the College’s response to the needs of the state and community. Twenty-three CTE programs span the field of transportation, trades, communication, and services. Thirteen CTE programs are unique in the UH system. They include the following programs: Aeronautics Maintenance Technology, Applied Trades, Commercial Aviation, Communication Arts, CENT, Cosmetology, Industrial Education, MELE, Occupational & Environmental Safety Management, Refrigeration & Air Conditioning, Sheet Metal & Plastics Technology, Small Vessel Fabrication & Repair, and Welding Technology. Each program defines its mission, program description, student learning outcomes, and program course requirements in the College catalog. To ensure compliance with these guidelines and that students receive the best training possible, each program maintains strong ties with industry leaders who participate on advisory committees that regularly review curriculum.

Research and Analysis: The College uses a wide variety of research data in the creation of all new programs. A primary source of data is the State Department of Labor and Industrial Relations (DLIR). [Department of Labor and Industrial Relations] The DLIR has a particularly useful data search engine, titled the Workforce Informer, which provides projections of State workforce requirements.
The College’s MIR office is part of the UH System organization known as the UH IR Cadre. This body creates a wide variety of Management and Planning Support reports. These reports include:

- Courses Registration Reports
- Degrees and Certificates Earned
- Fall, Spring, and Summer Enrollment Reports
- High-School Background of First-Time Students
- Professional-Clerical-Ratio Report (Fiscal Year)
- Transfer Patterns of Undergraduate Students

In the past, the College’s MIR office collected data and produced an annual Program Health Indicators report for each of the College’s programs. They included numeric measures to determine if the program was maintaining the necessary levels of demand, efficiency, and outcomes. Programs with poor health indicators were analyzed to determine how they could be adjusted to improve their health. The College receives a data set of common quantitative indicators from the UHCC system (aggregated by UHCC system IR personnel) that assists programs in their annual program review. This data set is then supplemented with additional required information from the College. In the Assessment Reports AY10-11, there were thirty-three common data sets for the CTE programs and twenty-six for the Liberal Arts program.

EVIDENCE
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Honolulu English Language Academy (HELA)

Native Hawaiian Center

Po’i Na Nalu

TRIO-Student Support Service

Computing, Electronics & Networking Technologies (CENT)

Additional CENT Links

Pacific Center for Advanced Technology Training (PCATT)
The College meets the Standard.

The recent UH System agreement to adopt a common IR data set of thirty-three and twenty-six items will help to analyze a program’s successes and deficiencies. However, it is expected that the data set may have to be adjusted as the Annual Assessment and Program Review cycles mature. Program personnel will be the first to detect these deficiencies and will initiate the needed changes.

Although analysis of IR data has been important in the decision to make changes to a particular program’s curriculum, many changes come from the faculty after consultation with industry leaders including those that were members of the program's Advisory Committees at least once each semester to discuss the changes in the industry that may necessitate changes in the curriculum. Thereafter, most program personnel maintain continual contact with these industry leaders. During the summer break some faculty members are employed or act as consultants in their specialty field. Consequently, program administrators are keenly aware of new changes affecting the industry.

Although research data remain important in identifying the need for the creation of new programs, creating new programs that are appropriate and effective in meeting industry needs is due primarily to the dynamic efforts of the faculty and administration. This requires that the faculty and administration keep well informed of cutting-edge educational methods to effectively and efficiently meet industry needs. The College has established key partnerships vital to the success of its new programs. As examples, please refer to the MELE and AVIT programs.

**Actionable Improvement Plans**
No action is required.

II.A.1.b. The institution utilizes delivery systems and modes of instruction compatible with the objectives of the curriculum and appropriate to the current and future needs of its students.

Descriptive Summary

The College utilizes delivery systems and modes of instruction compatible with the objectives of its curriculum and appropriate to the current and future needs of its students. The College is particularly concerned about accommodating the diversity of its student population. College has adjusted classroom delivery and modes of instruction to accommodate students with physical or learning disabilities and to comply with the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA), Title II, and the Rehabilitation Act, Section 504. The College offers sign language interpreters, note takers, readers, lab assistants, scribes, cassette recorders, talking calculators, amplification devices, audio recorded text, enlarged printed materials, and tables that will accommodate wheel chairs. Computer laboratories provide large screen monitors, ball track mice, special keyboards, and special software that will expand the screen image, or translate text into an audio format. The Faculty Development Committee has offered workshops on producing ADA compliant Web sites for on-line DE courses. [Committee on Disability Access - Honolulu; College Catalog].

Faculty have implemented a new concept of teaching called Universal Design for Instruction (UDI) developed by the University of Connecticut. UDI is an approach to teaching that consists of the proactive design and use of inclusive instructional strategies that benefit a broad range of learners including students with disabilities. These courses are designed to also accommodate a student population that is diverse in educational background, age, gender, culture, ability, disability, and primary language [Committee on Disability Access - Honolulu; College Catalog].

Cultural diversity is reflected in the ethnic diversity of the students. 25% of the College’s student population speaks English as their second language. The Faculty Development Committee has provided the faculty with “Teaching Tips” that include tips on how to best deliver a course to accommodate the diverse student population. [Faculty Development Committee]

High Tech Classrooms: The College uses a variety of high tech, state-of-the-art delivery systems to meet the needs of the students. 128 of the classrooms at HCC are now multimedia classrooms [Educational Media Center] that are permanently equipped with overhead projectors linked to a computer and digital versatile disc/videocassette recorder (DVD/VCR) that allow the instructor to present material in a variety of formats. There are 86 systems with video projector/screens and 19 systems with large array (52" +) LCD Monitors [Educational Media Center]. 21 classrooms also implement SMART technology (8 SMART Boards and 13 SMART Symposiums). SP and Calypso Control
digital control systems of media devices with video projector equipped classrooms are available in approximately 28 classrooms. The EMC also has a video studio where cable television (TV) DE courses are taped. [Educational Media Center]

Most instructors prefer to use Power Point presentations to visually enhance their delivery. With today’s larger memory capacity, presentations can easily include an array of video and audio clips. Some instructors have created instructional Web sites that they access during the classroom presentation. The introduction of Laulima has given instructors easy access to created Web sites for their classes. Laulima is the University of Hawaii’s online Collaboration and Learning Environment. It provides students with accessibility to course content and communication tools for interaction with the instructor and other students within the course. A course offered through Laulima can be accessed 24 hours a day, 7 days a week via the Internet. Some courses will use Laulima as a supplement to their traditional face-to-face course. Other courses will deliver all of the course material, testing, and communication within Laulima as a totally online course. This type of delivery essentially expands classroom interaction and allows student to access course materials online.

Computer Laboratories: The College has many classroom or program computer laboratories. There are 49 separate computer laboratories and over 700 computers for a student population of over 4000. Some laboratories are open for student use; others are specifically designed for instructional purposes. Instructional laboratories are equipped with overhead projectors, scanners, and printers. Most computer laboratories are equipped with 10 to 25 computers with software tailored for the unique requirements of the program. All of the College’s computers are linked to a local area network with access to the Internet.

Three new laptop systems have been created where laptop computers stored on carts can be wheeled to the desired classroom (AJ, Ocean, and ESL programs). The computers link to the Internet via wireless connections. There is also another similar system using iPads instead of laptops (Humanities). [Educational Media Center]

Instructors can log on to a local HCC network that allows them to access their computer files anywhere on campus. The campus is now set up for Wi-Fi throughout the entire campus. Students can access the internet thorough personal laptops anywhere on campus.

Technical Facilities: Most of the CTE programs have state-of-the-art technical facilities that provide the needed hands-on training necessary for the students to achieve industry certification. These facilities constitute specialized delivery systems where instructors must be certified in the use of the equipment as well as utilize specialized modes of instruction which is much different than the traditional laboratory. For example, the Commercial Aviation (AVIT) program has four aircraft, three single-engine and one twin-engine aircraft. Each is equipped with the latest navigation equipment, including global positioning systems (GPS) avionics. The program also has an advanced flight simulator that provides the needed simulated flight instrument training.
The Aeronautics Maintenance Technology (AERO) program facility has a variety of fixed wing and helicopter aircraft, including a complete DC-9 passenger aircraft donated by American Airlines. These aircraft provide the needed hands-on experience of repairing modern aircraft, including repair of avionics, airframe, and engine systems. Students have the option to receive an Aviation Maintenance Technician Certificate, an AS Degree in Aeronautics Maintenance Technology, or transfer to a 4-year program to obtain a Aviation Systems Management Degree.

The Automotive Technology (AMT) program facility has a modern state-of-the-art repair shop. The program has maintained its National Automotive Technology Education Foundation (NATEF) certification since 1993, undergoing a review every five years. The program has equipment to repair any mechanical or electrical component of an automobile.

The Auto Body Repair and Painting (ABRP) program facility has all the modern equipment including frame repair and an OSHA approve state-of-the-art paint booth.

The Small Vessel Fabrication and Repair (VESL) program holds its classes in the METC located on Sand Island, Oahu. The METC is located on Keehi Lagoon and is a state-of-the-art training facility. It features four large work bays to allow work on vessels up to 45 feet, a concrete pier equipped with two cranes to allow work on vessels in the water, finger piers for removing vessels from the water employing a marine straddle-lift, as well as classroom, laboratory, and office space.

Distance Education: Through the campus reorganization process, the College has developed a unit called Educational Technology. This group is made up of five positions that support distance education and other technology resources for instruction. Two full-time faculty members provide guidance, brownbag workshops and one-on-one assistance to faculty and students in DE courses. Three support personnel provide assistance in terms of website design and other instructional support.

The College offers over 70 approved DE courses. They are delivered in three different ways: on-line over the Internet, cable TV, or a combination of cable and online. The College’s cable TV courses also provide DVD disks through the Library for missed broadcasts to allow students more flexibility in their schedule.

The Faculty Development Committee has facilitated courses in Web design including interactive Web methods that allow on-line interaction between students and instructor. For some DE courses at HCC the UH System ITS provides video on demand that allows the instructors to video stream their lecture over the Internet.

Presently, there is no program at HCC that offers a degree solely delivered through DE. However, because of existing General Education articulation agreements, a student seeking an AA degree can take a majority of their courses via DE from any of the colleges within the UH System.
All DE courses must go through a rigorous review before they are approved for delivery. DE courses must first be reviewed and approved by the DE Review Board before the courses are forwarded to the CPC. The DE Review Board ensures that the policies outlined in the ACCJC Distance Education Manual and as outlined in the College’s Curriculum Handbook are followed. Review procedures are similar to the review of any other course, but emphasis is placed on maintaining content integrity, assessment integrity, and support service access. (See Standard II.2 below for more on the Curriculum review process to maintain the quality of DE courses.) The College has achieved the ACCJC substantive change approval for DE delivery for the Associate of Science in FIRE and the Associate of Arts degree.

**Pedagogical Diversity:** Students at the College are very fortunate to have instructors who are sensitive to their cultural background, life situations and learning styles. These dedicated instructors spend a significant amount of their faculty workload to creatively modify their curriculum and teaching styles to accommodate the varied learning needs of their students. Examples of the delivery modes and teaching approaches include the following:

Students in some CTE programs apply the knowledge gained in lectures and the hands on skills from the lab to actual projects on the College campus. For example, SMP students work on live campus projects from writing the bid, to fabrication, to installation, to cost analysis.

Students in a Family Resources class are able to take their exams in modules. With such a large amount of information, the instructor allows students to take the exam in separate chunks. For example, student can review the first set of topics, take the exam for those topics, turn in the exam, and then move on to the exam for the next set of topics.

Students in an online logic course are able to learn the complicated concepts in the course through clear, well thought out web presentations. Students appreciate the opportunity to do the work at their convenience anytime of the day or night. Other students across the state, out of state, and across the globe appreciate the opportunity to take Logic as a DE course.

Students in an ESL class are out in the community performing service learning and practicing their English skills.

Students in a cosmetology course learn through Mindful Teaching Techniques developed by Pivot Point. The focus is on concrete ways of teaching the learner by determining readiness, engaging in thinking, supporting performance and promoting responsibility.

**Self Evaluation**

The College meets the Standard.

The classrooms, computer laboratories, and other technical facilities adequately support
the delivery of the diverse technical curriculum the College offers. The results of a recent ITC Survey confirm this. Over 61% of those that have used the College’s laboratory computers say that the computer facilities are good to excellent and 77% said they were fair to excellent [Spring 2011 ITC/TDS Labs Survey]. A recent DE survey revealed that of the students who took a Web DE course, less than 3% thought the course was poor while 86% thought the course was good to excellent. [Fall 2011 DE Survey] Less than 9% of those in CTE felt the shop tools and shop equipment were poor. All instructional programs are scheduled to conduct an Annual Assessment or Program Review during the Fall 2012 semester. Strengths and deficiencies in delivery methods, equipment, and technical facilities will be revealed in these reports.

EVIDENCE

Laulima at Leeward EMC

Distance Education

Courses Approved By Distance Education Review Board Honolulu Community College

DE Fall 2011 Survey Summary

Spring 2011 ITC/TDS Labs Survey

Fall 2009 ITC/TDS/Labs Survey

Guide to Evaluating Distance Education and Correspondence Education

Curriculum Reference Manual

Actionable Improvement Plans

No action is required.

II.A.1.c. The institution identifies student learning outcomes for course, programs, certificates, and degrees; assesses student achievement of those outcomes; and uses assessment results to make improvements.

Descriptive Summary

The College has identified SLOs for all of its courses and programs. These SLOs can be found on the college’s website at and the Assessment Web page. Campus policy requires that the program SLOs are assessed each year during the Annual Assessment in addition to the Program Review conducted every five years. The assessment results are analyzed to identify weaknesses in the program, and a list of corrective actions is published in the reports. These annual reports have been performed for the past six years and the vast majority of programs include an assessment of their SLOs.
The campus hired an assessment specialist after the last self-study in 2006 to assist with helping the college conduct annual reviews of instructional programs including the assessment of student achievement and the use of this data to make program improvements. It became apparent in 2010 that having one person in charge of assessment was not the best model. Instead, the assessment specialist was reassigned to support DE as one of the campus priorities and the responsibility of assessment was placed on the Deans and Directors at the program level. If there are weaknesses in the curriculum, the curriculum will be adjusted and a curriculum change proposal will be forwarded to the CPC. If weaknesses in the program cannot be corrected internally because of funding shortfalls, a funding request will be included as a budget request that will go through the budget priority process and eventually be reviewed by the Planning Council. The Planning Council recommends priorities to all funding requests and forwards them to the Chancellor. Budget priorities that require new money and cannot be handled at the campus level by reallocation are then forwarded to the UH system Vice President for Community Colleges, the Board of Regents (Board), and the State legislators in the form of Program Change Requests (PCRs). (See Assessment/Program Review Flow Diagram in Standard II.A.2 below.)

**EVIDENCE**

- Course Descriptions
- Annual Assessment Template
- Program Review Template
- Assessment
- Program Review

**Self Evaluation**

The College meets the Standard.

Program SLOs and the assessment procedures are in place, and it appears that they will meet the College needs. The annual review process is functioning as intended to meet the Standard. From AY 05-06 to AY 09-10, all of the program review reports for all instructional programs are posted on the Intranet (See Program Reviews link above). The comprehensive reports are listed together with the annual reports.

Instructional programs have completed six cycles of their Annual Reviews. Nearly all have stated that they have achieved their programs’ learning outcomes. (See Standard II.A.2 below for a further description of the completed Program Review results.)

**Actionable Improvement Plans**
II.A.2. The institution assures the quality and improvement of all instructional courses and programs offered in the name of the institution, including collegiate, developmental, and precollegiate courses and programs, continuing and community education, study abroad, short-term training courses and programs, programs for international students, and contract or other special programs, regardless of type of credit awarded, delivery mode, or location.

Descriptive Summary

Since the last accreditation cycle, the College has made major strides to assure the quality and improvement of all credit and non-credit courses and programs it offers. The College has formed an Assessment Committee, established SLOs for its courses and programs, and established Annual Assessment and Program Review policies that require each program to assess its SLOs and make corrections to improve the curriculum based on the results of the assessment. A Planning Council has been formed to review the Strategic Plan and budgeting priorities based on what assessment reveals. The assessment process encompasses all programs, including developmental, continuing education, and short-term-training, regardless of the delivery mode or location. [Planning Council]

Assessment Committee and the Establishment of SLOs: The Assessment Committee, established in 2003, and the previous Assessment Specialist, hired in 2006, assisted faculty members in the development of SLOs for their courses and programs as well as to provide guidance in formulating assessment methods and tools to measure the success of the SLOs. [Assessment Committee] The results of these efforts have been very successful. Courses and programs, both credit and non-credit, are now described by their SLOs. Assessment methods are in place and all credit programs undergo Annual Assessment and Program Review processes. [Program Review]

Annual Assessment of SLOs: Major policies and procedures have been established to implement program assessment. The College policy requires that each instructional program undergo an Annual Assessment and report the findings by describing the results of the assessment activities that have occurred during the academic year. In addition to the review, many sets of data crucial to the report confirm that students are achieving the program’s SLOs. If the students are not achieving the SLOs, the report must identify the suspected area of weaknesses in the program, followed by the proposed curriculum change or other actions that will address the weaknesses. Proposed curriculum changes will be forwarded to the CPC for approval and then to the Planning Council if the changes require additional costs. The Annual Assessment and Program Review Flowchart shows the responsible committees and their required actions in the assessment process.
Annual Assessment Template: To ensure that the programs conduct the proper analyses and provide adequate information, the Assessment Committee and the previous Assessment Specialist created a report template to guide the programs in their assessment activities. The template was presented to the other community colleges in the UH System, and they have adopted it along with an agreement to have the IR Cadre provide specific sets of research data to be used in the assessment process. The types of research data sets that program administrators will receive are included in the template. [Annual Assessment Template]

To further assist the College’s programs, the Assessment Committee and the previous Assessment Specialist added guidance questions to ensure that specific criteria were developed:

- Have you listed your program SLOs in this report?
- What assessment methods did you use to measure the achievement of your program and course SLOs?
- Has a summary sheet been included showing the results of the assessment?
- What is your analysis of the assessment results?
- If you have detected weakness in the assessment analysis, what curriculum changes or other corrective actions do you propose? What are the estimated financial costs to complete these corrective actions?
- What role did the Advisory Committee play in the creation of SLOs, assessment, analysis, and action recommended?

Other Quality Indicators: A program’s Annual Assessment may reveal potential weaknesses leading to deterioration in the quality of the program, even though SLOs are being achieved. Some examples of these weaknesses are new technology advancements not being included in the curriculum, a shop or laboratory lacking adequate equipment to meet advancing industry standards, the number of qualified instructors in the lecture pool decreasing, or the number of applicants to the program decreasing. The CTE programs rely on the members of their Advisory Committees to keep them current on technology and equipment changes within the industry. If weaknesses are observed, the report must include recommended actions to overcome these potential weaknesses along with the estimated costs of these actions. These costs will be included in the program’s budget request and, if necessary, inclusion in the Strategic Plan to be approved by the Planning Council.

Research Data: Accurate and timely research data is provided to the program personnel in order for them to properly evaluate the health and future status of their programs. A common set of research data has been identified that is provided to each program. The data set is quite extensive (twenty-seven separate data sets) and provides the programs with enough information to determine the job-market demand and the cost efficiency of running the program.

Program Review: Both instructional and non-instructional programs conduct a Program Review every five years. Although the Program Review requires gathering more
information, the Program Review is similar to the Annual Assessment and requires similar responses in the report. Instructional programs will therefore use the data collected during the Annual Assessment cycles for inclusion in the Program Review. Flow of the Program Review process is the same as the Annual Assessment process. [Program Review Template]

Courses and programs have established SLOs. All of the credit and non-credit programs began their Annual Assessments in the spring of 2006. These include:

**Collegiate Programs:** Including CTE and the LBART program, twenty-five programs offer degrees. All collegiate programs are assessed annually.

**Pre-collegiate and Developmental Courses:** As described in Standard II.A.1, the College offers a series of entry-level math and English courses designed to bring the student up to program level. These courses are taught by the Math and English program faculty. The Math courses include: Math 9: Fundamental of Mathematics, Math 24: Elementary Algebra I and Math 25: Elementary Algebra II. Based on data and national best practices, the Underprepared Student Task Force developed an Essentials Curriculum that has overhauled the way English is taught to provide college students fundamental skills to fulfill their degree programs while also being competitive in today’s workforce. The English curriculum includes: ENG 8 Reading Essentials I, ENG 9: Writing Essentials I, ENG 18: Reading Essentials II, ENG 19 Writing Essentials II, ENG 21 Developmental Reading and ENG 22: Intro to Expository Writing. The Essentials English Curriculum is taught in the Essentials English Complex, a three building complex that was renovated over the 2011 winter break and includes a student lounge, computer lab and classrooms equipped with flat screen TVs and student laptops. [Essential English - April 21, 2011]

Instruction combines lecture and online computer programs, such as My Writing Lab and Reading Plus. The ESL Department offers six non-credit Introduction to College English (ICE) classes designed to teach recent immigrants written and oral communication skills to prepare for college or work. [Introduction to College English (ICE)]

**Continuing and Community Education:** The College is undergoing a reorganization of the Continuing and Community Education programs. Currently the Pacific Center for Advanced Technology Training (PCATT) is a division of the College and provides leadership and training in advanced technologies to enhance economic and workforce development programs and initiatives in the State of Hawaii of the Pacific Rim. The College has an Emeritus College, which responds to the special educational needs and requirements of senior citizens and of persons near retirement. The Emeritus College offers a continuing series of non-credit workshops and serves as a center of support and assistance for senior students wishing to enroll in any of the HCC’s programs, either credit or non-credit.

Pacific Center for Advanced Technology Training (PCATT)

Continuing Education and Training
Short-Term Training Courses: The College offers a wide range of non-credit skill upgrading courses for in-service automotive technicians, collision-repair specialists, and diesel technicians throughout the year. These short courses prepare the student for the National Institute for Automotive Service Excellence (ASE) certification exams. In addition, the College offers non-credit skill upgrading and professional licensure training in welding, electrical installation and maintenance, plumbing and Occupational Safety and Health Administration. Short-term, non-credit training in Music and Entertainment and Learning Experience (MELE) is being developed and will be offered to the community during the Spring 2012 semester. The Early Childhood Education (ECE) program offers Professional and Career Education (PACE) for Early Childhood, a series of short-term courses that deliver formal training for the National Child Development Associate (CDA) credential. These courses have the same content as the ECE program’s credit courses and therefore are covered in the program’s Annual Assessment and Program Review.

Music & Entertainment Learning Experience (MELE)

Professional and Career Education for Early Childhood (PACE)

Off-Campus Programs: The College is a member of the Service Members Opportunity Colleges Associate Degrees Program (SOCAD) and provides delivery of courses Hickam Air Force Base, Pearl Harbor Naval Station and Moanalua High School. The College’s Off-Campus Program help military members and dependents achieve their academic and educational goals. The program assists with the Servicemember’s Opportunity College (SOC) Agreement that allows members to transfer equivalent courses back to HCC upon moving to their next duty station. All courses offered are from the College’s approved curriculum.

Off Campus Education Program

Contractual Programs: The College coordinates the related instruction training for most of the State-registered construction and technology apprenticeship programs. Each apprenticeship program develops its own related instruction curriculum. These curricula are reviewed by the College’s Apprenticeship office and approved by the State DLIR. Each apprenticeship training program has at least one training coordinator and most have training committees. The responsibility of regularly reviewing and updating curricula rests primarily with these coordinators and/or committees. The College’s Apprenticeship staff assists the programs in an advisory capacity. The Apprenticeship office of the College also provides instructor training and professional development opportunities for apprenticeship instructors. Although the College provides guidance, the curriculum is controlled outside of the College and therefore does not fall under the assessment policies. The College also provides the delivery of the Associate of Science in Applied Trades to those students who have gained entry into the Pearl Harbor Naval Shipyard Apprenticeship program. This unique contract requires the College to deliver general education courses on the Naval Base while employees train on the specific skill set they will need through the co-operative education component of the program.
Apprenticeship Resources

Self Evaluation

The College meets the Standard.

The College has established procedures to ensure the quality of instruction is met. SLOs have been identified for credit and non-credit courses and programs. Assessment tools have been identified, and an Annual Assessment is scheduled for each program each year. The results of the Annual Assessments process are used to verify and improve each program. A Program Reviews schedule has been established for each instructional and non-instructional program. Each program has been through at least one Program Review.

Actionable Improvement Plans

No action is required.

II.A.2.a. The institution uses established procedures to design, identify learning outcomes for, approve, administer, deliver, and evaluate courses and programs. The institution recognizes the central role of its faculty for establishing quality and improving instructional courses and programs.

Descriptive Summary

The College uses established procedures to identify learning outcomes for, design, approve, administer, deliver, and evaluate courses and programs. The evaluation of existing courses and programs is performed through an established procedure of Annual Assessments and Program Reviews as described in Standard II.A.2. If these evaluation reports determine that a curriculum change is required, the change proposal must follow a rigid review process.

To ensure that the highest quality of instruction is maintained, all new or revised credit courses and programs must follow established procedures and be reviewed by two curriculum committees, the Division Curriculum Committee (DCC) and the Committee on Programs and Curricula (CPC). These established procedures are outlined in the College’s Curriculum Reference Manual. [Curriculum Reference Manual] This Manual was last revised during the summer of 2010, and updated in summer 2012. The Honolulu Community College curriculum is an integrated body of principles, knowledge, values, and skills. Its mission is to provide learning experiences that enable individuals to function effectively in school, workplace, home, and community. This Manual describes in detail the step-by-step process for curricular actions, including the make-up of the two curriculum committees and procedures for voting for each committee. In addition the CPC Charter specifies the membership and voting status of the Committee, and was revised in Spring 2012 to accommodate the inclusion of the Chairs of new Divisions created as a result of reorganization. [CPC Charter]
Division Curriculum Committee

Committee on Programs and Curricula

Curriculum Reference Manual

CPC Charter

A course-change proposal must be submitted whenever there is a change in a course’s title, description, prerequisites, or SLOs. The manual requires that specific forms be completed to ensure that the proposal is submitted with sufficient information so that committee members can make an informed decision. The proposal must include a statement on the impact the change will have on other courses and the program as a whole. A change to more than one course in a program is considered a change to the program curriculum and will be reviewed to determine the impact on the program’s SLOs.

On-line Curriculum Proposal Forms have been developed and are used for curriculum action. They are accessed on the HCC Intranet. The forms are created in Microsoft Word and allow those involved with the curriculum action to save and modify the contents. There are basic forms available to add a new course; modify, deactivate or delete an existing course, and make changes to a program.

Proposers are encouraged to work closely with their division chair when proposing curricular actions. Completed forms must be forwarded to the Division Chair in accordance with the Curriculum Reference Manual. Following approval by the Division Chair, curricular change proposals are reviewed by the DCC and then by the campus-wide CPC. Both committees ensure that SLOs meet the stated goals and fall within the program’s mission. The committees also review the SLOs and course content to ensure that the depth, breadth, and rigor are maintained at appropriate college-level standards. When several courses are changed to modify a program, the committees review the sequencing of courses to ensure that adequate prerequisite preparation is achieved. Most programs expect their students to complete a degree within two years or a certificate within one year. Most programs require 60 credit hours for a degree, which averages to fifteen credit hours each semester. These credit-hour requirements are within the norms of higher education. In addition, the College is in compliance with a credit hour definition that is consistent with the Carnegie Unit, “one hour of classroom or direct faculty instruction and a minimum of two hours of out of class student work each week for approximately 15 weeks for one semester or trimester hour of credit, or ten to twelve weeks for one quarter hour of credit, or the equivalent amount of work over a different amount of time.” [U.S. Department Of Education Final Regulations on Program Integrity and Student Aid]

The three flow diagrams in the Curriculum Proposal Flow Charts show the curriculum approval process. Selecting which flow process to follow depends on whether the
A proposal is a minor change, a change to a program, a major change, or a change to a General Education course. All flow diagrams show that the DE board first reviews all DE courses before they are reviewed by the DCC and CPC. [Distance Education Review Board] How the DE board functions to maintain the quality of DE courses is outlined in Standard II.A.2.d. The middle flow diagram shows that changes to a General Education course or curriculum must first be reviewed by the General Education board via the Articulation board(s). (See Standard II.A.3. below to learn how the General Education board functions and how articulation agreements are maintained.) (Flow diagrams are located on page 17 of the Curriculum Reference Manual.)

Major changes to a program must be forwarded through the UH System for final Board of Regents (BOR) approval before they are presented to ACCJC/WASC for accreditation approval. General Education courses are forwarded through the UH System to ensure articulation agreements are followed.

Various campuses throughout the UH system are at different stages of implementing Curriculum Central. The campus liaisons meet via conference call each Wednesday to receive updates from the lead programmer regarding the latest developments in the software. Honolulu CC is preparing for implementation by doing the following: (1) existing curriculum hard copy files are being scanned and inputted into the Curriculum Central system, to serve as a repository for current and archival information, and also as the information base to enter data into the Curriculum Central database; (2) the Curriculum Central database is being developed by the programmer using existing Honolulu CC curriculum forms as templates. If work proceeds as planned, Honolulu CC should be ready for implementation (testing phase) in Spring 2013, with actual adoption of the system in Fall 2014.

The BOR recognizes the central role of its faculty for establishing quality and improving instructional courses and programs and the need for the faculty to control the curriculum: “... the faculty has primary responsibility for such fundamental academic areas as curriculum content, subject matter, and methods of instruction and research. On these matters the poser of review and concurrence or final decision lodged in the Board of Regents or delegated to administrative officers should be exercised adversely only in exceptional circumstances and for reasons communicated to the faculty.” [Board of Regents Policies and Bylaws - Chapter I General Provisions]

The faculty members have primary responsibility and oversight of all credit curricula at the College. The DCC and the CPC are subcommittees of the FSEC. DCC members are elected by their respective divisions, and except for the Division Chairs, the CPC members are appointed by the FSEC Chair in consultation with the Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs (VCAA). Faculty members of these committees are the only voting members. Most courses are created by the same instructor that teaches the course. As long as course SLOs are met, academic freedom allows the instructor to deliver the course in the manner that best fits the instructor’s teaching style.

**Self Evaluation**
The College meets the Standard.

Faculty members design courses and programs and establish SLOs with the assistance of the Assessment Committee, the previous Assessment Specialist and Advisory Committees. The Curriculum Reference Manual provides established procedures to review content, SLOs, administration, and delivery of a course or program. There is an established Annual Assessment and Program Review process to evaluate programs to determine if the quality and viability of the program are being maintained. The faculty members play a central role in establishing the quality and improvements of the curriculum as evidenced by the fact that all reviewing bodies (Assessment Committee, General Education Council, DE Review Board, DCC, and CPC) are composed of faculty members.

**Actionable Improvement Plans**

No action is required.

**II.A.2.b. The institution relies on faculty expertise and the assistance of Advisory Committees when appropriate to identify competence levels and measurable student learning outcomes for courses, certificates, programs including general and vocational education, and degrees. The institution regularly assesses student progress toward achieving those outcomes.**

**Descriptive Summary**

The College relies on faculty expertise and the assistance of Advisory Committees when appropriate to identify competence levels and measurable SLOs for courses and programs. The strong role of the faculty in curriculum development was addressed in Standards II.A.2 and II.A.2.a. Advisory Committees also play a major role in the development and assessment of the College’s programs. Each CTE program has an Advisory Committee, where members are prominent, successful citizens, who are genuinely interested in the quality of education in the program. The names and organizations of the Advisory Committee members are listed in the catalog under each program description. Members are often practitioners in the applicable field, and many are successful business owners that often hire the programs’ graduates. Most Advisory Committees meet every semester, others yearly. Completed Program Reviews contain statements regarding the important role the Advisory Committees had played in curriculum development. Advisory committees also assisted in the development of the programs’ SLOs and suggested possible assessment methods. Each program will regularly assess student progress toward achieving SLOs and report their findings in the Annual Assessment and Program Review reports. The guidelines require that the report include the contributions that the Advisory Committees have made in the development of the program, including the creation and assessment of program SLOs.

**Self Evaluation**
The College meets the Standard.

The role of the faculty members and Advisory Committees in curriculum development including the identification of competency levels and learning outcomes has been essential. Advisory committees have been essential in keeping the programs informed of new industry developments. Their active role in curriculum development has been essential in maintaining the quality of the College’s programs. Completed Annual Assessments and Program Reviews comment on the strong role their Advisory Committees play in the development of their curricula, including the establishment of SLOs.

**Actionable Improvement Plans**

No action is required.

**II.A.2.c. High-quality instruction and appropriate breadth, depth, rigor, sequencing, time to completion, and synthesis of learning characterize all programs.**

**Descriptive Summary**

**High-Quality Instruction:** The College has taken major steps to assess the quality of its courses and ensure SLOs are achieved. Annual Assessments and Program Reviews measure quality of instruction. The Career and Technical Education (CTE) and Liberal Arts programs at the College use several assessment methods to evaluate student achievement of SLOs. They include:

- Portfolios/Final Projects
- Industry Certifications
- Performance Exams
- Tracking Student Employment
- Student Surveys
- Knowledge Surveys
- Performance Exams
- Exit Exams
- Embedded Assessments

**Survey Instruments/Results**

However, the true quality of education depends on the quality of the instructors and their capability to engage the student and deliver ideas in a clear and logical fashion. Ideally, each instructor is someone who is highly educated, loves teaching, and is willing to spend a significant number of hours in course preparation. To this end, the College and the UH System follow strict guidelines for the steps necessary for a faculty member to be hired, promoted, and awarded tenure. These steps are part of the University of Hawai‘i Professional Assembly/Board of Regents agreement. [UHPA Faculty Contract]
All new applicants are first interviewed by a personnel screening committee of experienced faculty and staff members. Applicants hired for a tenure-track position are placed on probationary status for five years before they can apply for tenure. During that time, they must apply to renew their contract every two years. The contract renewal application must include a self-evaluation report of the teaching performance for the previous years. Included in the evaluation are student evaluations of each course taught. Also included are peer evaluations of class observations. The instructor is expected to comment on each criticism in the evaluations and state the action to be taken to improve the area of criticism. The instructor’s application is reviewed by the Division Personnel Committee, the Dean, and the VCAA before it is forwarded to the Chancellor for final approval. Each review step requires comments on the instructor’s strengths and weaknesses along with a recommendation to either terminate or renew the contract.

New instructors normally have a mentor assigned to them to provide guidance throughout the probation period. For those in tenure-track positions, at the end of five years the instructor must apply for tenure or request an extension of the probationary period. This tenure application requires more information than the previous contract renewal applications and must include campus involvement such as committee participation as well as off-campus community service. The tenure application is first reviewed by a panel of the unit’s faculty and then by the Tenure and Promotion Review Committee composed of faculty members from the College as well as faculty members from other units in the UH System. If awarded tenure and promoted to Assistant Professor, the instructor must serve three years before applying for the next promotion. The promotion application must again include a self-evaluation, student evaluations, and instructor evaluations as well as descriptions of campus and community service. Tenured full Professors are subject to a review every five years at the discretion of the Chancellor. [Faculty Development Reappointment/Tenure]

Faculty Development: Professional scholars realize that continuing education and self-improvement are lifelong pursuits. To assist in these pursuits, the College’s Faculty Development Committee, with members representing each division of the College, is dedicated to aggressively supporting the ongoing personal and professional growth of all faculty members. By providing information, training, forums, connections, and other support services and activities, the Faculty Development program vitalizes the faculty, strengthens the College, improves the quality of instruction, and helps the College to better serve the community. The College also employs a full-time faculty member who is responsible for Faculty Development coordination at the campus and represents the College in system-wide professional development activities. Each year, the committee offers between 50 and 60 training and educational activities. The committee also facilitates a Web site that offers an array of professional development and teaching assistance resources and links to other education-related Web sites. [Faculty Development Committee]

The committee members assess the professional development needs of the faculty each semester and then plan and deliver activities in response to these assessments. Activities
are often coordinated with other College committees and offices to broaden the scope of delivering professional development activities to all of the College’s faculty and staff members. An evaluation form that has been developed is collected from attendees at activities. Improvements are made, and future activities are offered in response to these evaluations. The committee members establish the application criteria and distribution procedures for the yearly $10,000 to $20,000 provided by the College for faculty professional development, which generally includes attendance at local and Mainland workshops, seminars, conferences, and membership in professional organizations.

Professional Development has emerged as a College Strategic Initiative. Funding for the current fiscal years for Professional Development is set at $45,000. This will fund Professional Development activities, including sabbaticals, for faculty and staff.

**Breadth, Depth, and Rigor:** The appropriate breadth, depth, rigor, sequencing, time to completion, and synthesis of learning characterize all programs. This statement is based on the premise that high quality instructors will ensure that breadth, depth, and rigor are maintained in the content of their courses. Annual Assessment and Program Review findings also address these issues and identify needed changes. In addition, the Curriculum Reference Manual directs the DCC and CPC to review all new programs or program changes to ensure that the appropriate breadth, depth, and rigor are maintained at the appropriate college level and that courses are appropriately sequenced with the proper prerequisites. The DCC and CPC ensures that the appropriate type and number of General Education courses are included in each program to ensure that the synthesis of learning produces a well-rounded citizen capable of proper decision making.

In addition, the College has written a policy on General Education. The purpose of this policy is to establish a philosophy and rationale for General Education as a part of Board of Regents’ approved credentials offered by Honolulu Community College, and establish a framework for General Education for Associate Degrees offered by Honolulu Community College.

The policy was approved by the Committee on Programs and Curricula and the Faculty Senate Executive Committee in Spring 2012. The College’s General Education curriculum has comprehensive learning outcomes and ensures that students are able to meet these outcomes. These outcomes include the development of:

- Understanding the basic content and methodology of major areas of knowledge, including humanities and fine arts, natural sciences, and social sciences;
- Skills necessary to be a productive individual and lifelong learner, which include oral and written communication, information competency, computer literacy, scientific and quantitative reasoning, critical analysis/logical thinking, and the acquisition of knowledge through a variety of means; and
- Qualities necessary to be an ethical human being and effective citizen. These include an appreciation of ethical principles, civility and interpersonal skills, respect for cultural diversity, historical and aesthetic sensitivity, and the willingness to assume civic, political and social responsibilities locally, nationally and globally.
The goal of relevant general education is to prepare students to adapt to changes in their environment and to instill a desire for life-long learning. The acceptance of the inevitability of change and the development of coping skills and attitudes to meet the growing demands of the family, the workplace, and society as a whole will contribute to the individual's well-being. The specific HCC degree requirements for all Career and Technical Education (CTE) associate degrees are detailed in the appendix of the policy.

Given the comprehensive nature of Honolulu Community College’s General Education curriculum for all programs, the need to be in full compliance with the expectations of our accreditors, and the varying needs of individual programs, the college will implement new options for ways in which the General Education component of CTE programs can be met. These options include an updated set of designated courses, as well as alternative means of meeting the requirements of each of those requirements detailed in the appendix of the policy. These new requirements will be implemented effective Fall 2012.

Self Evaluation

The College meets the Standard.

Instructors must undergo an intense peer review process before being hired, promoted, and selected for tenure. This process ensures a high quality instructor, who is capable of designing courses and curriculum that provides sufficient breadth, depth, and rigor at the appropriate level. The breadth, depth, and rigor of the programs are reflected in student responses gathered in the 2008 Community College Survey of Student Engagement (CCSSE). [2008 CCSSE Institutional Report] Through the responses of all students surveyed, the College was above the mean in the following student engagement activities:

- Relationships with instructors
- Acquiring job or work-related knowledge and skills
- Developing clearer career goals
- Gaining information about career opportunities
- Job placement assistance

Actionable Improvement Plans

No action is required.

II.A.2.d. The institution uses delivery modes and teaching methodologies that reflect the diverse needs and learning styles of its students.

Descriptive Summary

The College uses delivery modes and teaching methodologies that reflect the diverse needs and learning styles of its students. This Standard was addressed in section II.A.1.b,
which described how the diverse ethnicity, culture, language skills, learning disabilities, and physical disabilities of the College’s student population require adjustments in teaching methodologies. It was also stressed that CTE programs that teach hands-on skills using the latest high tech equipment in state-of-the-art facilities require a different type of delivery and a different teaching methodology from the traditional lecture-lab delivery. Instructors in these high tech facilities must be highly skilled and well prepared to correctly, clearly, and safely demonstrate technical procedures.

There are substantial system-wide resources available that support faculty and students in distance education. Both Honolulu Community College and The University of Hawaii have extensive websites that provide those resources for faculty and students. There are testing facilities set up on all islands to ensure that proctoring is done properly. There is also a web server (Laulima) that can be used in support of all courses.

In addition, distance education students (and all students) have access to various student services. There are links on the main page of the college’s website to these services, which include such things as links to counselor’s email addresses, the records office, and financial aid.

The University of Hawaii’s Distance education website has specific links for DE students. Those links include: My UH Portal a web site designed to provide secure, personalized access to UH Services and Information such as registration and enrollment and encompasses a new suite of services including calendaring, email, and new course tools. DE students also have access to computer labs with Internet access. The ITS Help Desk may also help DE students by providing the UH community with a single, efficient resource for information regarding ITS Email information, connecting to the Internet, computer software and hardware recommendations and network status. The University of Hawaii system libraries offers additional support to the distance learner by encouraging the use of new technologies to deliver library services between Islands. Exam proctoring information is also provided because instructors require students to take exams at an on-campus proctoring office.

Academic Technologies also provides the Laulima (our web server) distance learning student with an orientation site to the Laulima Learning & Collaboration Server. The site offers textual, as well as, graphical information which answers frequently asked questions concerning Laulima. Information presented ranges from accessing Laulima to working with some of the most common Laulima tools that may be presented in a course. This service is very important because Laulima is used very frequently for all courses, but especially for distance education. Laulima is the learning and collaborative server used for enhancing face-to-face courses, conducting fully online courses, and facilitating collaborative groups.

For students registered for a cable course, general information on UH cable access programming is available on the University's UHTV webpage. UH programs a full channel of higher education cable programming for broadcast on Hawai‘i’s educational access cable channels (Olelo, Hoike, Na Leo O Hawaii, and MCCTV). The UH
programming service, or channel, is called UHTV. UHTV includes original programming from within the UH system (e.g., cable courses and UH produced informational programs) as well as programming selected by UH from other educational programming resources. UHTV is programmed by UH to meet the higher education needs of the people of Hawai‘i.

Distance education students also have access to two-way video services. Two-way video is facilitated through the Hawaii Interactive Television Service (HITS), a digital interactive video service using H.323 videoconferencing protocol to deliver High-Definition (HD) Telepresence. HITS2 was designed and optimized for delivering ITV courses within the UH System.

Although DE courses are derivations of successful courses delivered in the traditional classroom, the College is concerned that the quality of a DE course is maintained. A curriculum review process is in place to ensure that DE course proposals are specifically reviewed. The Distance Education Review Board (DERB) ensures that the policies outlined in the ACCJC Distance Education Manual [Guide to Evaluating Distance Education and Correspondence Education] and outlined in the College’s Curriculum Reference Manual are followed. Review procedures are similar to the review of any other course, but emphasis is placed on overcoming the weaknesses that are inherent in DE. The guidelines provided by DERB for proposers of DE courses ensure that all required elements of course design are included (e.g., a statement of SLOs, assessment methods clearly stated and based on work that can be authenticated, nature of student-student and student-instructor interactions, access to course materials) as well as statements of campus and system policy (e.g., access to support services, student conduct code.) The DE Review Board also ensures that the delivery mode is appropriate to the content of the course and that other resources are available to help students successfully complete DE courses. Students must be provided with information on equipment, skill requirements, and other resources needed to successfully complete a DE course. A self-assessment tool on the UH DE Web site helps students determine if DE learning meets their needs. [e-learn]

EVIDENCE

Laulima

Student Conduct Code

University of Hawaii Distance Learning

Services for Students

Two Way Video

HITS Frequently Asked Questions
Distance Learning Self Assessment

UH TV Programming

HITS2 Locations and Staff Sites

Public Computer Labs

Information Technology Services (ITS)

About the ITS Help Desk

UH Libraries

UH DL Proctoring Office Information

Laulima Orientation

Self Evaluation

The College meets the Standard.

Delivery modes and teaching methodologies to meet the needs of the curriculum and the diverse student population were addressed in Standard II.A.1.b. Quality of all courses, and in particular DE courses, is maintained through the structured review process as shown in the Curriculum Proposal Flow Chart as well as the review process of the Annual Assessment and Program Review. Interviews with instructors that teach DE courses indicate they are confident that quality is maintained, and integrity issues can be controlled as they are in a traditionally delivered class. Faculty is expected to carry out assessment of the course at the end of the term. On the downside, instructors report that they must spend two to three times the amount of time on DE courses as compared to time spent on traditional courses in preparation, delivery, and student interactions (e.g., e-mail or chat rooms). [Spring 2008 Distance Education Survey Summary Report] The College is confident that the quality of DE courses is high. This has been verified by the recent survey (2008) that revealed 85% of the students responded by agreeing or strongly agreeing to the question, “I would RECOMMEND or consider taking another course using the same delivery vehicle.” Only 5.9% disagreed or strongly disagreed to that question.

Actionable Improvement Plans

No action is required.

II.A.2.e. The institution evaluates all courses and programs through an ongoing systematic review of their relevance, appropriateness, achievement of learning outcomes, currency, and future needs and plans.
Descriptive Summary

This Standard was addressed in Standard II.A.2 and II.A.2.a. The College evaluates all courses and programs through an ongoing systematic review process. For instructional programs, there are two reviews: the Annual Assessment and the Program Review. The Program Review, which is conducted every five years, requires a more in-depth analysis than the Annual Assessment, but both review their relevance, appropriateness, achievement of SLOs, currency, future needs, and plans. If weaknesses are found, and curriculum changes are proposed, the proposals must go through the curriculum review process as shown in the Curriculum Proposal Flow Chart. Funding for the approved change will be reviewed and recommended by the Planning Council.

Self Evaluation

The College meets the Standard.

Annual Assessment and Program Reviews for all instructional programs are in place. Program personnel, in consultation with the Assessment Committee, have determined and implemented the assessment tools that best fit their programs.

Actionable Improvement Plans

No action is required.

II.A.2.f. The institution engages in ongoing, systematic evaluation and integrated planning to assure currency and measure achievement of its stated student learning outcomes for courses, certificates, programs including general and vocational education, and degrees. The institution systematically strives to improve those outcomes and makes the results available to appropriate constituencies.

Descriptive Summary

This Standard was addressed in Standard II.A.2 and II.A.2.a. The Annual Assessment and Program Review are systematic evaluation procedures that assess the achievement of each program’s SLOs. These assessment activities include both credit and non-credit programs. Reports from these assessment activities are distributed to all pertinent constituencies as shown in the Annual Assessment and Program Review Flowchart. If these reports recommend changes to the curriculum, they are forwarded from the program personnel to the CPC via the DCC. If these reports recommend changes that require additional funding for items such as new equipment or additional personnel, they are forwarded to the Planning Council. All reports will be reviewed by the Assessment Committee, which will validate the assessment methods and recommend future adjustments.

Self Evaluation
The College meets the Standard.

Systematic evaluations through the Annual Assessments and Program Reviews are in place. The Assessment Committee, the previous Assessment Specialist and other experts work with program administrators and program personnel to determine the optimum assessment methods for each program and these methods have been incorporated in the assessment evaluations of the programs.

**Actionable Improvement Plans**

No action is required.

**II.A.2.g. If an institution uses departmental course and/or program examinations, it validates their effectiveness in measuring student learning and minimizes test biases.**

**Descriptive Summary**

Assessment methods, including direct examinations to measure course and program SLOs, are in place. Various assessment tools utilized in General Education course are described in detail in IIA3. The report template guidelines for Annual Assessment and Program Review recommend methods of assessment, including methods of eliminating test bias. The Faculty Development Web site is also a primary source for reviewing various assessment methods, including tips on how to make exams valid, reliable, and balanced and avoid the biases of gender, age, ethnicity, cultural differences, educational background, and physical or mental disabilities. [Faculty Development Guidebook]

**Self Evaluation**

The College meets the Standard.

The Annual Assessment and Program Review guidelines include testing methods and verification to eliminate test bias. The Assessment Committee and Assessment Specialist have helped each program choose the best methods of assessment to be used in their Annual Assessment and Program Review. Several course clusters, including English 22 and English 100, collect aggregate data through Knowledge Surveys and other assessment methods, to standardize course delivery.

**Actionable Improvement Plans**

No action is required.

**II.A.2.h. The institution awards credit based on student achievement of the course’s stated learning outcomes. Units of credit awarded are consistent with institutional policies that reflect generally accepted norms or equivalencies in higher education.**
Descriptive Summary

SLOs have been established for all Credit courses. SLOs are described for every active credit course in the current online catalog and the course outlines given to each student at the beginning of the semester. Instructors are expected to teach and then assess all students to determine if they have met the SLOs. The degree that students meet these SLOs is the basis of grading each course.

Units of credit awarded are consistent with College policies that reflect generally accepted norms or equivalencies in higher education. Policies on the number of credits assigned to a course are outlined in the Curriculum Reference Manual. The number of credits awarded to a student adheres to the universally accepted hours of lecture per week. (e.g., if a semester course offers three hours of lecture per week, then the credits earned will be three credit hours). For a two or three hour laboratory each week, the student will be awarded one credit hour. For any new course, the CPC attempts to determine if the SLOs can be reasonably achieved within the credit hours requested. Conversely, the CPC also attempts to determine if the SLOs reflect the depth and breadth of the credits requested in the new course proposal.

Some CTE program courses have established a combination of one hour of lecture for every three hours of laboratory for two units of credit. However, most CTE programs teach their courses in one continuous block of time to allow for better concentration on the subject matter until the concepts and hands-on skills are mastered. For example, AMT teaches its Engines course from 7:00 AM to 11:45 AM each meeting day. Therefore, the one-hour lecture and three-hour laboratory have been converted to actual “contact” hours for the semester. This conversion equates one credit to every thirty contact hours of a combined one-hour lecture and three hour laboratory course. For example, the AMT Engines course is an eight-credit-hour course for a total of 240 hours of lecture and laboratory combined contact time for the semester (8 credits × 30 hours = 240 contact hours). The course descriptions in the catalog list the number of credits earned as well as the combined lecture-laboratory contact hours required.

Self Evaluation
The College meets the Standard.

All active credit courses have established SLOs as the basis for earning credit. SLOs can be reviewed in the current online catalog. It should be noted that many assessment actions that measure course SLOs are intended to measure the quality of instruction and are not used to determine a student’s grade. For example, “knowledge surveys” have been created for several high enrollment courses such as English 100 and ICS 100. Because these courses are General Education courses for many of the programs, uniformity of instruction is essential, and the survey determine if all SLOs are being met across all sections. If SLOs are not met, then adjustments are required. The units of credit awarded are within the accepted norms of higher education.

Actionable Improvement Plans
II.A.2.i. The institution awards degrees and certificates based on student achievement of a program’s stated learning outcomes.

Descriptive Summary

Successfully achieving each course’s SLOs in a program’s curriculum ensure that the students also achieve the program SLOs. Thus, degrees and certificates are awarded indirectly for the completion of the program’s SLOs. When a program decides to administer a required exit exam that specifically measures the achievement of the program’s SLOs, then there is a direct relationship between SLO achievement and the degree or certificate awarded.

Some programs may choose to administer exit exams. The AMT program requires an exam on the repair and maintenance of each major automobile component. The exam measures the SLOs for the proper repair and maintenance of that component, and the students are awarded a certificate if they pass the exam. Currently, most program assessments are intended to measure the quality of the program and to determine positive or negative trends. If weaknesses are found, then corrective action to adjust the curriculum or method of instruction follows.

Self Evaluation

The College meets the Standard.

Degrees and certificates are awarded on the successful achievement of all course and program requirements. Annual Assessment and Program Review activities are intended to measure the quality of the course and curriculum and not intended as a method to award grades or degrees. In the future, programs may use defined SLOs to award degrees and certificates.

Actionable Improvement Plans

No action is required.

II.A.3. The institution requires of all academic and vocational degree programs a component of general education based on a carefully considered philosophy that is clearly stated in its catalog. The institution, relying on the expertise of its faculty, determines the appropriateness of each course for inclusion in the general education curriculum by examining the stated learning outcomes for the course.

Descriptive Summary
The College requires of all academic and vocational programs a component of general education based on a carefully considered philosophy that is clearly stated in the catalogue. The College, the UH system and the Board of Regents are deeply committed to providing all our students with a broad based general education that will aid them in achieving both personal and professional success.

The Board Policy and Bylaws state: “It is the Board of Regents' policy that all University of Hawaii campuses offer a recognizable core of General Education based on a philosophy and rationale that are clearly stated... At a minimum, General Education introduces the content and methodology of the major areas of knowledge--the humanities, the fine arts, the natural sciences, and the social sciences.” The Board policy goes on to include competency in communication and quantitative skills, critical analysis of data and argument, and appreciation of cultural diversity. [Board of Regents Policies and Bylaws - Chapter 5 Academic Affairs]

The College is dedicated to a carefully considered general education philosophy. As stated in the catalog:

“Honolulu Community College believes in unlimited human potential. General Education is a process whereby lifelong learners grow and fulfill that potential. General Education supports individuals in the quest to become whole, complete persons by encouraging development in areas such as thought, communication, ethical deliberation, creativity, feeling, empathy, adaptability, and awareness. General Education proves foundation skills necessary for successful living in the ever-changing, global environment.

In addition to encouraging uniqueness and personal development, General Education provides the commonalities which enable us to collaborate and achieve community. Indeed, as we face the challenges inherent in human existence, General Education is a key to solving the problems of survival for individuals, communities, nations, and the species.”

In Spring 2012, after college-wide review and discussion, the Faculty Senate Executive Committee passed an expanded General Education Policy that states:

“The Honolulu Community College General Education curriculum has comprehensive learning outcomes and ensures that students are able to meet these outcomes. These outcomes include the development of:

a) Understanding the basic content and methodology of major areas of knowledge, including humanities and fine arts, natural sciences, and social science.

b) Skills necessary to be a productive individual and lifelong learner, which include oral and written communication, information competency, computer literacy, scientific and quantitative reasoning, critical analysis/logical thinking, and the acquisition of knowledge through a variety of means.
Qualities necessary to be an ethical human being and effective citizen. These include an appreciation of ethical principles, civility and interpersonal skills, respect for cultural diversity, historical and aesthetic sensitivity, and the willingness to assume civic, political and social responsibilities locally, nationally and globally.

LIBERAL ARTS General Education: In 2002, a UHCC Liberal Arts task force met and developed general education competencies, referred to as hallmarks, for written communication, mathematical/logical reasoning, global/multicultural perspectives, humanities and arts, social sciences, natural sciences, ethical deliberation and oral communication. These hallmarks are the basis of the current Liberal Arts course SLOs and Program Outcomes. [Associate in Arts Task Force Report - Fall 2002]

General Education requirements for the Liberal Arts AA degree at HCC are grouped into four main areas: Foundation, Diversification, Focus requirements and an Oral Communication requirement.

The Foundation requirement is intended to give students skills and perspectives that are fundamental to undertaking higher education. Foundations courses teach written communication skills, symbolic reasoning or global and multi-cultural awareness. The Diversification requirement is intended to assure that every student has a broad exposure to different domains of academic knowledge in order to aid students in realizing self-sufficiency, personal and professional fulfillment, and to be positive contributors to their community and world. Courses are grouped under The Arts, Humanities, Literature and Languages, Natural Sciences (which includes the Biological and Physical Sciences), and Social Sciences. The Focus requirements identify three skills and discourses essential to General Education: writing; ethical analysis and deliberation; and Hawaiian, Asian, and Pacific issues. Any course in the curriculum may be identified as a Focus course if it meets the criteria and is approved by the General Education Board. Writing Intensive Focus (W) courses are designed to increase a student’s writing proficiency. Hawaiian, Asian, and Pacific Issues Focus (H) courses are designed to increase a student’s understanding of Hawaiian, Asian, and Pacific issues and to foster multicultural understanding and respect. Contemporary Ethical Issues Focus (E) courses are designed to give students tools for the development of responsible deliberation and ethical judgment. The Oral Communication requirement is designed to improve a student’s proficiency in oral communication. [College Catalog]

CAREER and TECHNICAL EDUCATION (CTE) General Education: The College Policy states that two components comprise the minimum General Education requirements for all AS, AAS, and ATS degrees:

- General Skills (6 credits minimum), include basic competencies in written communication and computational skills. Students would need to master these skills on a level higher than that of the Learning Foundations competencies. Students placing in college level English (ENG 100) or Math (MATH 100) would have other options, including oral communication, or logical reasoning.
• General Education (9 credits minimum), including competencies in Natural Sciences, Social Sciences and Humanities and Fine Arts. The policy further states that the college will implement new options for ways in which the General Education component of CTE programs can be met. These options include an updated set of categories and hallmarks, as well as alternative means of meeting the requirements of each of those categories. [General Education]

The General Education Review Working Group met in October and December 2010 to review and revise the General Education requirements for CTE programs, address areas where the College did not meet Accreditation Standard criteria, and address findings of the Underprepared Student Task Force.


Taskforce for Underprepared Students: Fact-Finding Visits

Recommendations Approved by FSEC - April 23, 2010

Three Town Hall meetings were held in January 2011 to discuss the draft documents circulated by the General Education Working Group. Formation of a CTE General Education Subcommittee, consisting of Liberal Arts and CTE faculty and incorporated under the existing General Education Board, was recommended; categories, hallmarks and courses were drafted; the working group was reconstituted as a Committee on Programs and Curricula (CPC) subcommittee.

This CTE Gen Ed subcommittee met in April 2011 to discuss changes to the existing draft before circulating to University College and the CTE programs for input. The draft of General Education Hallmarks for CTE degrees was presented at the September 2011 CPC meeting. A report from the ad hoc subcommittee on General Education for CTE was presented at the October 2011 CPC meeting. A vote was taken at the November 2011 CPC meeting to approve seven General Education for CTE categories. Due to opposition from CTE program faculty, a subsequent vote was taken at the March 2012 CPC meeting to rescind the November 2011 vote. [CPC Minutes]

Dialog to update the CTE Gen Ed requirements is going forward. The CPC ad hoc subcommittee on General Education for CTE will continue to meet to address guidelines for assigning new courses to categories through the summer of 2012.

EVIDENCE:

General Education for CTE: Notes from the First “Town Hall” - January 11, 2011

General Education for CTE: Notes from the First “Town Hall” - January 18, 2011

General Education for CTE: Notes from the First “Town Hall” - January 21, 2011
General Education and Articulation Board: The General Education and Articulation Board [General_Education] is composed of the main board with sub-boards for Foundation, Diversification, Oral Communications, each Focus area and a newly added sub-board, which monitors general education for the career and technical programs. The main board is composed of chairs from each of the sub-boards. Membership of the sub-boards is composed of LBART and CTE faculty members who teach courses and are considered experts in the respective sub-board areas.

Courses are approved as meeting specified general education core requirements by the appropriate General Education sub-board before being forwarded to the appropriate DCC and then the CPC for further approval. Each new course offered and each course applying for a Foundation, Diversification, Focus or Oral Communications designation or as meeting a specific CTE General Education requirement must adhere to a strict set of guidelines to ensure the content meets the learning outcomes and hallmarks set for the requirement.

For the LBART General Education Requirement, the syllabus must include SLOs that specifically address the agreed-upon hallmarks. The certification application must present specific strategies for achievement of these SLO’s as well as a plan for assessing this achievement. Sub-boards work with individual faculty members applying for designation in helping them to understand, address and meet these criteria.

Courses are cyclically recertified based upon demonstration of the achievement of hallmarks/ SLO’s and continuous improvement based upon assessment data. Currently all certified Foundations, Focus, and Oral Communications courses meet these criteria. There are 199 courses that currently have a Diversification designation. For a majority of existing courses, the certification occurred in 2001, and was approved en masse by the system-wide University Council on Articulation. In Fall 2010, HCC’s Diversification Board established a process for working with faculty to re-certify courses in phases and established a 5-year re-certification cycle. The Board chair sends periodic reminders with re-certification updates and deadlines to the HCC instructional faculty. Lists of diversification-approved courses and courses needing re-certification are posted on the Intranet, under the General Education section. As of February 2012, of a total of 201 courses, 68 courses have been recertified. The board is working diligently with the faculty to achieve recertification of the remaining 133 courses by the end of the current year.
Articulation of LBART General Education Core: The General Education Board has been given authority by the FSEC to negotiate and draft articulation agreements with other UH System institutions regarding any General Education course. System-wide articulation agreements have been reached and successfully implemented for all common general education courses. Subsequent to UH-Manoa’s decision to move their Ethics and Oral communication requirements to the 300 level, these courses are no longer articulated. We remain committed to these requirements and are hopeful that this may change in the future. In the meantime, these courses can be accepted as electives if transferred and most often meet diversification requirements at both HCC and transfer institutions.

Specific articulation issues, including those involving course to course articulations or courses fulfilling major requirements, are handled by the system-wide University Committee on Articulation. Further, as noted below (II.A.6.a), the Vice Chancellor of Academic Affairs works closely with the Articulation / Matriculation Officer (counselor) on the development of new articulation agreements and pathways, works to resolve articulation errors across the system and to monitor and renew these agreements prior to the expiration date.

Assessment of LBART General Education:

The Written Communication Foundation Requirement: This requirement is currently satisfied by English 100. For several semesters, Language Arts faculty teaching the required English 100 (Composition) classes were asked to have students complete pre- and post-tests using the Knowledge Survey designed by the Language Arts faculty. This Knowledge Survey contains the essential expected learning outcomes (as developed by the UH System and the Language Arts Department) associated with the basic English Composition course. The faculty has used these results to identify ways to improve student learning including analyzing their own class results and sharing written summaries of their conclusions with each other. Initial findings and discussions led the department to identify the need for an English 100 exit exam. In Spring 2008, English 100 faculty again met to analyze and discuss cumulative results for three semesters. Resulting analysis led to the establishment of several goals, including a mutual commitment to increase emphasis on writing and research techniques for research essays. Another departmental goal established in response to assessment of student learning was to increase the amount of instructional time on use of word processing as well as increased use of computer lab time. The language of the English 100 SLOs was refined to ensure students understood their intent. In Spring 2011 ten sections of English 100 used MyWritingLab.com by Pearson Publishing as part of a grant to help further standardize the specific grammar taught across sections of English 100. Faculty participating in this grant were pleased enough with the results that all sections of English 100 are using
MyWritingLab.com as part of our standardization of grammar content and for further English 100 assessment efforts as well.

EVIDENCE

English 100 Knowledge Survey - Spring 2009

ENG 100 Knowledge Survey Cumulative Report - Spring 2009

Cross-Discipline Discussions: In Spring 2009, an embedded assessment project was carried out as English department faculty read and analyzed a sampling of writing assignments of students in English 22, English 100, and ESL courses. This initial embedded assessment effort was very successful, leading to greater awareness and energized and productive discussions among faculty regarding different writing tools and assignments, and enabling them to share and learn more about the variety of ways colleagues assess student writing. They have also discussed the use of the standardized “exit exams” for English 22 and English 100 to assist with grammar, information literacy skills, and critical thinking skills.

English courses that are partnered with other courses as part of the Learning Communities initiative undergo an additional level of assessment and analysis. In Spring 2009, the University College Dean asked the Assessment consultant carrying out many of these knowledge surveys to prepare a brief report on the overall ‘value added’ indicated by student perceptions in the pre- to post-test surveys for English 100. The results strongly indicated that students gained significantly in their confidence in understanding SLO measures—an impressive indication of success in teaching students fundamental, foundational writing skills.

EVIDENCE

Sample of Value Added Learning Outcome Gains – Calculated From Knowledge Survey Pre and Post-Tests

Symbolic Reasoning Foundation Requirement: Students fulfill their symbolic reasoning requirement through taking one of a number of math courses, or logic (offered by the Philosophy faculty.) For all courses questions on surveys and exams are aligned with hallmarks and designed to measure achievement of course SLOs. Departments meet every 3 to 5 years to evaluate survey results and scores on SLO questions. Groups discuss strategies for how to cover SLOs and possible modifications of SLOs.

In all sections of Philosophy 110 (Introduction to Logic), assessment through use of pre- and post-course knowledge surveys effectively measures student confidence in learning of course SLOs. In addition, instructors have carried out collective analysis of student performance on final exam questions, and the instructors in this discipline routinely discuss curriculum in the lights of the SLOs and knowledge surveys. The instructors in this discipline have also participated in knowledge survey comparisons between on-
campus courses and distance education offerings.

The Math department faculty is using embedded questions on exams for assessment of the achievement of SLO’s, which were previously mapped to the Foundations hallmarks. They are tracking the points earned for each embedded question to determine whether or not students are meeting the established minimum of 70%. The hallmark applications for Math100 and Math115 are finished and those for Math135 are close to completion. Instructional faculty are now working to implement the same assessment strategy into all Math courses by providing example questions and articulating their correspondence to hallmarks and SLOs. It is planned that every 3 to 5 years appointed liaisons will summarize all collected tabulations and discuss the summary at a meeting of the mathematics department. Strategies in the ways that SLOs can be covered, or whether or not an SLO should be modified, will be discussed.

**Global / Multicultural Perspective Foundation Requirement:** For several years, instructors teaching the World Civilizations courses (HIST 151, HIST 152) have carried out individual course assessment, including instructor-specific knowledge surveys carried out periodically, as well as use of embedded analysis of student results on exam questions. Since spring 2009, there has been a common Knowledge Survey instrument evaluating student confidence in learning common course SLOs, as well as specific content and thematic topics. This survey is used by all History instructors, allowing for longitudinal comparison across different semesters and years, as well as enabling cumulative results for the entire department. Instructors teaching online History 151 and History 152 classes can also evaluated student learning outcome results in their face-to-face classes compared to online versions of the class, and use those results to improve in both formats.

A ‘value added’ review was conducted in 2009 by the College’s Assessment consultant, reviewing results from the cumulative World Civilizations I (HIST 151) results. In terms of student confidence in knowledge of core SLOs, the difference from the pre- to post-tests was impressive, indicating significant gains in student understanding of core concepts and historical themes.

The History Department met in fall 2012 to further discuss assessment of the World Civilization courses. To supplement what was learned from Knowledge Surveys, they decided to carry out an embedded assessment. Everyone included a question in our his or her exam or final projects related to an SLO for History 151 and History 152. They will be meeting after Spring Break to assess the results of student responses to these embedded questions, and to utilize this as the basis for departmental discussion about the pedagogies and topics covered by individual instructors.

**EVIDENCE**

*History 151 Knowledge Survey - Spring 2009*

*History 151 Knowledge Survey Cumulative Report - Spring 2009*
Sample of Value Added Learning Outcome Gains – Calculated From Knowledge Survey Pre and Post-Tests

Results of 2011 Embedded Assessment: Will be posted later in Spring 2012

**Diversification Courses:** The A.A. Diversification requirement requires students to take an array of courses across all the Liberal Arts disciplines, so assessment of this part of degree learning requires classroom- and department-based assessment. Such assessment and explicit identification of student learning outcomes and assessment methods are part of current certification/recertification process described above. Faculty has developed a variety of activities to measure achievement of course SLOs. These include quizzes, exams testing fact-based and conceptual knowledge, completion of class or studio or laboratory projects, essays, and knowledge surveys. Faculty use results from these activities to modify and improve delivery of courses.

The general College student evaluation form assessing instructor pedagogy and effectiveness is increasingly being administered online, which increases the number of students participating and invites much more extensive and useful comments. In Fall 2010, 237 classes conducted end of the semester student evaluations. Results from these evaluations are provided to individual faculty.

**Writing Intensive (WI or W-focus) Focus Requirement:** Faculty teaching Writing Intensive courses have been carrying out different forms of assessment, and carrying out analysis of and response to these assessment findings for several years.

**Surveying Students:** Every semester, all instructors teaching WI courses are required to conduct a student survey. For several semesters, the primary focus of this survey was to monitor the rigor of the class, to ensure that the instructor was meeting the hallmarks in terms of things such as amount of formal writing required and degree of interaction between instructor and students. Individual instructors receive these reports and used them to determine whether and how they can strengthen their course. The WI Coordinator also receives these reports, and if necessary follows up with individual instructors to ensure skills hallmarks are being met in the class.

In Spring 2009, it was decided to use this regularly conducted survey to also gauge student confidence in key writing skills. Thus in addition to ensuring the integrity of the course structure, the surveys directly assessed the learning that students felt they received in key areas of writing mastery. Individual instructor reports as well as the cumulative report for the WI Coordinator were generated. This gauging of student confidence was useful in identifying general strengths and weaknesses in learning of writing skills. For example, based on the 2009 results, ability to utilize appropriate citation skills and confidence in mastery of grammar were areas where WI faculty felt they needed to work to further improve skill development.

**EVIDENCE**
For several years, the WI faculty have carried out a periodic embedded assessment. The latest round of embedded assessment was completed in Fall 2011 and the WI faculty met in February of 2012 to discuss the results. The process of carrying out embedded assessment has been refined several times over the years to make the process more effective and revealing. This assessment is done of writing samples of students near to graduation, so is intended as an assessment of success in producing graduates who have gained requisite writing skills, as intended by requiring the completion of at least two Writing Intensive courses. A rubric was established and the numerical results of all reviews are input, generating an overall report of student performance. The rubric evaluations are then analyzed, shared with the WI faculty, broken down by discipline, and discussed at WI faculty meetings. The results of embedded analysis of student writing skills are discussed at a meeting of all WI teaching faculty. These meetings have been markedly productive, providing a forum in which instructors discuss common concerns in student writing, and identify agendas for improving individual instruction as well as the WI program as a whole. Out of these WI analysis meetings, initiatives and action steps have been identified and implemented. For example, faculty have developed plans to create a common style sheet of marking symbols to help with consistency of feedback to students; identified the most common writing problems to create a basis for ongoing discussion and sharing of solutions; addressed weaknesses in student preparation and skills in writing research papers; and proposed the creation of a WI instructor handbook. Pedagogical interchange has included fruitful discussion of topics such as the degree to which WI classes (as a whole) are addressing the hallmarks, the degree to which instructors should do copy-editing for students as part of instruction and learning, how to better communicate with students the utility and value of writing well as an overall learning goal, and how to respond to the continuing concern over plagiarism.

The WI coordinator also prepares an annual report to be shared with counterparts at the system level, in accordance with articulation agreements and as a basis for system-wide discussion, assessment and improvement.

EVIDENCE

Imbedded Assessment Rubric Results and Report

Certification: At the Spring 2009 meeting of the WI faculty, it was agreed that new courses would be certified for a three-year period, and that subsequent re-certification would be good for a five-year period. A staggered cycle was established to ensure that all WI courses offered will carry current up-to-date certification. The process of certifying and recertifying courses as meeting the WI requirement explicitly assert and require that all instructors carry out individual assessment in addition to the cumulative efforts of this Focus group. Instructors are required to report on how assessment of student learning
outcomes is being carried out, and how assessment results have led to any efforts (if needed) to modify the course.

**EVIDENCE**

**Application for Recertification of a Section of a Course as Writing-Intensive**

**Contemporary Ethical Issues (E-Focus) Focus Requirement:** Instructors teaching E-Focus courses are carrying out assessment activities that ensure courses are structured to meet the degree hallmarks, as well as evaluate student learning in relation to Focus and course-related outcomes. Students in all E-focus courses are surveyed each semester to evaluate whether the course content and pedagogy fulfill the system hallmark objectives for the E-focus requirement for the A.A. degree. The results of E-focus surveys are reported to the E-focus chair as individual faculty reports as well as a cumulative report. Instructional faculty members are also provided individual reports each semester. If results indicate that the hallmarks are not being met, the E-focus chair follows up with the faculty to remedy the situation and help in reaffirming the rigor of the course. All E-focus instructors meet periodically to review cumulative results and to revisit and revise, as necessary, the Focus mission, evaluation, and certification processes. Meetings leading to revisions occurred in Spring 2005, Spring 2006, Fall 2007, Spring 2008, Spring 2010 and Spring 2012. Results of these surveys were discussed and analyzed by instructors. E-focus instructors carried out a review of their assessment methods and, as a result, designed a new evaluation instrument.

In addition, as part of the 5-year certification cycle, faculty must present their own individual assessment strategies and data regarding student achievement of hallmark SLOs, as well as detail course improvements made in response to assessment results. In fall 2011 all E-Focus courses were recertified by the E-Focus sub-board and two new E-Focus courses were added. After reviewing the applications and the data from the evaluation instruments as well as the chair’s summary reports from each semester, the board unanimously agreed that the faculty had met all requirements and were, in fact, exceeding the expectations of all hallmarks. These assessment activities ensure the integrity of this Focus requirement. Instructors are certified and recertified based on student assessment of class pedagogy and learning taking place.

**EVIDENCE**

**E-Focus Courses & Board**

**Application for E-Focus Designation or Recertification**

Minutes, E-Focus Meeting - Spring 2009

Minutes, E-Focus Meeting - Spring 2012

Minutes, E-Focus Meeting - April 9, 2008
Hawaiian, Asian and Pacific Issues (HAP-Focus) Focus Requirement: In Fall 2007, HCC joined the University of Hawai‘i HAP multi-campus agreement, while simultaneously discontinuing the H-Focus Board and establishing the HAP-Focus Board at the College. Approved HAP-Focus courses fulfill the HAP-Focus graduation requirement for the A.A. degree at HCC and UH-Manoa’s baccalaureate requirements.

Prior to Fall 2007, assessment of HAP-Focus courses was administered by individual instructors with a paper-and-pencil version of a student survey. In Fall 2007 the first online HAP-Focus survey instrument was developed and administered to all students enrolled in HAP-Focus courses. Students are surveyed to evaluate how well course content and pedagogy fulfill system hallmarks for the H-Focus requirement for the A.A. degree. Online surveys have been administered regularly since going online. A summary report of aggregate data is held by the HAP Board Chair, and individual course survey results are sent to each instructor for individual course assessment. The aggregate results are made available to the UH HAP multi-campus group when it meets annually. The UH multi-campus group may also request to review an individual course, particularly a new course, to ensure it is meeting the hallmarks of the HAP multi-campus agreement and SLOs.

In Spring 2012, the HAP committee developed a framework to further analyze HAP course assessments and a plan to enhance or maintain the current assessment tools utilized. They have requested from help from the assessment specialist to begin to review and formulate this plan.

**EVIDENCE**

**HAP-Focus Courses & Board**

**Speech Requirement:** Until Fall 2009, Honolulu Community College maintained an O-Focus requirement for the A.A. degree. This was: a) in spite of the fact that UH-Manoa only recognizes O-Focus courses taken at the 300- or 400-level as meeting graduation requirements, and b) because faculty felt some form of Oral Communication mastery was an important requirement. Acknowledging the resulting confusion for students, the 2008-2009 Committee on Programs and Curricula (CPC) approved a change in A.A. program requirements that will retain this requirement, but make it a general graduation requirement rather than a Focus requirement. This change is formally reflected in the 2010-2011 and subsequent college catalogues.

Students in all Oral Communications courses are surveyed to evaluate student achievement of system hallmark SLOs for the Oral requirement for the A.A. degree. In all of the courses in this Focus area, the instructor receives individual reports of student responses regarding confidence in achieving the course SLOs. This report enables instructors to make course-specific modifications if necessary. A cumulative report that includes responses from all students taking classes in that focus area is provided to the Focus area coordinator. This report serves as the basis for evaluating student success in
meeting SLOs for this component of the A.A. degree. Discussions among instructors of these classes are continuing, and help to identify areas where all instructors can contribute to the improvement of the program.

All sections also conduct knowledge survey assessments every semester. Individual reports are sent to individual faculty. A cumulative report is issued to the Oral Communications chair and shared with all Speech faculty, as well as members of sub-board. The numerical results are analyzed, as are trends based on comparison with previous semesters. Speech faculty and those on the board also analyze reasons for successes and weaknesses in student responses, as well as identifying action steps to improve overall student results, for example, refining course descriptions in the catalog. The Board has responded with recommendations to improve consistency across all sections, as well as possible changes to hallmark specifications.

In addition, the Speech faculty has implemented pre-test/post-test measures to assess student knowledge of interpersonal communication and public speaking principles. Further, these same items are addressed in the final examinations for all Speech classes. Finally, the Speech faculty has recently piloted a new assessment strategy to establish consistency in evaluating student achievement of SLO’s. Every three years, beginning in 2010, faculty will randomly select two students from a colleagues class and evaluate their final speech using his or her own evaluation instrument and by a collaboratively developed rubric. Faculty meet to compare results and to make adjustments and improvements where needed.

EVIDENCE

O-Focus Student Evaluation Data and Summary Report - Spring 2009

Assessment of CTE General Education:

Students seeking a degree in a CTE Program (AS, AAS or ATS) are required to complete at least 15 credits of General Education courses. Requirements effective in Fall 2012 include One course each (6 credits) required in the Skills areas of Communication and Quantitative or Logical Reasoning. Three courses (9 credits) are required in the areas of Natural Sciences, Social Sciences, and Humanities and Fine Arts. [College Catalog]

Hallmarks: Courses that satisfy the requirements identified above are certified as having SLOs that align with hallmarks for a given category. These may include either courses from the Liberal Arts disciplines that have met Diversification or other criteria (see above), or courses from CTE programs the SLOs of which align with hallmarks. Guidelines and application forms are available online. [General Education]

Assessment: Methods utilized by CTE programs to assess student achievement of program SLOs include Portfolio/Final Project, Industry Certification, Performance Exams, Practicum/Internship, Course Mapping, Graduate Survey, and Tracking Student Employment.
Mapping course SLOs to general education hallmarks provides the basis for re-evaluation of general education courses in the CTE programs. Mapping has resulted in revisions to curriculum and/or sequencing for some courses; SLOs and accompanying assessment measures for these identified courses continue to be updated in 2012 via the DCC and CPC review and approval process.

EVIDENCE

Accreditation Focused Midterm Report (Page 84) - October 15, 2009

CPC Minutes

General Education for CTE: Notes from the First “Town Hall” - January 11, 2011

General Education for CTE: Notes from the First “Town Hall” - January 18, 2011

General Education for CTE: Notes from the First “Town Hall” - January 21, 2011

General Education - HCCP # 5.213

Report from ad hoc subcommittee on General Education for CTE to CPC, 10/28/2011

Self Evaluation

The College meets the standard.

However, while the General Education component of the CTE programs was previously deemed to be sufficient, there was growing concern among faculty and administration that a review of this requirement for CTE, unchanged for more than three decades, was warranted to better ensure more rigorous compliance with ACCJC standards. This was the impetus for the committee work that followed.

Next steps identified by the Town Hall meetings in 2011 included mapping course to program SLOs to align CTE courses with General Education hallmarks as had been done by the Tech 1 and Tech II divisions; meeting hallmarks with content embedded in existing CTE programs; needs assessments by individual programs and how they will be met. Since potential program and curriculum changes will be involved, further work will be coordinated by the Committee on Programs and Curricula (CPC).

Actionable Improvement Plans

No action is required for the Liberal Arts Program.

The CTE programs must continue to review, revise, and update their General Education component.
II.A.3.a. An understanding of the basic content and methodology of the major areas of knowledge: areas include the humanities and fine arts, the natural sciences, and the social sciences.

Descriptive Summary

LBART General Education: There are comprehensive SLOs for all General Education courses in the major areas of knowledge that ensure an understanding of their basic content and methodology. As described in II.A.3 above for the LBART degree, the College’s Diversification requirements for the LBART degree include courses in the humanities, fine arts, the natural sciences and social sciences. Courses in fine arts include Art, Theater, Music, Speech, and Hawaiian Studies. Courses in the humanities include American Studies, Asian Studies, Hawaiian Studies, History, Philosophy, and Religion. Courses in the natural sciences include courses in the biological sciences: Biology, Botany, Microbiology, Zoology and Science, as well as courses in the physical sciences: Astronomy, Biochemistry, Chemistry, Geography, Meteorology, Oceanography, and Physics. Courses offered in the social sciences include Anthropology, Economics, Hawaiian Studies, Political Science, Psychology, Sociology and Women Studies. The A.A. degree is essentially all General Education.

CTE General Education: CTE students can select courses in the humanities and fine arts that include classes in American Studies, Art (studio or history), Asian Studies, Hawaiian Studies, History, Music, Philosophy, and Religion; this area may also include CTE program courses, when certified, in such areas as Communication Arts and Fashion Technology. Natural science courses included both the biological sciences (Agriculture, Biology, Botany, Food Science and Human Nutrition, Microbiology, Zoology and Science) and the physical sciences (Astronomy, Chemistry, Geography, Meteorology, Oceanography, and Physics.) Social science courses include Anthropology, Economics, Geography, Political Science, Sociology, and Women’s Studies; this area may also include CTE program courses, when certified, in fields such as Administration of Justice, Family Resources and Social Work. [College Catalog]

Self Evaluation

The college meets the standard for the Liberal Arts program.

The College meets the standard for CTE programs. While 15 credits remains the minimum number for General Education, new requirements may provide for other means by which those may be satisfied, beyond course completion. Tech 1 and Tech 2 faculty began mapping course to program SLOs and to General Education hallmarks in Fall 2008. Mapping, though not complete, has resulted in some revisions to curriculum and/or sequencing, and has provided the basis for ongoing re-evaluation of general education courses in the programs. [Accreditation Focused Midterm Report - October 15, 2009]

EVIDENCE
SLO/PLO and SLO/Gen Ed Mappings
http://home.honolulu.hawaii.edu/~sam/Mappings.html

Actionable Improvement Plans

No action is required is required for the Liberal Arts program.

CTE programs should complete the mapping of SLOs to hallmarks and make program modifications as needed to ensure that the General Education requirements are met.

II.A.3.b.  A capability to be a productive individual and life long learner: skills include oral and written communication, information competency, computer literacy, scientific and quantitative reasoning, critical analysis/logical thinking, and the ability to acquire knowledge through a variety of means.

Descriptive Summary

LBART General Education: The General Education requirements for the LBART degree meet the requirements of this standard, as described in detail above. All Liberal Arts students must take an Oral Communications course as a requirement for graduation. Written Communications courses are also required. English 100 fulfills the Foundations requirement for written communication and is a pre-requisite, with a grade of C or higher, for two additional required writing intensive courses. The requirements for quantitative/logical reasoning are met in the Symbolic Reasoning Foundation courses and E-focus courses. In addition to computational skills, Symbolic Reasoning Foundation courses teach the concept of proof as a chain of inferences and application of formal rules or algorithms, hypothetical reasoning, and the use of appropriate symbolic techniques in the context of problem solving and in the presentation and critical evaluation of evidence. E-focus courses teach the application of logical and critical thinking, and the ability to recognize fallacious reasoning, to contemporary ethical issues. The Natural Sciences Diversification Requirements teach both scientific reasoning and quantitative reasoning; a broad spectrum of Biological and Physical Science courses fulfill the Diversity Requirements for graduation.

Information competency, computer literacy and the ability to acquire knowledge through a variety of means are emphasized across the curriculum. While these are not explicit requirements, these skills are embedded in the curriculum and developed and utilized as tools in many courses. In the Oral Communications courses SP 151, 251, and 253, students are taught research skills and how to discern the credibility of various types of print and online sources. They are also expected to learn how to use PowerPoint "appropriately" and "effectively" as a presentation visual aid medium, and they are expected to have knowledge of basic word-processing skills in order to submit their assignments in the proper format on Laulima. As detailed above, analysis of assessment
data by the Written Communication faculty led to the establishment of several goals, including a mutual commitment to increase emphasis on research techniques for research essays and the amount of instructional time on use of word processing as well as increased use of computer lab time. In addition, the language of the English 100 SLOs was refined to ensure students understood their intent. Numerous other required courses ensure that students can recognize when information is needed and are able to locate, critically evaluate and utilize that information. The array of courses required, the diversity of disciplines the students must be exposed to and the skills that must be acquired and demonstrated ensure that students have and can in the future acquire knowledge through a variety of means.

CTE General Education: The CTE General Education categories contain the courses necessary to meet the requirements of this Standard. However, whether or not all requirements are met may depend on courses selected, and mapping should be completed to determine the full extent to which a given CTE program provides a comprehensive grounding in General Education.

Oral and written communication:
All CTE programs require completion of at least one communications course (speech and English composition) and six programs require completion of both oral and written communication courses. As noted, students must place at the ENG 100 level to take a communications course other than a writing course.

Information competency:
CTE General Education courses support the development of a set of abilities engaging students to determine the nature and extent of information needed; access it effectively and efficiently; critically evaluate it and its sources; incorporate it into one’s knowledge base; use it effectively to accomplish a specific purpose; and understand the economic, legal and social issues surrounding the use of it, and access and use information ethically and legally. These opportunities for seeking, evaluating, and managing information are specifically present in the language arts courses.

Computer literacy:
An introductory computer literacy course has been required by 12 CTE Programs; it may be certified for inclusion in a different category under the new General Education requirements for CTE. Additionally, many General Education as well as CTE courses require assignments that involve some aspects of computer literacy. A large number of computers are available to the students to allow them to complete their course work using word-processing, spreadsheet, database management, electronic presentation, and graphics software are available in multiple locations on campus for students to complete their course work.

Scientific and quantitative reasoning:
Application of quantitative reasoning and scientific inquiry and analysis are an integral part of the natural science and math courses. In addition to being imbedded in the curriculum of the major courses, all CTE programs require completion of a quantitative
or logical reasoning course. Fourteen CTE programs identified specific math courses which are relevant and required for graduation from their specific programs. Students must place at the MATH 100 level to take a course other than one involving computational skills.

**Critical analysis/logical thinking:**
Student-centered teaching methods such as problem-based, evidence-based, and inquiry learning promote critical thinking and self-directed learning. Opportunities for developing these thinking skills are present in math, philosophy, information and computer science courses.

**Ability to acquire knowledge using a variety of means:**
CTE students use information retrieval systems such as databases accessible by computer in writing classes. They depend on physical examination in Natural Science courses to supplement lectures and textbooks. They use software technologies to observe and analyze in math, chemistry and physics classes. CTE program courses may also offer opportunities for students to acquire knowledge through hands-on experience.

**EVIDENCE:**

- [Association of College and Research Libraries Information Literacy Competency Standards for Higher Education](http://www.ala.org/acrl/standards/literacy)
- [American Association of Community Colleges Position Statement on Library and Learning Center Programs](http://www.aacc.org/about/position-statements/library-learning-center-program)
- SLO/PLO and SLO/Gen Ed Mappings
  - [http://home.honolulu.hawaii.edu/~sam/Mappings.html](http://home.honolulu.hawaii.edu/~sam/Mappings.html)

**Self Evaluation**

The College meets the Standard for the Liberal Arts program.

The College meets the Standard for CTE programs. The skills described in this Standard are interdisciplinary and not limited to specific courses. However, whether or not all requirements are met may depend on courses selected, and mapping should be completed to determine the full extent to which a given CTE program provides a comprehensive grounding in General Education. SLOs and accompanying assessment measures for CTE courses continue to be updated in 2012 via the DCC and CPC review and approval process to ensure more rigorous compliance with this Standard.

**Actionable Improvement Plans**

No action is required for the Liberal Arts program.
The CTE programs will continue to review, revise, and update their General Education component. CTE programs should complete the mapping of SLOs to hallmarks and make program modifications as needed to ensure that the General Education requirements are met.

II.A.3.c. A recognition of what it means to be an ethical human being and effective citizen: qualities include an appreciation of ethical principles; civility and interpersonal skills; respect for cultural diversity; historical and aesthetic sensitivity; and the willingness to assume civic, political, and social responsibilities locally, nationally, and globally.

Descriptive Summary

LBART General Education: Each of the desired attributes listed in the standard are addressed within the wide array of required General Education courses that satisfy the Foundation, Diversification and Focus Requirements for the LBART degree. Specifically, the College is the only community college in the UH System to require an E-focus course for the AA degree. Currently, several courses in Philosophy, Religion, Political Science, and Woman’s Studies meet the E-focus hallmarks. These courses are designed to give students tools for the development of responsible deliberation and ethical judgment and to be effective citizens. All of these courses address civic, political and social responsibility. Civility and interpersonal skills are explicitly addressed by the SLO’s in the Oral Communications requirement and implicitly in many other courses which emphasize group work and collaborative learning. The H-focus area requirement is designed to increase a student’s understanding of these specific cultures and to foster multi-cultural understanding and respect for cultural diversity. Also, the Global and Multicultural Perspectives Requirement provide thematic treatments of global processes and cross-cultural interaction from a variety of perspectives. Currently, some Anthropology, History, and Religion courses meet these hallmarks. In addition, the College offers courses with a Service Learning component, which combine service to the community with student learning in a way that improves both the student and the community. These courses help promote civic responsibility.

As detailed previously, all the Diversifications courses must demonstrate that they specifically meet the hallmarks in their respective area and many of the above requirements are particularly addressed in these hallmarks. The Arts requirement is designed to foster an aesthetic responsibility as explicitly stated in the following hallmarks:

- uses the definitions, descriptions, and terminology of the visual arts, performing arts, or other creative arts;
- emphasizes the acquisition of practical and theoretical skills necessary to produce visual, performing, or other creative arts for primarily aesthetic purposes;
- develops creative abilities in which artistic conventions are applied and originality is sought.
The Literature requirement emphasizes cultural analysis and respect for cultural diversity with the following hallmarks:

- uses the terminology of literary and/or cultural analysis;
- involves the study of texts, concepts, forms, figures, styles, tonalities, processes, theories, or issues relating to literary and/or cultural analysis;
- demonstrates inquiry that is guided by qualitative, argumentative, and/or quantitative methods employed in literary and/or cultural analysis.

Historical sensitivity is encouraged by our Humanities Diversifications requirement with the following hallmarks:

- uses the terminology of historical, philosophical, language or religious studies;
- involves texts, artifacts, concepts, processes, theories or issues of concern in these studies;
- demonstrates inquiry that involves the methods of study, reflection, evidence-gathering, and argumentation that are employed in these studies.

**CTE General Education**: The General Education categories for the CTE degrees contain the courses necessary to meet the requirements of this Standard. However, whether or not all requirements are met may depend on courses selected, and mapping should be completed to determine the full extent to which a given CTE program provides a comprehensive grounding in General Education.

Humanities and Fine Arts courses address historical and aesthetic sensitivity, and respect for cultural diversity. Social Science address civic, political, and social responsibilities. Both of these categories may also address ethical principles.

**Self Evaluation**

The College meets the Standard for the Liberal Arts program.

The College meets the Standard. The qualities of an ethical human being and effective citizen described in this Standard are interdisciplinary and addressed by specific course content as well as SLOs. SLOs and accompanying assessment measures for CTE courses continue to be updated in 2012 via the DCC and CPC review and approval process to ensure more rigorous compliance with this Standard.

**Actionable Improvement Plans**

No action is required for the Liberal Arts program.

The CTE programs should continue to review, revise and update their General Education component. The skills described in this Standard are interdisciplinary and not limited to specific courses. However, whether or not all requirements are met may depend on courses selected, and mapping should be completed to determine the full extent to which a given CTE program provides a comprehensive grounding in General Education. SLOs and accompanying assessment measures for CTE courses continue to be updated in 2012.
via the DCC and CPC review and approval process to ensure more rigorous compliance with this Standard.

**II.A.4. All degree programs include focused study in at least one area of inquiry or in an established interdisciplinary core.**

### Descriptive Summary

**Liberal Arts:** The LBART program requires students to take an interdisciplinary core of General Education courses leading to an AA degree. Courses completed must be at the baccalaureate level and conform to the Foundation, Diversification, Oral Communications and Focus requirements outlined in the catalog and described above. LBART graduates may enter UH Manoa as a Junior.

LBART majors may also take courses that will prepare them for a particular major at UH Manoa and the other four-year colleges. These majors include Business, Nursing, Education, and Social Work. In addition Academic Subject Certificates are now being offered in a variety of disciplines including Hawaiian Studies, Asian Studies, and Psychology. The Academic Subject Certificates allow students to pursue a pre-major focused study in one core discipline. This provides students the opportunity to explore areas of interest prior to the junior year, expedite academic decision-making, and to receive a solid preparation for advanced studies in their area of interest.

**CTE:** The CTE programs at the college all specialize in one focused area of inquiry. There are 23 CTE programs that offer a wide array of technical skills. They include Carpentry Technology, Fashion Technology, Human Services – Community Service, Refrigeration and Air Conditioning Technology (RAC) to name a few.

### Self Evaluation

The College meets the Standard.

The College’s 25 programs offer the community a wide array of disciplines to meet the diverse needs of this culturally diverse state. The campus is proud of the specializations offered in the CTE programs—some of them unique in the state—and the established interdisciplinary core of general education content offered by the LBART program.

### Actionable Improvement Plans

No action is required.

**II.A.5. Students completing vocational and occupational certificates and degrees demonstrate technical and professional competencies that meet employment and other applicable standards and are prepared for external licensure and certification.**
Descriptive Summary

Students completing CTE certificates and degrees demonstrate in a variety of ways that they have attained technical and professional competencies that meet employment and other applicable standards. When applicable, students are also prepared for external licensure and certification. Several of the programs are certified by the same institutions that issue the licenses and certificates to the College graduates.

Automotive Technology (AMT): The AMT program is a certified “Master” National Automotive Technicians Education Foundation (NATEF) Program. This indicates that this program complies with the training requirements set forth for all eight areas of automotive service and repair. It is one of a select group of automotive programs nationwide to attain this status. All faculty and staff are also Automotive Service Excellence (ASE) “Master Technicians” who have been certified in all eight areas of automotive service and repair by successfully passing ASE examinations. ASE testing is currently the testing platform used by the State to certify automotive technician competency.

Auto Body Repair and Painting (ABRP): The ABRP program is a certified National Automotive Technicians Education Foundation (NATEF) Program. It holds certification in the "Structural", "Non-structural", and "Refinishing" areas. It also imparts instruction gleaned from the I-CAR Education Foundation in-service curriculum into instruction. All faculty and staff are Automotive Service Excellence (ASE) certified.

Aeronautics Maintenance Technology (AERO): The AERO facility is an approved aviation maintenance technician training facility operating under Federal Aviation Administration (FAA) Air Agency certification standards that include airframe, power plant, and combined airframe and power plant ratings. It is the only such school in the Pacific Basin. Each element of the AERO curriculum meets Federal Aviation Regulations (FAR) Part 147 and prepares the student to successfully complete the FAA certification examinations.

Commercial Aviation (AVIT): The AVIT program is FAA-approved and in compliance with FAR Part 141. A combination of the program’s ground school courses and flight instruction courses prepares students to pass FAA exams in several areas: private pilot certificate, instrument rating, commercial pilot certificate, multiengine certificate, and flight instructor certificate.

Computing, Electronics, and Networking Technology (CENT): The CENT program, in conjunction with the Pacific Center for Advanced Technology Training, is a Cisco Academy, a CompTIA Training Center, a Microsoft IT Academy and a VMware IT Academy. The CENT curriculum prepares students for several certification exams: CompTIA A+, Cisco Certified Network Associate, Cisco Certified Network Professional, CompTIA Security+, VMware Certified Professional, and Microsoft Certified Professional certification exams.
Cosmetology (COSM): The COSM program is a member of an international school system known as Pivot Point. Pivot Point has established a structured curriculum that covers the theory and skills necessary for students to meet the standards and requirements of the State Board of Cosmetology licensing exam.

Early Childhood Education (ECE): Students who complete coursework and practicum requirements for the various certificates and the AS degree in the ECE program earn credits and clock hours towards several national and state certifications and licenses, including the following: the Child Development Associate designation administered by the Council for Professional Recognition; teacher requirements for programs accredited by the National Association for the Education of Young Children; and teacher requirements for programs licensed by the State of Hawai‘i Department of Human Services.

Fire and Environmental Emergency Response (FIRE): Students in the FIRE program who successfully complete a sequence of courses earn additional credits for completing basic recruit training for firefighting, which is required by agencies that adhere to the National Board on Firefighter Professional Qualifications (ProBoard) certification and/or the International Fire Service Accreditation Congress (IFSAC). This provides students with nationally recognized standards of competence that are recognized by firefighting and emergency response agencies in the U.S.

Welding Technology (WELD): The WELD program designed its curriculum to meet the minimum theory and skills standards required by the American Welding Society for entry-level welders.

The Carpentry Technology (CARP), Electrical Installation and Maintenance Technology (EIMT), and Sheet Metal and Plastics Technology (SMP) programs prepare students for entry-level employment, including apprenticeship positions.

Self Evaluation

The College meets the Standard.

Many of the College’s CTE programs are certified by the same institutions that award individual certification to the program’s graduates. Therefore, the program faculty members feel confident that their curriculum adequately prepares the student for licensure.

Following up on the status of CTE graduates in fields that have licensing standards or requirements is more difficult, but the College is embarking on a process to more systematically connect with, and obtain information on, CTE graduates. Some programs attempt to directly monitor licensure exam results of their graduates since these results would give the program a definitive method of confirming that the program’s SLOs have been achieved. Unfortunately, recent federal laws regarding student privacy rights have prevented licensing institutions from revealing exam results including general, non-
personal statistical information (e.g., percent of the College’s graduates that have passed the licensing exam). Consequently, programs must rely on a mail survey of graduates to determine licensure success. The resources that each program can commit to this effort vary, as do the success of these efforts. For example, the EIMT program achieves a very successful 80% response rate to its mail survey, but most others have been less successful with only a 10% to 20% response rate. To assist programs in this effort, the VCAA has secured a Perkins grant to enable a counselor to track and maintain contact with recent CTE graduates. The grant was secured in Fall 2011, and work began in Spring 2012.

Some surveys have revealed that many graduates do not take licensure exams because their employers do not require it. For these employers, the College’s degree or certificate is adequate proof of competency. Therefore, many program faculty members feel that if their survey reveals that graduates have acquired a job in a related field, then their program is a success.

Most programs maintain close contact with industry leaders both informally as well as formally through the Program Review process and through the program’s Advisory Committee. These leaders are employers of many of the programs’ graduates and therefore provide direct feedback on graduates’ performance, including licensure success. A list of the CTE programs and their current advisory committees is located in the College catalog.

**Actionable Improvement Plans**

Program personnel will develop assessment plans and assessment methods that will better measure the quality and success of their programs. These assessment results will be good indicators of licensure success.

**II.A.6. The institution assures that students and prospective students receive clear and accurate information about educational courses and programs and transfer policies. The institution describes its degrees and certificates in terms of their purpose, content, course requirements, and expected student learning outcomes. In every class section students receive a course syllabus that specifies learning objectives consistent with those in the institution’s officially approved course outline.**

**Descriptive Summary**

The College catalog describes each program’s certificate and degree requirements in terms of their purpose, content, course requirements, and expected SLOs. Recently revised individualized rack cards, displayed in the counseling office and at various recruitment events provide useful summaries of various degree and certificate options, are available for current and prospective students to take home.

SLOs are required by the CPC and the General Education Board and are published in the on-line catalog. The Curriculum Handbook requires that syllabus descriptions given to each class include SLOs consistent with those in the officially approved course outline.
Transfer of credit policy is included in the catalog as well as described in the Curriculum Handbook. Transfer of credit policy and procedures are discussed in more detail in Standard II.A.6.a below.

Actions have been taken to ensure clear and accurate information is provided to students and prospective students. These actions are amplified in Standard II.A.6.c below.

Self Evaluation

The College meets the Standard.

The College catalog, the Curriculum Handbook, program rack cards and course syllabi contain the information required to meet this standard.

Actionable Improvement Plans

No action is required.

II.A.6.a. The institution makes available to its students clearly stated transfer-of-credit policies in order to facilitate the mobility of students without penalty. In accepting transfer credits to fulfill degree requirements, the institution certifies that the expected learning outcomes for transferred courses are comparable to the learning outcomes of its own courses. Where patterns of student enrollment between institutions are identified, the institution develops articulation agreements as appropriate to its mission.

Descriptive Summary

The College makes available to its students clearly stated transfer-of-credit policies in order to facilitate the mobility of students without penalty. The College catalog states the transfer-of-credit policies and guides the student as to what action must be taken to ensure transfer credits are accepted. The college maintains a large transfer database, which informs students and counselors. Transfer of credit requests for courses not yet in the database are forwarded by the counselors to the appropriate General Education sub-board or to the relevant individual faculty member for review. The general policy is to accept a course if at least 70% of its SLOs match a comparable College course. If the course is not described by SLOs, the course description or list of course competencies are compared to the College’s course SLOs.

In addition, in Fall 2011, the college adopted use of the STAR, an online student advising tool. STAR for Students allows students to track their progress towards their current degree program. It also allows students to compare their courses against different degree programs and to drag and drop courses into their academic planner to check if they are on track towards graduation. Several reports are also made available to our CTE
students. These include Gainful Employment Reports, Certificate Programs to Workforce Ready data, and Completion to Work Reports.

Discussions and negotiations on articulation issues within the UH System take place within the University Council on Articulation (UCA). However, other system articulation committees are authorized to meet and form agreements. The College’s General Education Board has been given authority to enter into negotiations with other UH system colleges. System wide articulation agreements have been reached for all common Foundations, Diversification and Focus courses. These agreements allow for immediate and unencumbered transfer of all courses. The Ethics Focus and Oral Communications requirements are a notable exception as discussed above. However, the College maintains its commitment to their inclusion in its general education core. The VCAA works closely with the Articulation / Matriculation Officer (counselor) on the development of new articulation agreements and pathways (as evidenced by the CENT, ECE and AD pathways to UH West Oahu and others discussed below), works to resolve articulation errors across the system and to monitor and renew these agreements prior to the expiration date. The Articulation counselor acts as the point person from the college with program faculty on this and other campuses. The VCAA / and or the Chancellor has final authority and responsibility to approve the agreements. The VCAA in the role of Chief Academic Officer attends system wide Chief Academic Officer meetings to coordinate overall system issues relating to articulation.

In addition, the College has entered into the system wide Automatic Admissions agreement. Any student, who is not enrolled in a 4-year institution and does not have a bachelor’s degree, and who has 93% of their graduation requirements completed and 96% of their core requirements completed with a GPA of 2.0 or higher in the A.A. or A.S. in Liberal Arts, CENT, OESM or ECE, is given an automatic admission opportunity to any university in the system. The university will utilize its STAR system, which records all of the student’s course data, to identify those graduating each semester from a community college and eligible for automatic admission into one of the system’s three baccalaureate-granting campuses. These students will be notified that they have been admitted to the baccalaureate campus of their choice. To ease the transition, UH will also waive the application fee, allow for priority registration, and analyze student transcripts to help identify likely major(s).

The UH System has also instituted a Reverse Transfer Policy. The university will also identify students who transferred to a baccalaureate campus from a community college before receiving their associate’s degree. Reverse transfer will provide an option for students to be awarded their associate’s degree as they progress toward their bachelor’s degree. If for any reason, they choose not to finish, they will have their Associate degree in hand. Receiving one degree may also encourage them to continue their course of studies.
Both the Automatic Admissions Policy and the Reverse Transfer Policy aim to “improve degree attainment in the state and allow the UH campuses to work together to help students achieve their academic goals.”

Articulation agreements for the CTE programs have also been developed. These include: Early Childhood Education with the University of West Oahu, Administration of Justice (AJ) with Chaminade University, Hawaii Pacific University and UH at West Oahu. AVIT with Galvin Flight Services Hawaii, CENT with Hawaii Pacific University and Mele with Belmont University in Tennessee. [Progress Report on Student and Credit Transfer Within the University of Hawai‘i; Articulated Courses; UHM General Education]

Recently there was a system wide ICS articulation meeting where an agreement was reached to articulate all common ICS courses. During this meeting the SLOs for eight ICS courses were rewritten. Establishing common SLOs was the basis for the articulation agreement.

EVIDENCE:

Systemwide Academic Initiatives
Reverse Transfer
UHM General Education Articulation and Transfer
STAR
Transfer Credit Policy
Self Evaluation

The College meets the Standard.

Based on the Transfer of Credit Policy and the Articulation Agreements achieved, the standard has been met. The College remains optimistic that lower level E-focus courses and Oral Communications courses may be accepted in transfer at UH Manoa in the near future.

Actionable Improvement Plans

No action is required.

II.A.6.b. When programs are eliminated or program requirements are significantly changed, the institution makes appropriate arrangements so that enrolled students may complete their education in a timely manner with a minimum of disruption.
Descriptive Summary

Program review data is used to review annual program performance. Over the last four years, the College has “stopped-out” two programs that needed to completely realign the curriculum and SLOs. This occurs when indicators suggest that a program needs to undergo serious evaluation or re-vamping of curriculum and SLOs to meet the needs of the industry the program serves. For example, in Fall 2008, the MARR program underwent a stop-out based upon student enrollment numbers. The stop-out allowed for the program faculty to become engaged in and part of an external accreditation process. The review and adoption of a new program took a year of work. The launch of the new program in Fall 2009 resulted in a healthy program enrollment of 30 majors. As a further example, in Fall 2011, the college stopped out the Diesel program (DISL) in an effort to adopt the nationally accredited NATEF curriculum. The program dean is now in the recruitment stage of identifying a Diesel program faculty to lead that process. It is expected that the Diesel program will begin a new intake of student for Fall 2012.

On the rare occasion when such programs are eliminated or significant changes are made to the curriculum, the CPC reviews the program’s transitional plans to ensure that there is minimum impact on the student. In accordance with the Curriculum Handbook, an attempt is made to extend the existing second year curriculum for one year, or long enough to complete the onboard students without requiring additional courses. If it is not economically feasible to extend one year, and there are significant changes to a program’s curriculum, the CPC will review both the old and the new curriculum and determine if there are sufficient transitional prerequisite courses to allow the student to smoothly shift to the new curriculum without requiring an inordinate number of new courses. The CPC will require the program to account for the students who will be able to continue with the old curriculum and those who must shift to the new curriculum along with the additional courses they will be required to complete.

If it is not economically feasible to extend a program that is slated to be eliminated, students will be advised to transfer to another campus that offers a similar program, or change to another College program compatible with the student’s goals.

EVIDENCE:

Curriculum Reference Manual

Self Evaluation

The College meets the Standard.

Interviews with the College counselors indicate that past program transitions were relatively smooth and most students were satisfied with the outcome. In some instances, when the curricula for a program underwent significant changes, new students were initially not accepted into the program and continuing students were assisted in finding substitute courses to earn their degrees. Other options for these students included
transferring to another college or to another program at the College to earn their degree. For example, when AEC was revised to an AS degree program, students were offered the option to upgrade their under-100 Drafting level courses through credit-by-exam. Students who preferred to earn the phased-out Drafting Technology degree were allowed to substitute courses so they could graduate in a reasonable amount of time. The RAC program instituted substantial changes to their curriculum in Fall 2006. The program personnel instituted a plan that included the date the old curriculum would be terminated and when the new RAC courses would be offered in order to accommodate current students graduating under the old RAC requirements.

The College Curriculum Handbook sufficiently covers the procedures that must be followed. Past experience has shown that a dedicated effort is needed by both the program faculty and the College counselors to ensure the transition takes place with minimum impact on the student and HCC has demonstrated its commitment to that effort.

**Planning Agenda**

No action is required.

*II.A.6.c. The institution presents itself clearly, accurately, and consistently to prospective and current students, the public, and its personnel through its catalogs, statements, and publications, including those presented in electronic formats. It regularly reviews institutional policies, procedures, and publications to assure integrity in all representations about its mission, programs, and services.*

**Descriptive Summary**

The College has taken major steps to ensure that it presents itself clearly, accurately, and consistently to prospective and current students, the public, and its personnel through its catalogs, statements, publications, and Web site. The college catalogue is the institution’s primary means of communication. All course and programs changes undergo a rigorous review process as previously described in II.A.2. This process culminates with appropriate information being forwarded from the administration to those in charge of the current catalogue. Similarly, all changes made in college policies and/or procedures undergo an equally rigorous process of review by the appropriate governance bodies. This process also culminates with appropriate information being passed from the administration to those in charge of the current catalogue. The catalogue is meticulously reviewed and edited each year to ensure that all information is current and accurate.

The College website is maintained by the webmaster. Most information presented is drawn from the college catalogue. Any changes must be approved by those who maintain the catalogue. Any other information must be approved by the administration. For example the class availability for courses offered each semester undergoes several drafts and reviews by all concerned before being approved by administration for publication. All other statements and publications made by the College must align with the information published in the catalogue. The college has also developed and published a policy on “Social Media Site and/or Account Use and Management” to further ensure the
integrity and consistency of college communications both internally and externally. All of the Colleges external communications are reviewed and must be approved by the Chancellor’s executive assistant.

**EVIDENCE:**

Curriculum Reference Manual  
CPC Minutes  

General Education  

Social Media Site and/or Account Use and Management - HCC # 2.211  

College Catalog  

Self Evaluation  

The College meets the Standard.

**Actionable Improvement Plans**

No action is required.

**II.A.7. In order to assure the academic integrity of the teaching-learning process, the institution uses and makes public governing board-adopted policies on academic freedom and responsibility, student academic honesty, and specific institutional beliefs or worldviews. These policies make clear the institution’s commitment to the free pursuit and dissemination of knowledge.**

**II.A.7.a. Faculty distinguish between personal conviction and professionally accepted views in a discipline. They present data and information fairly and objectively.**

**Descriptive Summary**

The policy on Academic Freedom is outlined in the 2009-2015 Agreement between University of Hawaii Professional Assembly (UHPA) and the University of Hawaii Board of Regents. Article IX of the agreement ensures that the faculty members are entitled to the free pursuit and dissemination of knowledge. [UHPA Faculty Contract](#)

With this freedom, it is also expected that the faculty members conduct themselves in an honorable and ethical manner. In the agreement, under Article IV “Faculty Professional Responsibilities and Workload”, the statement reads:

“In giving instruction upon controversial matters, Faculty Members are expected to set forth justly and without suppression the differing opinions of other investigators and in their conclusions provide factual or other scholarly sources for such conclusions. Faculty
Members should be careful not to introduce into their teaching controversial matters that have no relation to their subject.”

**EVIDENCE:**

*UHPA Faculty Contract*

**Self Evaluation**

The College meets the Standard.

The 2009-2015 UHPA Board Contract satisfies the Standard regarding academic freedom, and Article IV requires the faculty members to distinguish between personal conviction and professionally accepted views in a discipline. Faculty members must present data and information fairly and objectively.

**Actionable Improvement Plans**

No action is required.

*II.A.7.b. The institution establishes and publishes clear expectations concerning student academic honesty and the consequences for dishonesty.*

**Descriptive Summary**

The policy on student academic honesty is found in the Student Conduct Code and is also included in the catalog. The Student Conduct Code addresses cheating and plagiarism, and gives several examples to clarify the terms. Furthermore the college policy on plagiarism is stated in most course syllabi. Each instructor is given several options in dealing with a suspected Student Conduct Code violation. If the student contests the instructor’s action, the incident is brought before the Dean of Student Services who will make a further investigation and determine the validity of the accusation and if additional action is required.

**EVIDENCE:**

*College Catalog*

*Student Conduct Code*

**Self Evaluation**

The College meets the Standard.

**Planning Agenda**
II.A.7.c. Institutions that require conformity to specific codes of conduct of staff, faculty, administrators, or students, or that seek to instill specific beliefs or worldviews, give clear prior notice of such policies, including statements in the catalog and/or appropriate faculty or student handbooks.

Descriptive Summary

The College requires conformity to several specific codes of conduct that apply to administrators, faculty, staff, and students. They are outlined in the catalog and include academic rights and freedoms of students, workplace non-violence, nondiscrimination and affirmative action, sexual assault and sexual harassment, illicit drugs and alcohol, tobacco use, lethal weapons, personal property and copyright infringements. These subjects are also addressed in the Student Conduct Code. College Policies are aligned with system policies.

In accordance with the Federal Drug-Free Schools and Community Act of 1989 and the Drug-Free Workplace Act of 1988, the College annually distributes a newsletter notifying all faculty, staff, and students of the policies regarding alcohol and drug abuses. The College does not have a code or policy to instill specific beliefs or worldviews.

Self Evaluation

The College meets the Standard.

Actionable Improvement Plans

No action is required.

II.A.8. Institutions offering curricula in foreign locations to students other the U.S. nationals operate in conformity with standards and applicable Commission policies.

Descriptive Summary

The College does not offer curricula in foreign locations.

Self Evaluation

The Standard is not applicable.

Actionable Improvement Plans

No action is required.
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Standard IIB: Student Support Services

The institution recruits and admits diverse students who are able to benefit from its programs, consistent with its mission. Student support services address the identified needs of students and enhance a supportive learning environment. The entire student pathway through the institutional experience is characterized by a concern for student access, progress, learning, and success. The institution systematically assesses student support services using student learning outcomes, faculty and staff input, and other appropriate measures in order to improve the effectiveness of these services.

II.B.1. The institution assures the quality of student support services and demonstrates that these services, regardless of location or means of delivery, support student learning and enhance achievement of the mission of the institution.

Descriptive Summary

Student Support Services at Honolulu Community College are organizationally housed within the Student Services and Academic Support units of the institution. The College is committed to providing students with access to the support needed to progress, learn and succeed in meeting their educational and personal goals. Services are learning-centered and focused on assisting students to reach their highest potential.

The Student Services Program Review process, which operates on a five-year cycle, was established to evaluate the Division’s performance in meeting student needs. A schedule has been developed for years 2010-2014, inclusive of all programs and divisions. [Program Review]

The Program Review process incorporates assessment of the following:

- Development and review of Division and Departmental mission statements
- Creation of strategic academic development plans
- Implementation of annual processes and outcome objectives
- Collection of assessment data
- Systematic evaluation of data

The following Units are currently involved in ongoing evaluations of their programs.

STUDENT SERVICES

Admissions Office:

The primary mission of the Admissions Office is to provide information and assistance regarding the academic and financial requirements of the College to prospective students, as well as their family members, secondary school counselors and community agents. Staff members also provide Admissions counseling to students, which includes step-by-step assistance with the admissions process, selecting a program of study, and preparing for registration.
The Admissions unit employs surveys and evaluation forms to provide feedback and suggestions to improve and simplify the Admissions process. Accepted students who do not enroll in courses receive follow-up contact to determine if further assistance would result in the student’s ability to attend the College. Evaluations are disseminated to students during a designated period to obtain feedback on the performance and effectiveness of the Admissions Counselor. In addition, those who participate in Campus Tours, Counselors-on-Campus Days and Student Tour Guide Training Days are asked to complete a brief evaluation to assist the unit in assessing itself and improving services.

Advising/Counseling:

The primary mission of the Academic Counseling unit is to empower students to develop strategies for attaining college success. Individual and group counseling sessions conclude with administering of surveys to assess the effectiveness of services. Academic Counseling has identified goals, objectives, and student learner outcomes (SLOs) and are creating assessment instruments to measure effectiveness in meeting these goals, objectives, and outcomes.

Mental Health and Wellness:

Appropriate and reliable mental health support services are available to students. The Mental Health & Wellness Service, the first of its kind in the University of Hawai‘i’s Community College system, was established in 2008 and is directed by a licensed clinical social worker. It is committed to providing an array of mental health support services that support the academic, social and emotional growth and well-being of students; to educating the campus community about mental health and wellness issues; to developing partnerships with community agencies; and to establishing assessment tools to evaluate the effectiveness of program services activities on campus. Its services include faculty consultations, student walk-in services, crisis counseling, individual and group counseling, community referrals and clinical meetings. There has been a significant increase in the number of consultations of all types in the past few years, which can be attributed, in part, to the following factors: an increase in student enrollment, more students attending college with diagnosed mental health conditions, and an increase in environmental stress factors. The Mental Health and Wellness Service has also increased its outreach in the form of more classroom and group presentations, attendance at campus events, a direct role in new student orientation programs, and direct contact with students needing assistance. In addition it has developed and annual Health & Wellness Provider Fair on campus, with about forty service providers and community organizations participating. The Mental Health & Wellness Service has developed and implemented a number of assessment tools to identify the needs and concerns of students, faculty and staff, and to assess the effectiveness of the service itself. These include: Faculty and staff Mental Health Needs Assessment Survey (2008); Student Mental Health Needs Assessment Survey (2008); MHWS Student Satisfaction Survey (Survey Share) (2009-2010); Evaluation tools for MHWS activities (workshops, trainings, conferences, presentations, fairs); and the American College Health Assessment Survey (2010.) These assessment tools have helped the Mental Health & Wellness service identify the
most pressing concerns of students, faculty and staff, and have led to the creation of new tools to assist with the collection and tracking of clinical services needs and responses.

Career and Employment Center:

The primary mission of the Career and Employment Center (CEC) is to coordinate and facilitate all career development and employment-related activities for students, in partnership with faculty, staff, employers, and community partners. The Center helps students to understand themselves and bridge the gap between self and their academic experiences.

Career counseling is provided for students to assist them in the decision-making process when selecting a major or occupation. Various career assessments may be administered on a case-by-case basis in order to help clarify a person's values, interest, skills, and abilities. Once students are able to identify their career choice, an academic plan is created to map out the transition from college to professional life.

CEC also coordinates services that aid students in preparing and seeking employment during college and after graduation. Each student is given an opportunity to develop pre-employment skills through one-on-one counseling sessions or in-class presentations. Pre-employment development can range from résumé and interview preparation to learning appropriate workplace behaviors.

The CEC also houses the on- and off-campus employment database, which is called the Student Employment and Cooperative Education (SECE) system. Eligible students are able to log onto SECE and perform a job search and obtain job referrals for either on- or off-campus openings. Additionally, employers and on-campus supervisors are able to post job openings by accessing the SECE database online. On-campus supervisors are required to go through a mandatory training session with the Job Placement Coordinator. During the training, supervisors are taught how to utilize the database as well as understand the policies that govern the SECE system.

Lastly, CEC interacts with community employers and builds partnerships for HCC students. The department hosts an annual Career Fair and invites employers who offer job opportunities for almost every major on campus. The fair provides HCC students a chance to network and build connections to industry. CEC also offers employers the opportunity to recruit year-round by setting up a table on the campus mall area. Employers in both venues are satisfied with the accommodations and venue to meet and greet our HCC students.

Financial Aid:

The primary mission of the Financial Aid office is to provide assistance in applying for and receiving state and federal aid in a student-friendly environment that is equitably accessible to eligible students pursuing post-secondary education. The Financial Aid office is also responsible for reducing the College’s cohort loan default rate and developing and implementing an outcomes assessment of students and the improvement of student performance in repayment of loans.
Between AY 2008-2009 and AY 2010-2011, the Financial Aid office experienced a 75% increase in applications. The number of Federal Pell Grant recipients grew during this period from 562 to 954, leading to a 70% increase in recipients. The total number of students offered any type of aid increased by 13%. This dramatic increase is likely due to the high unemployment rate and the focus of residents returning to school. Other initiatives concentrating on student support for success, including the Achieving the Dream initiative, have likely made financial aid support more visible, and have required greater assistance in completing the process of applying for financial aid. The Financial Aid office is working to become more proactive in delivering the information necessary to educate students and parents about the process of applying for financial aid.

TRIO – SSS:

The mission of TRIO-SSS is to provide a range of academic support, career guidance, transfer planning, and professional development opportunities to qualifying community college students who are first-generation in college, have a financial need and/or disability, and demonstrate strong academic potential. Students receive guided individualized assessment and planning, small group tutoring, mentoring, cultural and educational workshops, club and community service activities, and other academic support.

TRIO-SSS is supported by a grant that has been designed to 1) increase the retention and graduation rates of eligible students; 2) increase the transfer rates of eligible students from two-year to four-year institutions; and 3) foster an institutional climate supportive of the success of individuals who meet one or more of the eligibility criteria as noted above. This project is annually funded in the amount of $237,656 by the U.S. Department of Education (2010-2015), and serves and reports on up to 160 students.

Native Hawaiian Center:

The Hulili Ke Kukui: Native Hawaiian Center (NHC) is comprised of two programs: Po‘i Nā Nalu (The Native Hawaiian Career & Technical Education (CTE) Program funded primarily through a Carl Perkins Grant) and a Title III Native Hawaiian serving institutions grant. The Native Hawaiian Center’s mission is to actively preserve and perpetuate Hawaiian culture and values. Through an array of comprehensive services, the Center strengthens the college's educational programs and enables students of Hawaiian ancestry to succeed in their academic, career and individual endeavors, in accord with major components of the mission of the College and the strategic plans of both the College and the UH system. [Native Hawaiian Center]

The Po‘i Nā Nalu Program supports Native Hawaiian CTE students and provides services such as career and financial aid advising, pre-professional certification and workshops, CTE-related cooperative education, peer-assisted gateway general education courses, stipends, four-year transfer transition workshops, as well as an array of cultural enrichment and service activities. [Po‘i Nā Nalu]

The Center has supported the establishment of several G-funded positions: a Hawaiian Studies instructor, NHC academic support computer lab manager, an academic counselor
and a Native Hawaiian CTE coordinator. The Center has a technologically advanced computer lab. Through Title III, the Center has been able to establish the First Year Experience program, the Music & Entertainment Learning Experience (MELE) Associate of Science program, as well as the Hawaii Ocean: Kūholoaloa Program.

As part of an indigenous-serving institution, the Center provides academic, career and transfer advising, co-curricular activities that promote culture-based education and enrichment events such as ‘Imi Na‘auao lecture series and Mālama ‘Āina Days, academic tutoring and mentoring, Summer Bridge and Learning Community courses, a Technology Tools Series and Financial Aid and Scholarship workshops, as well as faculty and staff professional development opportunities. The Center tracks the usage of the facilities, services and events by administering surveys and evaluations for participating community guests, students, staff and faculty members.

Student Health Services:

The primary mission of Student Health Services is to integrate individual health services, health education, disease prevention, and public health responsibilities. The Health Office continues to support the front-line staff in Admissions with health clearance by reviewing documentation submitted, seeking clarification from health care providers/students, and in providing guidance and advice in dealing with difficult situations.

Initially, the Health Office began to evaluate where best to concentrate efforts, given that the College is a commuter campus and only limited care can be provided. Being available as the designated emergency contact was an obvious service that the office could provide, given that many of our students are at work technical-occupational areas that involve some degree of risk. The Office began to work towards ensuring this was incorporated into our admission process. In addition, we continue to maintain first aid kits, write up accident reports, and provide initial care for injured students. While working to encourage more students to provide us with emergency contact information, we were deeply affected by an accidental death on campus, and the subsequent tragedy at Virginia Tech. This motivated the campus to work towards forming an ad hoc Emergency Planning Subcommittee that Health Office personnel co-chair. With safety an increasing concern on campus, the office has become more involved with finalizing the emergency action plan for the campus, and working towards sharing more emergency medical procedures with the campus via the phone directory and campus-wide posters. The Office has also worked towards educating faculty, staff, and students to sign up for the UH Alert system where they would be notified in the event of a campus-wide emergency. The Office also continues to support our Security Officers with annual CPR & first aid training, and works closely with Security during the year, providing support when emergency situations arise that may require debriefing and feedback/adjustment of procedures that affect the health and safety of students.

Due to the lack of clerical support and difficulty securing student assistants, it has been challenging to provide basic Health Office services/hours and take on additional activities. Other initiatives that the office felt were a priority and have actively supported include: domestic violence awareness projects; hosting and recruiting participants for campus flu shot clinics and community blood drives; and educational workshops and
wellness activities in partnership with the Health & Wellness Subcommittee and the Staff Development Council. With the arrival of the new Mental Health & Wellness Counselor, the Office has found another partner in the area of health and wellness; working together on problematic areas noted on the recent American College Health survey completed by HCC students.

Student Life:

The primary responsibility of Student Life and Development (SLD) is to provide services to students during their entire time at the College, from orientation of new students to Graduation, with an array of co-curricular programs and activities in between. The services provided by SLD are offered to the entire student body. SLD is directly involved in supporting the college mission by providing diverse educational opportunities for personal enrichment, providing the academic and student support to assist students as they progress through their respective courses and programs, and to facilitate the important work of our faculty and staff.

SLD provides a wide-range of services to HCC students. Such activities include Student Life General Management (Lockers, Lost & Found, Facilities, Student Employees), mandatory new student orientation, graduation, co-curricular programming, teaching and training, student identification cards (day students, SOCAD, Pearl Harbor, Apprentice, guests, and ICE), advising chartered student organizations (ASUH and Student Media Board), and registered Independent Student Organizations (Clubs.)

Student Life and Development created six Student Learning Outcomes that reflect the College’s Mission and Strategic Plan. Students who have been involved with Student Life & Development will be able to 1) Assume personal responsibility for their actions, and work effectively as an individual and as a member of a group; 2) Discuss and understand diverse ideas, beliefs, and behaviors; 3) Access, interpret, evaluate, and synthesize information using multiple resources; 4) Understand the value of community and civic engagement as a lifelong concept; 5) Explore and express personal creativity; 6) Understand self and others as members of our diverse global community. The SLD student learning outcomes ensure that the program is meeting students’ needs. In order to improve services to students, surveys are often used to assess student satisfaction.

ACADEMIC SUPPORT DIVISION

Records Office:

The primary mission of the Records Office is to efficiently manage and provide high-quality educational support services to current and former students, faculty, staff and the community at large in all aspects of student academic record-keeping. The Office also collaborates with its Community College counterparts within the UH System in efforts to advance System services and ensure consistency across all campuses. The Records Office employs several student surveys to obtain feedback and suggestions to improve and simplify the Registration process.

College Skills Center:
The primary mission of the Testing Services unit of the College Skills Center (CSC) is embodied in the mission of the CSC, and the testing center mission is to support the College mission by providing access to students to take their quizzes, tests, and exams in a monitored, secured, and test-conducive environment. In the CSC, where placement, DE, makeup, and fee-based testing services are offered, system-based satisfaction surveys are administered at the end of each semester to students using testing services to verify whether the services offered meet students’ needs.

Distance Education:

In the last several years, Honolulu Community College’s Distance Education (DE) program has undergone comprehensive change in order to sharpen a tighter program out of what has sometimes been a disparate, diverse group of classes. Our DE program has written a handbook for instructors containing policies and procedures in order to drive standardization of course goals and outcomes. This handbook offers training and descriptions of best practices in distance education and is a significant part of HCC’s systematic goal of ensuring that all of our DE classes do an even better job of meeting a uniform standard of quality, rigor, and academic integrity. These goals, and the processes necessary to achieve them, remain an ongoing effort.

Honolulu Community College’s Distance Education Review Board (DERB) has become more streamlined in order to review and approve courses in a timelier manner. Currently, there is a renewed effort at actively accumulating information on student services and support specifically for our distance education courses. This information will be part of HCC’s Handbook for Distance Education, which is nearly complete, and will also contain comprehensive descriptions of distance education modalities as well as helping to manage student expectations.

Student ACCESS:

The primary mission of the disability services providers is to ensure equal access for students with disabilities to all curricular and co-curricular opportunities offered by the College. Services for students with disabilities has been renamed Student ACCESS and is also now a designated office with designated employees focused on meeting this mission. Since 2007, annual reports are written at the end of each academic year encompassing data from student surveys, program data (including gate counts, the number of students serviced, types of conditions, and costs associated with student services.) Data collected also include evaluation of the program as a whole, the provision of services students received, and recommendations from the students for service/program improvements. The evaluations from the students continue to very positive.

Student ACCESS has also made considerable changes to its website to provide (1) information to faculty and staff to promote an informed campus, and (2) information for students with disabilities regarding procedures to secure disability-related accommodations. In 2007, the Guidebook to Academic Accommodations was developed, distributed to various departments at HCC, and posted on the disability services website for both students and employees to be able to access. Additionally, an
Access Map was developed, distributed, and posted on the disability services website, highlighting accessible routes and other features at HCC. [Disability Access Website]

During the Summer of 2011, Student ACCESS was moved to a new location on campus. This has been a very positive move for two primary reasons: (1) the office is now on the ground floor, and (2) students no longer might feel uncomfortable walking through the learning lab to get to the office.

Based on the College’s new plan for structural reorganization, Student ACCESS is going through a slight change. Student ACCESS will be located in the Academic Support Division with direct reporting to Administration. Given the nature of the work performed in Student ACCESS with complying with federal laws and given that the College’s ADA/504 is an Administrator, this is a logical decision. (Previously, Student ACCESS was positioned in the College Skills Center.)

An essential component for students with disabilities is the utilization of the Testing Center. The Testing Center provides essential and required services for our students with disabilities. The testing center has designated space (separate rooms for reduced distraction) for students with disabilities to utilize their testing accommodations. Additionally, to support students’ disabilities, disability-related equipment and assistive technologies have been purchased and/or upgraded to provide effective and equal access to testing materials.

Self Evaluation

The College meets the Standard.

The College provides a multitude of high-quality support services aimed at meeting the individual learning needs of our diverse student population. Regardless of locale, the Student Services and Academic Support Divisions support the mission of the College and collaborate to enhance the overall student experience.

Actionable Improvement Plans

No action is required; however, it is suggested that the College continue to create solutions and/or means of service delivery for DE students who are unable to meet in-person obligations as outlined by UH System policies. Further, is it suggested that there be coordinated efforts in tutoring services provided by different Units within the College by requiring all departments to provide training to certify their tutors to the same standard. It is also suggested that these areas coordinate scheduled meetings to ensure consistency in the services they offer.

II.B.2. The institution provides a catalog for its constituencies with precise, accurate, and current information concerning the following:

Descriptive Summary

General Information:
The 2011-2012 College Catalog is clear, easy to understand, easy to use and well structured. The name, physical address, phone numbers, Web site address, philosophy, and mission of the College are included, as are course, program, and degree offerings, academic calendars, and descriptions of program length. Available student aid, learning resources, names and degrees of administrators and faculty members, and names of governing UH Board members are also included. A Facebook page, maintained and updated daily, also contains this and other information appropriate for that platform.

Requirements:

Detailed admissions information, tuition information, other financial obligations of students, and degree and certificate requirements are explained in the catalog. Program descriptions indicate the degree(s) applicable to specific programs and the courses that meet the degree requirements. Both graduation requirements, which are based on program requirements, and transfer information are given in the “Degree and Certificates” section of the catalog. A pdf document of the catalog is available on line. The college also maintains a dynamic website that contains pages for every program area. Listed on the program websites is the information contained in the catalog, which reflects the requirements of admissions, placement, all degrees and certificates and the requirements for graduation.

Major Policies Affecting Students:

All admissions, registration, credit, transfer processes, grades and examination information are included in the catalog. Academic dishonesty, the student conduct code, the grievance process and complaint procedures are also addressed both in the catalog and on the website. The Dean of Students’ office contains the official policies related to all the student service areas. Policies relevant to placement, mandatory enrollment and articulation agreements and policies are housed in the office of the Vice-Chancellor of Academic Affairs.

Other Policies:

The Catalog includes URLs to department and policy sites that list the most up-to-date information for students. Other print and online materials are available to students.

Self Evaluation

The College meets the Standard.

The practices and policies on campus focused on student placement and mandatory enrollment in remedial/developmental education in the first semester has required a substantial updating of pre-requisites and policies. In order to deal with uncertainties and minimize misinformation arising from this new policy, a group has been convened to ensure accuracy in the catalog as well as in Banner (the student information system and registration system.) It is expected that all issues related to this and other curricular changes will be fully addressed in the AY 2012-2013 catalog. It is the College’s responsibility to ensure that degree/certificate/course information is true and correct. The
college has put into place a pre-requisite process that requires personnel check for errors in Banner prior to the start of each registration period.

In addition to regular checks for updated content, the fact that the catalog is printed on campus has reduced production turn-around time and made it possible to extend deadlines for making changes. In-house printing has also allowed for installment printings that have made typographical and other non-substantive corrections possible at each printing.

**Actionable Improvement Plans**

No action is required; however, it is recommended that the College continue to ensure that information pertinent to courses, certificates and degrees is correct and up-to-date. Efforts will continue to ensure that information such as course pre-requisites are consistent across various sites (e.g., Curriculum Action Forms, Catalog, Banner, Websites) so that the registration process is seamless for students. A task force has been convened to review information sources and processes, and identify means to improve consistency.

II.B.3. *The institution researches and identifies the learning support needs of its student population and provides appropriate services and programs to address those needs.*

II.B.3.a. *The institution assures equitable access to all of its students by providing appropriate, comprehensive, and reliable services to students regardless of service location or delivery method.*

**Descriptive Summary**

The College serves students regardless of service location or delivery method. Resources such as MyUH portal and the STAR advising system are available through any internet connection making for easy access to registration, payment, or advising assistance seamless regardless of the student’s location. Student services personnel also use additional electronic methods of providing student support through individual appointments via Skype or telephone with students not able to access the main services building in person.

**Self Evaluation**

The College meets the Standard.

**Actionable Improvement Plans**

No action is required.

II.B.3.b. *The institution provides an environment that encourages personal and civic responsibility, as well as intellectual, aesthetic, and personal development for all of its students.*

**Descriptive Summary**
The college provides an environment that offers many opportunities for our entire student body to engage in, encouraging personal and civic responsibility as well as intellectual, aesthetic, and personal development for all of its students. This objective is supported by the numerous student clubs, organizations, committees and support programs across the Honolulu Community College campus.

Service Learning:

Students can participate in various forms of service learning and community service. These opportunities have included the following: helping at the Nike Na Wahine Triathlon; cleanup of the Korean care home; assisting with children’s activities at Families Can Survive Camp; patrolling the nearby community for the Weed and Seed program; volunteering at nearby elementary, middle, and high schools; volunteering in human service agencies around the community; peer-tutoring in various programs. Individual instructors may offer options for service learning projects in their courses.

One special example of service learning that was initiated by the College’s Native Hawaiian Center (NHC) is Malama Aina Days, implemented in 2007. Malama Aina Days are intended to provide Honolulu Community College students, faculty, staff and their 'ohana an opportunity to perpetuate Hawaiian culture, instilling the concept of kuleana or responsibility in students, faculty, staff. Each month a cultural service learning project is performed at a Hawaiian cultural site or organization. While visiting these sites, participants not only learn about the importance of such places have an opportunity to give back to the community and a chance to connect with these places and communities. During this work, participants discuss Hawaiian values and concepts such as laulima (many hands working together towards one goal) as well as lokahi (working in unity); more importantly, participants are provided an opportunity to practice these values and concepts. Although Hawaiian, these ideas are relevant to students and their journey through higher education because the successful completion of college is a difficult and challenging one and many times the achievement of a single degree requires the helping hands of many different people. [Mālama ‘Āina Days]

In keeping with the collaborative spirit, the NHC has partnered with Title III, First Year Experience, TRIO-SSS, and Hawaiian Studies faculty. All parties meet twice a year to plan and coordinate the various Malama Aina Days for the semester. Fliers are distributed and posted around the HCC campus, email are sent our regularly, announced in class, and dates of events are posted in program calendars and websites. [Native Hawaiian Center Activities Calendar, Cultural, Educational & Service Learning Events]

Life Skill Workshops/Services:

To assist in the transition, retention and matriculation of our students, various campus clubs, programs, departments and organizations have offered workshops/services. Workshops/Services offered since the last accreditation self-study have included such diverse topics as: Time Management; Organizational Skills; Basic Computer Skills; Planning your academic journey through the utilization of STAR; Career Preparation (Resume Writing, Interviewing Skills, Customer Service, Career Kokua); Google Docs, Utilizing my UHPortal; Research Writing; Preparing for tests/exams; Basic Math Skills;
Financial Aid/Scholarship Fairs; Financial Responsibility; Stress Management; Note-taking Skills; and the NHC’s ‘Imi Na’auao Series.

Related activities have also included: Flu shot clinics, Blood Bank Drive, Walk a Mile In Her Shoes, Domestic Violence Awareness, The Great Aloha Run, Mental Health and Wellness Fair, LGBTI Safe Zone Training, Take Charge Mental Health Exhibit, Clothes Line Project.

Student Media Board: Ka La

*Ka La* is the student newspaper of Honolulu Community College. It is entirely student-run and operated under the supervision of the school’s Student Media Board. *Ka La* presents a forum for students to demonstrate their thoughts and report on what is happening within the HCC community as well as the University of Hawaii system at large. *Ka La* has implemented a website where the students as well as the larger community can access the most recent publication and up-to-date articles. In addition, *Ka La* has expanded to monthly publications, thus demonstrating the increase in student interest and participation. [Ka Lā, Ka Lā Newspaper]

Associated Students of University of Hawaii at Honolulu Community College:

All fee-paying students are regular members of the Associated Students of Honolulu Community College (ASUH-HCC). The Student Senate represents the ASUH-Honolulu CC on most College, Faculty Council, and University councils and committees. It is through this important student organization that students play a prominent role in the governance of the College and the University System. Student Government provides interested students the opportunity to learn and develop leadership skills. Student leaders learn parliamentary procedures and individual and group decision-making and interaction techniques. Student leaders have also planned and implemented a variety of campus and community activities; they have also partnered with other campus units and organizations to cultivate other leaders under the aegis of the Hawaii Association of Student Life Advisors (HASLA.) [ASUH-HCC]

Student Life and Development (SLD)-Clubs:

Clubs are encouraged to contribute to the campus by developing events and activities funded in part by student activity fees. All clubs are open to all students of Honolulu Community College. Clubs represent a number of individual CTE programs (Architectural Engineering and CAD, Communication Arts, Cosmetology, Construction Management, Fashion Technology, Human Services, Music Entertainment learning Experience) as well as other focused interests (Gymnastics, Hui ʻOiwi, Math, Phi Theta Kappa, The Righteous Rainbow, Suzume no Kai, and Veterans Academic Support.) [Student Organizations]

Self-Evaluation

The College meets the Standard.
Students have many opportunities on campus to develop personal and civic responsibility. Extracurricular, service learning, workshops, activities and leadership opportunities provide for development of self and civic engagement. Students are made aware of these opportunities via email, website, flier, on campus postings, throughout the school year.

**Actionable Improvement Plans**

No action is required.

**II.B.3.c. The institution designs, maintains, and evaluates counseling and/or academic advising programs to support student development and success and prepares faculty and other personnel responsible for the advising function.**

**Descriptive Summary**

Admissions and Counseling, which is located in the Administration Building, is staffed by eight counselors and three clerks. All counselors are knowledgeable and able to advise students in all degree programs at the College. Counselors are also liaisons to specific programs, and work closely with program faculty and students. They make sure that the requirements in STAR and program degree sheets are up-to-date so students can access these tools on their own if needed. Counselors also make sure that the necessary information is on-line for students to access, including tool lists and frequently asked questions.

Two Counselors are assigned to the Liberal Arts student population as well as Running Start, Jump Start, Bridge-to-Hope, and MELE. The other six counselors are assigned to the campus’ CTE degree programs. Additionally, counselors also process transcript evaluations and graduation applications for their respective programs. CTE Counselors visit classes for First Semester Advising, Registration Advising, and Graduation Advising. Liberal Arts Counselors hold transfer workshops. [Advising/Academic Counseling Program Review]

The units within Admissions and Counseling are Admissions, Academic Counseling, Mental Health and Wellness, and International Students. Using the Council for Advanced Standards in Higher Education [www.cas.edu] as a guide, mission statements, goals and objectives for each unit have been developed with the student as the primary focus. For example, in Academic Counseling, one of the listed goals is to “teach students self-directive and planning skills applicable to college and life.” An objective under this goal is to “utilize various delivery methods to formulate an academic plan such as one-on-one counseling, classroom advising, workshops, and on-line planning.” [Academic Counseling Program Review] An initiative that addressed this objective is Passport to College.

The development of Passport to College has been a gradual one, in which versions of a mandatory new student orientation were implemented semester by semester. The first version of a mandatory policy was implemented in Fall of 2009, when a mandatory new student registration was required for incoming freshman students. Results of the pre-post
survey revealed that mandatory new student registration sessions significantly improved students’ knowledge of information that supports student success in college. In the Spring 2010, as part of an initiative proposed by the Recruitment and Retention Committee, a number of new students registration sessions included a new student orientation component. During the summer of 2010, the new student registration and orientation hybrid offerings were revamped to meet the campus’ Achieving the Dream benchmarks for recruitment and retention. [Achieving the Dream, November 25, 2008 - Achieving the Dream Update]

Currently, Passport to College is an orientation and registration session that is mandatory for incoming new students. Passport to College offers breakout sessions that provides new students with an opportunity to learn about our campus resources, college success, requirements for their degree programs, and an opportunity to become familiar with the registration process that utilizes the online MyUH Portal system.

A continuing unit initiative that has supported the unit’s goal to “teach students self-directive and planning skills applicable to college and life” is found in the unit’s usage of STAR. STAR is a computerized program that allows students to be self-directed in checking on and planning their academic progress. Some of its features include a progress check towards completing their degree requirements in their declared major (Academic Journey), a progress check towards another major within the UH system, creation of an academic plan, information on scholarships, and a view of the student’s transcripts. Counselors have annually updated the courses and requirements in the 38 STAR Academic Journey degree checks. The number of students accessing STAR has increased from Fall 2006 to Spring 2011. Counselors have made concerted efforts to encourage students to use STAR and introduce its various features by going to classes, holding workshops, and one-on-one session with students. With the addition of the wireless access in Spring 2011, counselors have been able to have students access their personalized STAR while in the counselor’s office. [Academic Counseling Program Review]

With the belief that teaching in a group setting is an effective way for counselors to teach students about self-advising tools, workshops on STAR have been offered to students. The workshops have been hands-on sessions where students can access their own personalized STAR. STAR Workshops have also been offered in the Learning Communities, which are pairs of co-requisite classes that have been offered as part of the Achieving the Dream efforts. Additionally, STAR workshops have been done for the Math essential skills classes as part of the classes’ success component. [Academic Counseling Program Review]

In response to the success of the STAR workshops, two months were identified as being STAR months. In Fall 2011, September was identified as a STAR month. In Spring 2012, February was identified as another STAR month. During STAR months, students were able to drop in and meet with an academic counselor to learn about STAR as a self-advising tool. In addition, the unit offered a “hands-on” workshop for teaching faculty how to advise students using the STAR online degree audit system.
Assessment of the quality and efficiency of academic counseling services provided by the unit are done using a variety of instruments. For example, student evaluation forms are distributed, completed, and reviewed for group advising sessions and for the registration session of Passport to College. In addition, use of the SARS software program allows for quantitate reports to be generated on the number of students served during walk-in advising periods and on the reasons why students dropped in for walk-in advising. SARS is an appointment-scheduling and reporting software product for advising and counseling offices in higher education institutions.

Counselors have maintained their currency through attendance at various workshops and conferences. Recently, coordinated professional development workshops have provided counselors with an opportunity to further their knowledge on various topics relating to the advising and counseling area.

Self-Evaluation

The College meets the Standard.

There has been marked progress in developing missions, goals, and objectives in Admissions and Counseling. The move to consistently use SARS has resulted in a standardization of how we code and enter data to support unit needs. Counselors continue to develop, implement, and evaluate assessment instruments.

Actionable Improvement Plans

In order to continue to effectively provide services to students, it is recommended that the College hire an Outreach Coordinator to coordinate and support the campus’s recruitment initiatives as identified by the campus’ five year strategic plan. The Outreach Coordinator would be responsible for coordinating local high school visits, college fairs, campus tours, and other recruitment activities. Academic counselors would continue to assist in recruitment efforts but will be able to focus on retention efforts. [Strategic Plan 2008-2015]

It is also recommended that the College hire a Counseling Coordinator to design, maintain, and evaluate counseling and/or academic programs that support student development and success. The Counseling Coordinator will also oversee and coordinate counseling-related grant development and management activities to ensure grant compliance and quality assurance as directed, and develop and manage special student projects or initiatives.

II.B.3.d. The institution designs and maintains appropriate programs, practices, and services that support and enhance student understanding and appreciation of diversity.

Descriptive Summary

Hawai‘i is known as a melting pot of ethnic groups where, culturally, East meets West. The College is proud of the fact that its student population reflects the ethnic diversity of
Students from diverse ethnic, cultural and socioeconomic backgrounds attend the College. The College offers many programs to support and enhance all students’ understanding and appreciation of diversity, as well as an enhanced understanding of and appreciation for the indigenous, host culture of the islands; its recently updated Mission Statement makes explicit this commitment.

The Native Hawaiian Center (NHC) provides a variety of cultural presentations open to students, faculty, and staff. Each semester, an Artist in Residence displays creative work. The ‘Imi Na’auao Lecture Series presents monthly talks on various topics regarding Native Hawaiians. Some topics include but not limited: Film showing (Feather lei making, Hawaiian History, Overthrow, Annexation, Noho Hewa) leis workshops, floral arrangement, tattooing, featured local musicians, Lua (Hawaiian form of martial arts), genealogy, makahiki, ghost tales of Hawaii, La’au Lapa’au on Hawaiian medicinal plants, Oli (Native Hawaiian Chants), Lomi Lomi (Holistic Form of Massage), Olelo (Hawaiian Language), Paddle making, Mala (Hawaiian Gardening), Huaka’i (Cultural Enrichment Activities): Hikes on various historical trails, Queen Emma Summer Palace, Iolani Palace, Kumu Kahua Theaters, Coconut Island, Moloka’i/Kalaupapa/Service learning in the Lo’i (Taro Patch) and fish ponds, Merry Monarch (Hilo), Kahoolawe [Nā Huaka’i]

In 2006 the Coordinator of HCC Native Hawaiian Career Technical Educational Program (Ka’iulani G.F. Akamine) began the planning of Malama Aina Days and in 2007 it was fully implemented.

Since the implementation of Malama Aina Days, it has partnered with Title III, First Year Experience, TRIO-SSS, and Hawaiian Studies Department. All parties meet bi annually to plan the various Malama Aina Days for the semester. Together we coordinate sign up, bus reservations, food, and assessments. Fliers are distributed and posted around the HCC campus, email are sent our regularly, announced in class, and dates of events are posted in program calendars and websites. [Native Hawaiian Center Activities Calendar, Cultural, Educational & Service Learning Events]

TRIO-SSS:

Cultural/Educational & Service Learning Events: As mentioned we partner with the NHC with regards to Malama Aina Days. In addition we have offered the following programming events to our student since the implementation of the grant in 2006-2007 school years.

Manoa Valley Theater, various hikes, Hawaii Opera Theater, Kumu Kahua Theater, Coconut Island, Iolani Palace, Queen Emma Summer Palace, Contemporary Museum, The Body Exhibit, Academy of Arts, Sea Life Park, Chinatown New Year’s Celebration, Tour of the Island, Campus Visit, UH-Hilo-Kona

Student Life and Development:

In addition to supporting Club-based activities, Student Life and Development organizes activities planned and implemented by students to provide students with awareness and appreciation of different cultures.
Self-Evaluation

The College meets the Standard.

Activities and programs organized by various student and College Organizations provide students with an awareness and appreciation of different backgrounds and cultures. These individualized programs often have missions, goals and SLOs, many of which relate to student development.

Actionable Improvement Plans

No action is required.

II.B.3.e. The institution regularly evaluates admissions and placement instruments and practices to validate their effectiveness while minimizing biases.

Descriptive Summary

Honolulu Community College welcomes applications from any U.S. high school graduate, GED (General Education Development) recipient or persons 18 years of age or over who can benefit from the instruction offered. Applicants under the age of 18 may be considered for Early Admission upon the recommendation of their high school counselor. Such students are eligible to enroll in HonCC courses approved by their HonCC counselor. The College also offers the Running Start Program, which allows public high school juniors and seniors to attend college classes while earning both high school and college credits. This classification also requires approval by the high school and HonCC Running Start counselors.

The College also accepts international applicants, and strictly adheres to International Student and Exchange Visitor regulations to ensure compliance of U.S. Department of Homeland Security policies. The College determines program offerings based on course offerings and program completion requirements. The Admissions counselor and registrar meet quarterly with their UH System counterparts to discuss common concerns and work to ensure consistency within the ten UH Campuses.

The College, along with all of the Community Colleges within the UH System, employs the COMPASS reading, writing and mathematics placement tests to determine the level of English and Math courses students are prepared to enter. Specific to HonCC is the Placement Policy regarding developmental classes, which was enacted in Fall 2011. The policy requires HonCC students who place below the English 22 (Introduction to Expository Writing) and/or Math 24 (Elementary Algebra I) levels to enroll in developmental classes in their first semester at HonCC. This requirement was designed to facilitate student success in all disciplines. In addition, students who are deemed eligible have the opportunity to advance to higher-level English courses based on faculty recommendations and consultation with the program counselor and program chair. The developmental Math 9 course (Fundamentals of Mathematics) is designed to allow students to receive credit for mastery of some but not all of the Student Learning Outcomes of the course. Such students are granted credit for Math 8 (Fundamentals of
Mathematics – Alternate Credit) and are required to register for and gain mastery in Math 9 in a subsequent semester, preferably the following semester, to progress in the Math sequence. English and Math faculty work with various units within the College to evaluate these placement instruments and practices to validate their effectiveness while minimizing biases.

**Self Evaluation**

The College meets the standard.

The Admissions Office works to systematically improve procedures of acceptance as questions arise, and consults closely with UH Community College System colleagues to develop policies and procedures to improve services for students.

The COMPASS coordinator meets regularly with UHCC System representatives to ensure compliance and consistency within testing procedures. In addition, Developmental English and Math faculty systematically collect data to review the success of their programs. These areas also meet regularly in consultation with Student Services staff members to ensure program effectiveness.

**Actionable Improvement Plans**

No action is required.

*II.B.3.f. The institution maintains student records permanently, securely and confidentially, with provision for secure backup of all files, regardless of the form in which those files are maintained. The institution publishes and follows established policies for release of student records.*

**Descriptive Summary**

The College is very diligent in its efforts to safeguard student records and personal information. The FERPA officer works closely with information technology staff on issues related to the collection and electronic storage of student records; records are stored on both an in-house server and on a server that stores the data for the entire UH System, which is housed at the UH Manoa Campus. The College also ensures the security of hard-copy documents, and enlisted the assistance of a professional records management company to secure additional data. As mandated by Hawaii State law (HRS 487N), HonCC submits Annual Personal Information (PI) System Reports for each department that maintains personal information to document its data collection methods and procedures. The report clearly outlines the legal requirements for establishing the PI system, state of federal laws or regulations that require any part of the PI system to be confidential, the categories of sources of PI, the institution’s policies and practices regarding the storage of PI, the institution’s policies and practices regarding the retention of PI, the institution’s policies and procedures regarding the elimination of PI from the system, who the PI is disclosed to, who has access to the PI and the forms that are used by the institution to collect PI. HonCC’s reports confirm that the institution is in compliance with all required regulations regarding the storage and collection of PI.
In addition, the College strictly adheres to the Family Educational Rights and Privacy Act (FERPA) and publishes this policy in its Registration Guide, College Catalog and on the HonCC website. The FERPA officer provides guidance to faculty, staff and students to ensure compliance and to assist in the College’s interpretation of the regulation. The FERPA officer also acts as the Campus Banner (Student Information System) Security Administrator and determines the Banner access required to perform job duties, according to faculty/staff position descriptions, and ensures that users are properly trained and are following pre-determined data entry standards. The Banner Security Administrator also conducts quarterly security audits of all HonCC Banner accounts to ensure accuracy and compliance.

**Self Evaluation**

The College meets the standard.

The College strictly adheres to the rules and regulations that govern the security of personal information and performs a number of self-audits on a regular basis.

**Actionable Improvement Plans**

No action is required.

*II.B.4. The institution evaluates student support services to assure their adequacy in meeting identified student needs. Evaluation of these services provides that they contribute to the achievement of student learning outcomes. The institution uses the results of these evaluations as a basis for improvement.*

**Descriptive Summary**

From 2005 to 2010, Student Services created a Program Review process for the various units such as Admissions and Records, Counseling, Financial Aid, Student Life and Development, Career and Employment, Native Hawaiian Center, TRIO-SSS, Mental Health Support, and the Health Office to better assess outcomes that can be directly tied to meeting the student learning outcomes, strategic goals and respective missions of the campus and the university. The evaluations used by the various units of Student Services include qualitative student surveys, quantitative assessment of student participation and usage of services and facilities, as well as the 2008 and 2010 results of the Community College Survey of Student Engagement (CCSSE).

In the Student Services 5 Year Program Review final report, Student Services is responsible for planning, developing, and implementing various support services that are applicable to students or potential students across the academic programs. Services are provided to enable students to succeed in their academic experience, to adjust to the College, and to seek future goals. In order to ensure that each unit in Student Services meet the students’ needs, the various units have submitted a Program Review which includes the overview of services, student learning outcomes and relationship to the college’s mission and strategic plan, quantitative measure and analysis, program changes and plans for improvement, and budget impact summary. The outcomes in the Program
Review report allow for better assessment of services that can be tied to program quality, service delivery and resource allocation.

**Self Evaluation**

The College meets the Standard.

Students have many opportunities on campus to develop personal and civic responsibility. Extracurricular activities, service learning, and online opportunities provide for development of self and civic engagement. Student Life, the unit that oversees the Student Senate, student clubs, and Student Media, has developed an overall planning summary that includes its program mission, goals, and SLOs, many of which relate to student development, self-improvement, and appreciation of others. Service learning opportunities have been increasing at the College, and the Academic Counseling unit developed and will continue to improve the online advising Websites.

**Actionable Improvement Plans**

No action is required.
IIB Evidence

Academic Counseling Program Review

**Achieving the Dream**

**Advising/Academic Counseling**

**ASUH-HCC**
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**Nā Huakaʻi**
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**Native Hawaiian Center Activities Calendar**

**November 25, 2008 - Achieving the Dream Update**
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**Program Review**

**Student Organizations**

**Strategic Plan 2008-2015**
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Standard IIC: Library and Learning Support Services

Library and Learning Support Services

Library and other learning support services for students are sufficient to support the institution’s instructional programs and intellectual, aesthetic, and cultural activities in whatever format and wherever they are offered. Such services include Library services and collections, tutoring, learning centers, computer laboratories, and learning technology development and training.

The institution provides access and training to students so that Library and other learning support services may be used effectively and efficiently. The institution systematically assesses these services using student learning outcomes, faculty input, and other appropriate measures in order to improve the effectiveness of the services.

At our particular campus, the Library, the College Skills Center (CSC), and the Educational Media Center (EMC) are the departmental units that provide services and resources for Standard IIC. These three units work independently under Academic Support Services. The campus’ recent re-organization has shifted resources and personnel; the CSC and EMC will address current and anticipated changes to each of their respective roles.

II.C.1. The institution supports the quality of its instructional programs by providing Library and other learning support services that are sufficient in quantity, currency, depth, and variety to facilitate educational offerings, regardless of location or means of delivery.

II.C.1.a. Relying on appropriate expertise of faculty, including librarians and other learning support services professionals, the institution selects and maintains educational equipment and materials to support student learning and enhance the achievement of the mission of the institution.

Descriptive Summary

Library

The Library’s Mission is to support the College’s mission by assisting students, faculty, and staff in obtaining and using information resources effectively to enable and promote student learning. The Library’s goals are to:

- Provide a physical space for resources and equipment.
- Provide information resources and equipment that support the curriculum.
- Provide a qualified staff to assist patrons.
- Provide an environment conducive to research and studying.

The Library currently 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 Hawaii web portal sites; Internet access is restricted on these PCs. Networked printing is available from all computer terminals. Four study carrels on the first floor are equipped as audiovisual stations giving students access to view materials on-campus, including cable-course programs available on DVD. Audiovisual equipment, such as TVs, DVD/VHS players, and overhead projectors, are provided for student use in group study rooms and for use in classrooms via faculty requests. Two public copy machines are available, as well as two microform reader/printers, a change machine, and an ATM machine.

Over the past two years, artwork on display throughout the library is on loan courtesy of the Hawaiʻi State Foundation on Culture and the Arts program, "Art in Public Places." Items on display include mixed media, paintings, drawings, and sculptures from local Hawaii artists, including selected faculty.

The Library consists of five main departments, Access Services/Circulation, Technical Services, Bibliographic Instruction, Reference Services, and Administration. In 2008, two librarian positions were transitioned from 9-month to 11-month contracts; the Library currently has five full-time faculty librarian positions. Four of these positions are 11-month appointments, and one is a 9-month appointment. There are five full-time paraprofessional positions (4-Access Services/Circulation; 1-Technical Services). One paraprofessional position (from Technical Services) was frozen after a retirement; and recent reorganization will move the position to a new department on campus. There are also four student assistant positions.

The Library’s collections include both print and online materials. Over 4,700 print books have been added to the library’s collection from FY 2005 to FY 2010. Acquisitions (print and online) were made through purchases, consortial contracts, a USDA grant, and donations from individuals. [Library Website] By comparison with community colleges of similar size, the College Library has an average size collection.

| Print Monograph Volumes | 62,253 |
| Print Serial Titles | 158 |
| Newspaper Titles | 11 |
| Audiovisual Materials | 1,136 |
| Microform Pieces | 65,974 |

[University of Hawaii Library Council Statistics]

Library resources are available to students, including distance learners, on-campus and off-campus (with remote authentication). [Distance Education Library Services] The library works with faculty to provide students with access to course reserves (textbooks, course notes, instructional handouts, etc.) from a broad spectrum of disciplines.

In addition to the collection of print resources, the library subscribes to online periodical
and index databases, e-book collections, and streaming video content. Over the last five years, the library has increased its online subscription resources to support the needs of students, faculty, and staff, as well as the campus’ curriculum.

**Subscription Periodical Databases:**
- CQ Researcher Online [CQ Press] – new
- EBSCOhost databases
- InfoTrac, Gale databases
- ProQuest Newspapers Online – new
- ScienceDirect Collection Edition [Elsevier]
- SIRS Knowledge Source [ProQuest]

**Electronic book (e-book) collections:**
- Ebrary: Academic Collection – new
- EBSCO e-book collection (formerly NetLibrary)
- Credo Reference – new

**Other online subscription resources and software:**
- Films on Demand, Streaming Video Collection [Films Media Group] – new
- LibGuides [Springshare] – new
- Insight (classroom management software) [Faronics] – new
- Libshield [Libdata] (PC time and print management software) – new

The HonCC Library participates with the Libraries of the University of Hawaii System for its access to Voyager [Ex Libris], the integrated library system (ILS). [Voyager]

Collection development is discussed throughout the academic year to maintain and build a collection of resources that reflect the quantity, quality, depth and variety able to support campus course needs. Librarians are subject specialists and are responsible for recommending and selecting materials for assigned subject areas. Various indicators are used to guide selections. Librarians monitor the information needs of students by assisting them with their assignments during library instruction sessions and on individual reference assistance. Librarians work collaboratively with faculty to ascertain curriculum needs; faculty requests are highly encouraged and purchases are made accordingly throughout the academic year. This has proven most useful when introducing new programs on campus (such as MELE), or more recently in support of distance education teaching and learning materials. Professional literature and publishers’ catalogs provide lists of reviews and new publications from which librarians make selections for their respective disciplines. Withdrawal of materials is ongoing to remove and replace items that are outdated/obsolete, damaged beyond repair, or no longer relevant to the curriculum. In anticipation of upcoming building renovations, the Library will identify materials for permanent withdrawal (i.e. weeding) from the collection. The weeding process will consider an item’s condition or physical appearance, duplicate copies that are no longer needed, and its currency to a collection or subject area.
The Head Librarian submits an annual budget request to the Vice-Chancellor for Academic Affairs. It is an itemized budget, arranged by quarterly expenses. Most of the budget covers the continuing costs for the ILMS (Voyager), numerous electronic databases, and magazine and newspaper subscriptions. The balance of funds is for books, equipment, maintenance fees for photocopiers and microform reader/printers and supplies. The annual budget is supplemented by special and grant funds. Special fund monies are from financial obligations paid by patrons for overdue fines, lost materials, damaged materials and print fees. USDA grant money is courtesy of Dr. Gopalakrishnan. Over the years he has given funds to the library to purchase computers, books, and magazines in support of the Oceanography program. Additionally, the library annually requests funds for an average of five student assistants. [Library Annual Assessment Report, AY 2010-2011]

College Skills Center (2006-2010) before the reorganization

The College Skills Center’s (CSC) Mission statement is to support the HCC Mission by providing access to the skills necessary for students to become responsible self-directed learners. This is accomplished by:

- Providing placement testing for students
- Providing entry-level classes in English and Math
- Providing testing services for students
- Providing services to students with disabilities

The College Skills Center (CSC) is located primarily on the third floor of Building 7, with an additional Math classroom on the fourth floor. The CSC shares the facilities on the third floor with the Educational Media Center, which provides media support for faculty and administration at the College. The main elevators of Building 7 provide access to floors 3 ½ and 5 ½, with students and staff walking either up or down to their desired floor. There is an additional elevator in the Library on the first floor, which has access to each floor. This elevator has a separate key card system to provide access to each floor to students and faculty with disabilities. On the third floor, the CSC facility consists of a large lab room, offices for faculty and staff members, a testing room, two rooms for testing for students with disabilities, a testing intake room, a room for the disability specialists and his education specialist, and one English classroom.

The CSC staff includes one coordinator (11-month faculty), two full-time math instructors (11-month faculty), two English instructors (one 11-month faculty, the other 9-month faculty), four full-time educational specialists (to help with testing and tutoring in math and English), one disability specialist (11 month), one disabilities services assistant, one half-time IT specialist, one clerk-typist, lecturers, and 20-30 student assistants (part-time tutors, testing room monitors and note-takers) The CSC completed an annual assessment report for 2010-2011. [Program Review Report For The College Skills Center (Assessment Period 2001-2005)]

CSC tutors are students hired part-time on the recommendations of their previous
academic faculty. They receive training at the beginning and throughout the academic year, and all receive a copy of the CSC Student Assistant Handbook. The tutors primarily assist with the entry-level English and Math students.

The CSC has a wide selection of materials, many of them commercially prepared and many of them prepared by the CSC faculty for the entry-level English and Math programs. These materials include traditional print and multi-media materials. The materials are evaluated regularly, and, when the budget allows, new materials suggested by faculty and students are acquired. The CSC updates the English and Math prepared in-house on an annual basis. Updates are based on student evaluations and on assessment. The CSC has computers in the English classroom and lab room for use by students in instruction and class assignments as well as office computers for faculty and staff. Completion rates for students in the entry-level English and Math program since 2006 to Fall 2010 have fluctuated. English 20 completion ranged from 42% to 69 and Math 20 completion ranged from 28% to 50%. [Program Review Report For The College Skills Center (Assessment Period 2001-2005)]

The CSC is responsible for several types of testing services. These include English and Math placement testing, proctored make-up exams, proctored exams for Distance Education courses, and testing accommodations for students with disabilities. These testing services are centralized within the CSC. In addition, the CSC staff members participate in special testing, including Automotive Service Excellence (ASE) certification and applicant screening for the Pearl Harbor Naval Shipyard (PHNSY) apprenticeship program.

The disability specialist is assigned to and utilizes the CSC facilities to provide services to help meet the needs of students with disabilities. He works closely with the other College’s disability service provider, the College nurse, who is located in the Health Center. The faculty and staff members on the HCC Committee on Disability Access (CODAH) assist with supporting students with disabilities.

The CSC coordinator submits an annual budget request to the Vice-Chancellor for Academic Affairs. Dialog takes place on campus for actual allocation of budget requests. It is an itemized budget, arranged by quarterly expenses.

Following the campus re-organization in AY 2011-2012, the College Skills Center now provides tutoring for a variety of disciplines, including History, Psychology, Speech, Biology, Chemistry, ICS, Spanish, Hawaiian Studies, Marketing and Learning Skills. Other subjects may also be available via SmartThinking, an online tutoring resource available through the CSC, which accesses knowledgeable professional tutors via the Internet. The CSC also expanded its academic support services to include distance learning, service learning, and COMPASS preparation, which offers students remedial instruction to enable them to pass the COMPASS Math Placement Test. This is a non-credit course and will not earn Math credits. It allows students to waive the Math retest fee once they complete the program with a 100% assessment in the College Skills Center. Most of these changes were implemented within the past year; as a result there is
insufficient data available to evaluate the success of these new endeavors.

Faculty and their offices affected by the re-organization were moved out of the College Skills Center and into their respective departments (Math & English). Under the old organizational structure there was little dialogue between developmental English and Math faculty (located in the CSC) and their departments. Moving faculty out of the CSC and into their proper departments and office space aligns communication and assists with efforts of the re-organization Math tutoring was moved to a room on the same floor as a majority of the classrooms used for Math instruction, thus making it more convenient for students to access. English tutoring was moved to the Essentials English Complex in a nearby building. The Math and English APT positions, previously under the CSC, are now tied to their individual departments. These changes have been made to improve student-faculty communication and promote more efficient learning.

Regarding Student ACCESS Services, the primary concerns of students are consistent with previous academic years when the office was moved from a discrete location (building 2, room 409) to a room in the College Skills Center (building 7, room 319). Individuals seeking assistance from Student ACCESS had to walk through the CSC’s learning lab to get to room 319; student feedback indicated that the long pathway and prying eyes from other students made them feel uncomfortable, as if they were advertising their own learning disability. A sense of privacy was lost with its CSC location, which often times led students to avoid seeking services. At the beginning of Fall 2011, Student ACCESS Services relocated to Building 5, room 106. This was an ideal way to better accommodate student privacy, as well as free up additional space in the College Skills Center for other functions.

**Educational Media Center**

The Educational Media Center’s Mission is to research, plan, develop, and deliver high quality media resources for faculty, administration, and student organizations. The EMC is a comprehensive media center and supports the following activities and functions [Annual Assessment Report, AY 2010-2011]:

- Development and delivery of distance education using a variety of media, such as broadcast television, cable television, web-based instruction, streaming video or other forms of digital delivery;
- Design, development and support of instructional and College program related websites;
- Operation of the print shop to provide duplication and print related services;
- Production of graphics;
- Coordinate media for live events including audio, video and static displays;
- Assist faculty/staff with coordinating and producing graphics, print, and audio-visual materials for instructional and administrative uses;
- Loan long term equipment;
- Design, install, and maintain campus wide media systems;
- Design, install, and maintain multi-media classrooms;
• Coordinate and provide the media services in the operation of the Norman W. H. Loui Conference Center
• Maintain and repair media and computing equipment;
• Train faculty and staff in the use of media equipment and materials;
• Serve widely distributed sub-campuses (in addition to the main campus): AMT/Diesel (Lower Campus), Marine Technology (Sand Island), Aviation Maintenance and Repair (HNL International Airport), Pacific Aerospace Training Center (Kalaeloa).

The EMC is presently separated into two separate locations on the College’s main campus. The Media Design/Production studio, production spaces, maintenance and repair facilities and shop storage, offices of the director and staff, and the service counter are located in Building 7 on the 3rd floor. The Print Shop/Graphics unit is located in Building 16, and handles general duplicating requests (e.g., faculty syllabi and other classroom materials) as well as special projects.

The EMC is comprised of four main units: 1. Instructional/Media Design/Production, 2. Media Support Services, 3. Print Shop and Duplication, and 4. Graphics. EMC staff include the EMC Director and an office assistant who provide overall coordination of services. Additional personnel include two Media Specialists in Instructional Design/Media Production, two Media Support Electronics Technicians, and a Print Shop Supervisor, Publications Specialist, Duplicating Machine Operator and Graphic Artist in the Print Shop and Graphics area. Six student assistants augment the staff for support in Media Design/Production, Maintenance and Repair, and the Print Shop. The majority of these positions are Revolving- and Special-Funded.

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. The third category is the Norman Loui conference Center.

Beginning in the fall of 2012, building 7 will undergo an entire renovation, including electrical and signals handling, power, ceiling tiles, air handling systems. As part of this renovation, all multi-media classroom systems within the building will have built-in signal and power for all classroom computers, video projectors, media equipment, and SMART systems. Equipment currently existing and still with operational life will be removed and retained, other systems which have been put together over the past 12 years will be updated and modernized. This combined with digital control systems, should result in similar operating characteristics which will be standardized throughout the building, and should result in better up time operations, and easier equipment operating use by the instructors.

Self Evaluation

Library
The College meets the Standard.

The Library meets its primary goals by providing a physical space for resources, services and equipment that support the curriculum, a qualified staff to assist patrons, and a welcoming environment conducive to research and studying. Services to students have improved since several 9-month librarian positions have transitioned to 11-month contracts. Each librarian has specific duties and responsibilities, yet all serve at the Reference and Information Desk. There are currently three librarian positions that provide instructional teaching. Instructional sessions are highly tailored to faculty assignments providing targeted research sessions where students are provided with ample time to do hands-on research at computer terminals. Data from recent surveys and library statistics confirm that bibliographic instruction is growing, evolving, and enhancing the student community of life-long learners. Librarians continue work with faculty in support of its collection development efforts; greater emphasis is being placed on acquiring more materials that add to the collection’s currency. As part of the Academic Support division, librarians have representation on campus governance committees. An increase in subscription electronic resource purchases provides traditional students and distance learners with comparable access to library materials. The Distance Education librarian arranges outreach and instruction to distance learners with online tools, as well as face-to-face sessions at local military bases when requested.

The Library has increased the number of available computers for student use. As a direct result of comments from the Library Survey, the 2010 edition of the Microsoft Office Professional Suite was installed on all computer terminals. There are a number of computers that need to be replaced due to age. Technical support for the Library’s computers is provided by a full time APT Computer Specialist; this position is shared with the College Skills Center. The new purchase of a computer and print management system has greatly alleviated work-flow issues for all library staff; student comments regarding its implementation have been very positive. The campus’ wireless network has been installed throughout the Library. Students can seamlessly access the Internet via their laptops and hand-held devices. It is anticipated that the campus’ forthcoming technology plan will assist with computer replacement and additional technical support. Apart from any increase in the library’s budget, the use of special fund and grant monies has contributed to purchases for (print/online) books, magazines, equipment, and computer software and services.

**College Skills Center**

The College meets the standard.

Although the College in 2006 assigned a classroom on the fourth floor of Building 7 to the CSC for Math classes, relieving space issues for the English classes, space issues remained a problem. In Fall 2010 three additional classrooms on the fourth floor of Building 7 were added as Math classroom instruction. The classrooms also function as Math labs, thus alleviating the space issue in the College Skills Center.
Since the last accreditation, the College Skills Center now has a full-time coordinator and a half-time IT specialist to assist with maintaining the computers in the CSC.

The different testing functions offered by the CSC currently meet the needs of the College largely due to the innovation and dedication of the staff. They work tirelessly with the other offices on campus to optimize their resources and to improve their services.

For the 2009-10 surveys administered, all items averaged above 4.5 on a 5.0 rating scale. Students have indicated that they are satisfied with the testing services provided and no further evaluation is needed. Given the increase in demand for placement and distance learning testing, satisfaction averages still remained high. If the average score is below 4.0, scores would be reviewed to determine if changes should be implemented to improve satisfaction. [Program Review Report For The College Skills Center (Assessment Period 2001-2005)]

**Educational Media Center**

The College meets the Standard.

A Media Services Survey administered to faculty and staff in Spring 2011, indicated a substantial level of satisfaction with all aspects of EMC service. Based on a 5-point scale (with 5 being the highest), services were rated as follows:

- Perceived effect on student learning: 3.9 across all areas
- Faculty Workroom: 4.1
- Classroom Equipment Services: 4.1
- Increased capability to instruct as a result of the services provided: 4.3 across all areas
- Instruction Design Services: average 4.135
- Electronic Maintenance and Repair: 4.23
- EMC Administrative Support 4.27
- Media Production Services: 4.40
- Print and Duplication Services: 4.61
- Publication/Graphic Arts Services: 4.61

The EMC is in the process of being reorganized into 3 different units: direct instructional support to meet the growing demands for instructional design, fast prototyping multimedia production, and distance learning support for websites, Laulima support, and assessment. The current print shop will be expanded into a Design Center, which will house graphics, duplication, marketing, the HCC webmaster for the college website, and production for fee supporting the Communications Arts Internship Program. Lastly, the AV technical support will move to the ITC to improve efficiency, provide cross-training between AV tech and IT tech, which should alleviate the previous problems with lack of manpower in depth under the old organizational structure.
**Actionable Improvement Plans**

No action is required.

*II.C.1.b. The institution provides ongoing instruction for users of Library and other learning support services so that students are able to develop skills in information competency.*

**Descriptive Summary**

**Library**

The College’s librarians are dedicated to teaching information competencies, which include research skills so that students can locate, evaluate, and utilize information for their educational needs. The Librarians 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. All librarians are available to help patrons find and use information efficiently and effectively. 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. Outreach to distance learners includes instructional sessions taught at off-campus sites and promotion of the library’s online resources. The Distance Education Librarian is a member of the Distance Education Advisory Committee (DEAC).

Following a recent retirement, a vacant Librarian position was filled in July 2011. The position description for the new Librarian was modified to more fully include instructional duties. There are now three Librarian positions that provide instructional support to the campus. Library instruction is provided to classes upon instructor request. Sessions are typically designed to focus on a specific class assignment with demonstrations and practice in using the library's online catalog, periodical databases, and other library resources to locate and evaluate information. The instructional librarians collaborate closely with faculty to custom-tailor research sessions. Individual or small group support is also available for students who need in-depth assistance with their research topics.

**College Skills Center**

The CSC faculty and staff members provide extensive, well-written materials for students to develop skills in academic and information competency. They evaluate the materials for effectiveness, updating them regularly, and adding to them as needed.

**Self Evaluation**

**Library**
The College meets the standard.

From Summer 2006 to Summer 2010 the instructional librarians have conducted a total of 359 instructional sessions. This averages to 43 sessions a semester, and three to five sessions in the summer. They have served a total of 5,862 students during this time which averages to 703 students during the Fall and Spring semesters and 47 students during the summer sessions. [Library Instruction Statistics]

Library survey data indicates that 60% of students agree or strongly agree that instructional sessions “have increased their understanding of libraries and research.” Approximately 40% of survey respondents did not attend a library research session; this figure is indicative of the high number of part-time and/or apprentice students who completed the questionnaire. [Library Survey Results, Spring 2011]

During the academic year, students are asked to fill out a short evaluation form at the end of each library instruction session. The online evaluation form (via SurveyMonkey.com) is easily accessed from a desktop link on each student computer. Student feedback is used by librarians to analyze student learning, as well as to improve or adapt teaching methods.

Evaluations from spring 2011 indicate that 100% of students either strongly agreed or agreed that “the library session was beneficial.” Students were also in agreement that “the librarian was helpful; well-prepared and organized; and clear and understandable.” There was student consensus that the research instruction led to understanding of how the library is organized, how to efficiently find information needed, and how to identity and select good resources.

Student’s additional written comments include:
• Thank you so much. I can access these sources at home. They are very helpful tools that I didn't know of.
• Well spoken, easy to follow and understand
• The library session was very helpful and I feel comfortable using the HCC library site.
• Thank you for the session. I didn't know there were so many resources.

Feedback from faculty has also been positive. The instructional librarians plan the sessions based on the needs of individual classes. Specific feedback from faculty includes:
• The presentation was obviously well thought-out and prepared for. All information was useful . . .
• Stefanie always does a great job, I have received positive feedback from students in a number of courses regarding her presentations.
• Carol has excelled in developing and organizing a presentation that motivates the
students to pay attention. She also goes beyond what is required by providing prizes/gifts to those who assist or complete the assignments first. Carol is definitely an asset to HCC.

College Skills Center

The College meets the standard.

The computers in the CSC English lab have since been upgraded. The CSC also coordinates student access to SmartThinking, an online tutoring service.

Actionable Improvement Plans

No action is required.

II.C.1c. The institution provides students and personnel responsible for student learning programs and services adequate access to the Library and other learning support services, regardless of their location or means of delivery.

Descriptive Summary

Library

The library has worked diligently to support the college’s mission to provide accessibility of its services and resources for all students and faculty, staff, and the programs that serve them. This accessibility is extended to both on- and off-campus entities, including distance education students and faculty. The UH identification card allows students to access materials from any UH System Library. Students have access to on-shelf resources such as periodicals, books, reserve materials, microform collections, media, and audio/visual equipment, copiers and printers. Remote access to online databases is campus-specific, due to subscription licensing agreements. Registered students login with their UH username and password information to gain remote access. Accessibility is enhanced and reflected in the library’s operational procedures and policies, staffing, the environment, and information access capabilities. Students also have access to most books (and some media) from across the 10-campus UH Library System using the Voyager ILMS. An intrasystem loan (ISL) service delivers books and materials between UH campus libraries with a simple online request form. Students, faculty, and staff have an expansive range of resources to select from using the ILS service.

Operational procedures and policies focus on the hours of operation that are posted at the entrance of the library and on the library website. These hours have been set by assessing the number of students on campus on given days and on the times of class offerings. Administrative costs, in terms of staffing and building maintenance (especially air conditioning), also determined the hours of operation. The operational hours are: Monday-Thursday, 8 am – 7 pm; Friday, 8 am – 3 pm; Saturday, 9 am – Noon; Sunday –
Students, faculty and college staff have access to library personnel during all hours the Library is operational. A librarian is always available at the Reference Desk near the entrance of the library, and there is staffing at the Circulation Counter to manage book checkouts, reserve materials, and computer use. The library website also invites access to librarians via email.

The library environment (ambiance) provides students with access to quiet study carrels and five study rooms for group use. A wide selection of (print and online) books, periodicals, and media are available for student research within the Library. Students have use of computers for internet access, as well as fee-based printing. There are 25 computers that are dedicated for instructional teaching.

A lounge area with comfortable seating provides a place for newspaper and magazine browsing. Vending machines, benches, and shady areas outside the building make the library an inviting place for students to gather. In addition, the library is ADA (Americans with Disabilities Act) –compliant, as reflected in the designs of the circulation and reference desks; two pneumatic tables for computers; a large screen computer with assistive keyboard, speakers, and screen-reading software; and a renovated first floor restroom. An elevator is available for second floor access for students, faculty and staff with such a need.

Students, faculty and college staff have access to a wide range of scholarly research material from Library subscription databases. Library e-resources are accessible 24 hours a day, seven days a week with remote authentication. These resources include newly-acquired ebrary (electronic books), Films on Demand, CQ Researcher and Credo Reference. There are Library Guides (online and in paper format) that provide assistance with citation style formatting and subject-specific research (i.e. Early Childhood Education, Speech, Fashion, etc.). Students and faculty can also renew books, conduct searches, retrieve sources, and e-mail or download information. Students enrolled in Distance Education courses are welcome to visit the Library on campus; however access to resources is easily accommodated directly from the Library’s website. The library ensures remote access capabilities before purchasing electronic resources. Distance learners are referred to available resources from the Library’s DE webpage.

Finally, in fall 2010, HCC Library began receiving the first of 10 new public access broadband-connected computers in its participation with the “Access for All: Hawaii Statewide Public Computer Centers” project. Funded by the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act of 2009, the Library, in conjunction with the University of Hawaii System and additional public partners, deployed the new computer workstations for access to the college campus and community. The grant also funded bundled software and a pneumatic computer table tailored for people with disabilities. The project ensures that individuals from vulnerable and diverse community populations are served with access to computers. Public facilities, including educational institutions such as Honolulu Community College, share in providing available broadband access and computer
hardware/software through this grant award.

**College Skills Center**

The CSC offers weekday services to the College’s students, Monday-Thursday, 9 am – 8 pm, Friday, 9 am – 1 pm. The CSC is accessible for students with disabilities via an elevator inside the library, which stops at every floor in Building 7. The hours and staff members are listed on signs posted on the doors leading to the CSC. The CSC room number is listed in a directory on the 3-½ floor of Building 7, where the outside elevators stop. Flyers are posted around campus on bulletin boards announcing CSC services. The services are also listed in the HCC Catalog.

The CSC website includes its mission statement and provides information about its hours and services. The website homepage contains links to informational pages regarding placement testing services, Asset Prep classes, faculty and staff tutoring program information, and calendars for fall, spring and summer activities. In addition, specific details on the CSC schedule are available in PDF format on the CSC homepage. [College Skills Center Website]

CSC has recently updated its web content to reflect Honolulu Community College’s re-organization. The website now contains information on the testing center, Smarthinking, drop-in tutoring, distance learning, and service learning.

The Testing Center staff assists students by going over exam instructions and seating them in the proper testing room. Students are assigned seats in the testing area, so they may be adequately monitored. The staff is also tasked with verifying completed online test submissions to insure test integrity and security. Cell phones and other electronic devices are turned off before students enter the testing room; this reduces disturbances to other test takers and prevents security breaches.

The Testing Center recently purchased Insight software by Faronics, a security tool for monitoring online test takers. It is used to frame capture students accessing prohibited outside websites and enables the Testing Center to report acts of cheating to instructors. Faronics Insight will also be used to take over client computers suspected of academic cheating to frame capture proof before students can hide (or minimize) a suspicious website.

In addition, the Testing Center has added a second back-up testing room for COMPASS e-WRITE and English Diagnostic Testing, as well as online distance education testing. With the increase of new added services, it was necessary to provide an additional testing room. Whole classes and multiple sections can be currently serviced now. The new testing room does not have a security camera system; installing such a system would alleviate having a proctor monitor the test taking.

To address security issues, the Testing Center uses two locked cabinets to store exam instructions with passwords (for online tests), class rosters with student information, and
hard-copy exams, both finished and unused. A security surveillance system is used to monitor test takers in the main testing room (316) and the ACCESS testing rooms (314 and 315). The security system is connected to a DVR setup that continuously records test takers during hours of operation. This camera system has been in place for approximately 6 years and has been showing its age the past few months; the cameras are slowly starting to fade. The existing security camera system will require replacement in the near future.

**Educational Media Center**

The EMC supports the development of state-of-the-art learning systems in the classroom and quality learning experiences for students engaged in distance or asynchronous learning. In addition, we design, build, and maintain classroom media systems and work with Academic Computing to provide Internet access that is safe and reliable.

**Self Evaluation**

**Library**

The College meets the Standard.

In terms of providing accessibility of library services to its students, faculty and staff, regardless of their location or method of delivery, the college meets its obligations. A Spring 2011 survey of students, faculty and staff supplements this self-evaluation with reference to the following: [Library Survey Results, Spring 2011]

Operational procedures and policies: In the aforementioned survey, 74.4% of the respondents were generally satisfied with the current library hours. Student anecdotal comments request weekend times extended and earlier openings for finals week. Other comments note how “quiet” and “cell phone” policies should be better enforced. The accessing of research and resource materials online and the commuter-nature of the students are duly noted in survey comments as reasons for minimal use of the library facility.

Library staff: The survey had 77.7% of respondents generally agreeing that the library staff are “approachable and professional,” with 74.9% saying they were given “adequate answers” to questions. The comments section also praised the efforts and efficiency of the staff, and expressed appreciation for instructional sessions. Maintaining positive and helpful relationships with library users continues to be a goal for staff.

Library environment: Survey respondents generally agreed that the library space for study was adequate (79.3%). In the comments section, respondents suggested enhancing and modifying the learning environment by providing more open space for studying, larger tables, more and larger rooms, and couches. Comments also noted how cold the room was. Moderate satisfaction with equipment was noted in the survey (computer needs, 62.4%; computer printing, 56.2%; and photocopiers, 53.6%). Library users
suggested more computers, common software, color printing, and a better system for printing documents. The Library has already begun to respond to student concerns with the recent acquisition of new printers, bundled application software, and PC/printer management software. The goals of the College’s Information Technology Strategic Plan will establish a dedicated budget for all technology and support and will establish a Life Cycle Replacement policy; the Library should benefit from these forthcoming changes. When all available computer terminals are in use at the Library, students are then referred to alternative computing locations, such as the Campus Computer Lab or the Native Hawaiian Center’s Computer Lab. There can be improvement by ensuring that all the computers are in optimum working order and the software is standard for the campus.

In Summer 2009, the library installed new flooring. The 35-year-old carpet and tiles were replaced. The flooring project also included the Educational Media Center and the College Skills Center. The study carrels on the first floor were moved from next to the study rooms to the mall side of the first floor. This move addressed two concerns. The first was that students always asked where they could study. The carrels are more visible at the front of the library. The second concern was noise from the study rooms, which are not soundproof, would impose on the students studying in the carrels. Having the bookshelves in front of the studying rooms somewhat buffers the noise.

In Summer 2011, twenty-four new tables for the computing area were purchased to replace older damaged furniture. The new tables are color-coordinated with the replaced carpeting, and each table easily accommodates two computers.

Information access: The Spring 2011 Library User Survey found respondents were generally satisfied with accessing the resources of the library on campus (locating materials needed (73.9%)); and off campus on the internet (finding print and e-books (65.3%), finding magazines, journals, newspaper articles (64.8%)). They also found the website (65.2%), library guides (65.4%), and online catalogs (63%) both informative and useful for research.

Students can access the Internet, as well as the MyUH portal, Laulima, and email from Library computer terminals. Library policy states what is prohibited on these computers, such as viewing offensive websites or downloading materials. In the summer of 2011, students were able to join the campus wireless network to enhance connectivity. The connectivity is now good to excellent throughout the Library, on both the first and the second floors.

Building 7 Renovations. The Library’s permanent location is in building 7, however renovation construction is currently underway. A timeline for when and how long the Library will be displaced has not been confirmed. Once the Library is moved out of the building access to physical materials, resources, services, and equipment will be significantly limited to the campus population. The Head Librarian and the library staff are in the initial stages of planning; accommodating students and faculty with access to services and resources is a major priority. Reference services, as well as research instruction, will primarily focus on utilizing the Library’s subscription electronic
resources. Librarians will solicit and encourage instruction within the classroom setting by using multimedia equipment and online tools. The Library’s relocation to a temporary space will also limit access to Circulation Services and selected equipment, however considerations will be made to minimize disruption.

The College Skills Center

The College meets the standard.

The CSC provides many sources of information about their services to students and to faculty and counselors who can then recommend the services to students. The CSC website is quite comprehensive and does satisfy Priority 1 of the Web Content Accessibility Guidelines, which governs the format, content and accessibility of websites.

Educational Media Center

The College meets the Standard.

The College meets the Standard. Over the past 6 years the EMC has been responsible for the design, acquisition, and installation of over 54 new multimedia classrooms, and upgrades to 54 other classrooms with no increase in staff. In addition, the EMC staff have participated in many faculty development classes and have individually mentored many other faculty.

With funding from a federal grant source, the EMC was able to acquire an internet server to build and deliver prototype 18 multi-media web-based classes, with 12 more currently undergoing curriculum development.

The EMC assists faculty in developing content and posting content to 12 other courses on the UH systems Laulima site.

The EMC provides conference and large venue media support through the campus Norman Lui Center and for on-going campus activities such as: Pearl Harbor Job Fair, State of Hawaii Science Bowl, Construction Career Days, and Technology in Education Fair among others.

The EMC also provides major support for the design, development and production of a wide-variety of published materials from marketing for the UH System to the HCC catalog.

As the re-organization moves forward, additional support and resource services within distance education (DE) are still needed to address student and faculty concerns. Students with limited technology skills taking DE courses require self-supported information readily available online. Student support should include workshops and instructional videos that tackle technical concerns and barriers to succeeding in the online learning environment. Faculty who teach DE courses also require online training
materials and modules that assist them with technology issues.

**Actionable Improvement Plans**

The Library should continue to replace some of its older furniture (couches and ergonomic computer chairs).

The CSC should hire a full time APT position for the Testing Center. The increase in hours and accessibility to test takers would benefit from additional personnel.

EMC (the newly formed EdTech Group) needs a more strategic standardized plan in developing a DE support website that serves both students and faculty with technology issues. Funding for software, equipment, and/or additional personnel to take on this task may be required.

**II.C.1.d. The institution provides effective maintenance and security for its Library and other learning support services.**

**Descriptive Summary**

**Library**

The library is housed on the first two floors of Building 7. This building is scheduled for major renovations, set to begin in the Fall of 2012 with a completion date of Fall 2014. In 2009, new flooring was installed and the library was rearranged to enhance the student study area to deter and monitor mold buildup. Partial interior painting is anticipated. Included in this renovation plan is an elevator system that will serve and stop at each floor of Building 7. The present elevator, which stops at half-floors, has necessitated the use of the library freight elevator for many students, faculty, and staff who cannot navigate the stairs. The new elevator system will alleviate unnecessary traffic through the library entry.

The library environment (which includes furnishings, flooring, restrooms, and books and resource materials) is maintained by the library and custodial staff. An APT position, from the Management Information & Research department, is Academic Support's designated IT support personnel. This position provides support to the College Skills Center and the Library by maintaining and upgrading computer equipment.

The library is equipped with a security system, The Digital Sprite 2, on the first two floors of Building 7 on campus. The system is a cost-effective and easy-to-use video multiplexer, digital video recorder, single channel audio recorder, and network transmitter all in a one-box solution. This system is used along with six black and white Sony video cameras located on both floors of the library. The system is connected to a Pelco monochrome monitor located in the circulation department area.

A 3M Library Security Gate System is positioned at the entrance/exit for the security of
the library collection. All library materials on open shelving are targeted with security strips. This system provides effective and significant reduction in the loss of Library materials. The library maintains a service contract for the upkeep of the 3M security system equipment. The entrance/exit has automatic doors and an inside freight elevator that requires key card access. The College provides security personnel, and there are established College emergency procedures to which the Library staff adheres. Fire and evacuation drills are scheduled each semester.

**College Skills Center and**

The College operations and maintenance staff maintains the CSC. The custodial staff cleans the facilities daily, and the maintenance staff makes electrical and other repairs when necessary. Major maintenance projects are usually carried out during the summer months or between-semester breaks. The College’s security staff provides security for the CSC, offering suggestions for improvements in security, responding to requests for help with students who are security threats, and making regular security rounds after hours.

**Educational Media Center**

The College operations and maintenance staff maintains the EMC. The custodial staff cleans the facilities daily, and the maintenance staff makes electrical and other repairs when necessary. The College’s security staff provides security for the CSC, offering suggestions for improvements in security, responding to requests for help with students who are security threats, and making regular security rounds after hours.

**Self Evaluation**

**Library**

The College meets the standard.

The library has maintained a clean and secure setting conducive to learning, studying, and accessing materials; in the 2011 survey, 80.5% indicated they were comfortable being in library.

An electrical upgrade has improved the power needed in the student computer area. The carpet and flooring have been replaced after 35 years of use. Renovations to the library and the building it is housed in are scheduled to be completed by Fall 2014.

The security system implemented is functional and effective.

**College Skills Center**

The College meets the Standard.
The College’s maintenance staff members properly maintain the CSC, so it meets the standard for cleanliness and maintenance of the facilities. The CSC has had several incidents with students who threatened CSC faculty, staff and students and who presented serious potential dangers. The CSC staff members have handled these incidents appropriately. Some of these students appeared to have had mental health issues, and may be part of what seems to be a growing number of students on campus who are working to cope with special needs or other life issues.

During the summer of 2009, one of the College’s capital improvement projects was re-flooring the third floor of Building 7 where the main services of the College Skills Center and Educational Media Center are located. This project replaced the original (1973) carpet and tiling. The project was completed at the end of the summer, and has improved the physical leaning environment for students.

At the end of summer 2010, electrical needs were increased for the new Math classrooms.

**Educational Media Center**

The College meets the Standard.

During Summer 2009, all of the EMC building 7 office floors were re-carpeted and re-tiled. The infrastructure was not upgraded: electrical, ceilings, air handling/quality, room appearance (except for the power circuit to the network routers). It is anticipated that in this next phase of building renovation, the result will a better working environment for EMC staff. In addition Room 305 has been designated in the upgrade plan to include a full-access multi-media classroom for HD lecture capture to meet the demands of the new digital cable system in agreement with Olelo and UH Systems to provide on-demand video programming.

**Actionable Improvement Plans**

Electrical upgrades are needed for all offices and production areas of the EMC. Network upgrades are needed for better access to web and media servers.

*II.C.1.e. When the institution relies on or collaborates with other institutions or other sources for Library and other learning support services for its instructional programs, it documents that formal agreements exist and that such resources and services are adequate for the institution’s intended purposes, are easily accessible, and utilized. The performance of these services is evaluated on a regular basis. The institution takes responsibility for and assures the reliability of all services provided either directly or through contractual arrangement.*

**Descriptive Summary**

*Library*
The current library management system (ILMS) contracted by the libraries of the University of Hawaiʻi System is the University of Hawaiʻi ExLibris Voyager Automated Online System. This system includes a public-access catalog, circulation module, and a cataloging module. A serials-acquisitions module is also available, but not used at HCC. The College Library has utilized this system since 2001. All cataloged UH library materials within the UH System are accessible through this library retrieval system.

The directors of the Libraries of the University of Hawaiʻi System form the University of Hawaiʻi Library Council [University of Hawaii Library Council (UHLC) Minutes]. The purpose of UHLC is to establish policies and improve and expand services and resources offered by the Libraries. Committees composed of representatives from Hawaiʻi Voyager libraries coordinate system-wide planning, agreements, and decision-making. Honolulu Community College’s librarians and staff are voting members of the System-wide Cataloging Coordination Committee [Hawaii Voyager Systemwide Cataloging Coordination Committee (SCCC) Website], the Hawaii Voyager Circulation Committee [Hawaii Voyager Circulation Steering Committee (HVCC) Website], the University of Hawaiʻi Library Information Literacy Committee (UHLILC), and Webvoyager Committee. Committees meet regularly, communicate through e-mail, and suggest policies and procedures to the UH Library Council. These Committees report to the UHLC and to the University of Hawaiʻi Voyager Coordinating Committee [University of Hawaiʻi Voyager Coordinating Committee (UHVCC) Website].

The College Library, and the other UH System Libraries, belong to the Hawaiʻi Library Consortium (HLC). HLC is made up of libraries from the UH, Hawaiʻi State Public Library System, the State Department of Education, private colleges and universities, and private elementary and high schools. Consortial purchase agreements negotiated through HLC or the UH Library Council, such as for LibGuides or its ongoing subscription to EBSCOhost databases, provide significant cost savings for each participating library.

Another collaboration across all UH Libraries is its IntraSystem Loan (ISL) service. Students, faculty, and staff may request books, and some media, found in other UH system libraries and have these items delivered to their campus of choice for easy check out and return. The self-directed ISL service has greatly improved and increased in use since going online several years ago. Document delivery of articles between libraries is also available.

**Educational Media Center**

Current cable course production under the Olelo grant is being administered by the Dean of University College.

**Self Evaluation**

**Library**

The College meets the Standard.
The Library is a member of the UHLC. The council meets monthly to discuss common concerns as well as system-wide decisions on database purchases. The council members have developed a mission statement and have created by-laws. The Library participates in the system-wide coordination committees as well, and adheres to the agreements made to provide consistency to students, staff and faculty. The Library is also a member of the HLC. The consortium members have also created by-laws.

The Libraries’ IntraSystem Loan service (ISL) is now available online in Voyager for students and faculty to easily access as they are searching. The 2011 Library User Survey indicates that 50% of all surveyed either strongly agreed or agreed that “I am generally satisfied with obtaining items from other UH Libraries via the HCC Library (IntraSystem Loan).” The ISL service has improved since the 2006 Self Study from 14% usage to 50%. Having this service readily available in Voyager has greatly increased access to more materials.

HCC Library periodically reviews usage statistics for its paid subscription electronic resources. Librarians have access to track usage directly from a vendor’s administrative website or by direct contact with vendors. Technical support and maintenance for all e-resources are maintained with consistent vendor communication.

**Educational Media Center**

The College meets the Standard.

Current cable course production under the Olelo grant is currently being administered by the Dean of University College.

**Actionable Improvement Plans**

No action is required.

**II. C. 2. The institution evaluates Library and other learning support services to assure their adequacy in meeting identified student needs. Evaluation of these services provides evidence that they contribute to the achievement of student learning outcomes. The institution uses the results of these evaluations as the basis of improvement.**

**Descriptive Summary**

**Library**

The Library uses a number of methods to evaluate itself and its support services. A Program Review, a variety of periodic surveys, instructional feedback from students as well as faculty, and continual evaluation of various services are all used to identify and meet student needs. HCC Library shares its current student learning outcomes (SLOs) with the Libraries of the University of Hawai‘i System; a primary Library SLO is: The
As part of the College’s ongoing assessment, a Library User Survey was in Spring 2011. The survey was made available online and in paper format to all students, faculty, and staff. Results from this survey include:

- Approximately 46% of those surveyed visit the library from 1 to 5 times per week
- Three quarters of respondents are satisfied with the hours the library is open
- Library staff are approachable, profession, and give adequate answers to questions

Close to 80% of those surveyed indicate that the library provides an adequate number of study areas. A small selection of student comments reflect their interest in wanting a more open study environment with couches, comfy chairs, and large tables with extra seating for socializing and group work.

- The library website is informative and useful for student research
- Use of the online catalog, subscription databases, and online guides allows students to locate resources to meet their course needs
- Students agree or strongly agree that attending a library instructional session increased their understanding of libraries and research
- Users were generally satisfied with the library's computers and printing services
- Less than 12% of survey respondents were currently enrolled in a distance education (DE) course. Of those students taking a DE course, three-quarters of them rated the quality of library support as excellent or good.

In Fall 2010, the Library requested faculty feedback for post-instructional sessions via an online survey. Feedback received from the Library Instruction Follow-Up Survey was used to determine whether the Library’s instructional program was beneficial and enhanced student learning outcomes. Results from this survey include:

- 100% of faculty rated the overall instructional session(s) as excellent
- 100% of faculty strongly agreed that sessions met their expectations and that relevant electronic and/or print resources were shown, and that the databases and search examples used were appropriate for learning library research
- 87.5% of faculty strongly agreed that the search techniques taught by the librarian enhanced the students' ability to conduct research for the course.

Library data from its Program Review provides an indication of the level of health for demand, efficiency, and effectiveness of services and resources. The Program Review, in addition to supporting the mission of Honolulu Community College, gives a clear voice to the goals and service outcomes for the Library. The Library Program Review for academic year 2010-2011 indicated the following three areas are in need of improvement:

- Library’s book collection needs to be updated. The collection still lacks overall currency of its materials.
- The arrangement and furniture in the student computer area are not ideal for library instruction. (Action taken: In summer 2011, the Library purchased twenty
new computer tables that were re-organized to provide a more productive
teaching and student learning environment. The ceiling-affixed media projector
was also moved to accommodate the new seating arrangement. Two new laser
printers, used exclusively for student printing, were purchased to replace older
existing equipment.)

- During a recent re-flooring project, a number of book shelves were
damaged/crushed by the contractor. (Action taken: Replacement shelving was
donated by a local medical library. A settlement was reached with the contractor;
they agreed to disassemble, transport, and reassemble the shelving between
library locations.)

The Library annually gathers and analyzes its data to identify strengths and weaknesses,
propose an action plan, and explore any resource implications (physical, human,
financial). Feedback from faculty, students, and staff was gathered in the Spring 2011
Library User Survey. A faculty survey evaluating the Library’s instructional services
was administered in Fall 2010. Comments and suggestions from all survey instruments
allow the Library to assess use, access, and tie its teaching to student learning. The
Access Services/Circulation unit creates reports to review use of materials and services.
The Technical Services and Acquisitions units keep and maintain counts of materials
added and removed from the Library’s collections. The Library’s web site was also
updated in 2009 to make it a more intuitive tool for students and the campus community.

**College Skills Center**

The CSC, its courses, and its faculty are evaluated to ascertain if they are meeting the
needs of the students the CSC serves. The evaluations are used to improve the services,
the courses, the materials, and the teaching techniques of the faculty. Student evaluations
of courses provide information about the English and Math series of courses. The CSC
faculty members also perform completion rate studies for their completers in upper level
courses. The CSC faculty members use this information to improve their courses. In
addition, the faculty members use this information to improve their teaching and to help
students improve their learning. There are also Student Satisfaction Surveys of the
Learning Environment, which are used to improve CSC services.

**Educational Media Center**

The EMC staff members are aware of the need for the assessment of its media services,
products and designs. The staff members have implemented assessment practices into
every phase of our production model. In 2005, an assessment process was started which
gives all clients who use our services, an opportunity to assess work performed, in terms
of: staff courtesy, on-time completion, satisfaction, and whether the product or service
assisted them in meeting their course/program outcomes.

A comprehensive survey is conducted annually. This survey is comprised of 10 questions
related to the six primary production and consultation service areas (customer service
satisfaction, response delivery time, understandable procedures, and quality of product).
The remaining two questions relate to how the service affected their capability to instruct, and the services contribution/or lack with regards to student learning. Results of these surveys are used in employee evaluation, equipment and software considerations, staffing levels, classroom equipment procurement, focus on media production types (web course, streaming video, DVD production), and faculty training and consultation.

In addition and as a result of increased production of web courses, the 18 total courses produced over the past year include a direct link from the course to the instructional designer, who is then responsible for assisting students in being able to access and use curriculum content, as well as make any corrections to bad links. Faculty use a system DE evaluation survey for students, as well as a direct assessment from the students thru a questionnaire that asks students:

- Use as adjunct website/hybrid learning?
- Does site help you learn?
- Preference for this course as web, classroom, or independent study?

### Self Evaluation

#### Library

The College meets the Standard.

The Library maintains its focus on utilizing a variety of assessment tools to continue its progress. The Program Review report and survey data supports its efforts at building solid relationships with students and faculty by providing essential resources and services to enhance student research and learning. Over the last few years, the Library has made significant changes in the development of its instructional program with a greater focus on faculty collaboration and methods of assessment. Streamlining data to gauge the effectiveness of student learning has been troublesome; however student and faculty satisfaction with research instruction remains high.

#### College Skills Center

The College meets the Standard.

Student evaluations of the remedial English and Math programs show a high level of satisfaction with the courses. Of these students responding, 85% indicate that they are very satisfied with the courses. Faculty members are also evaluated regularly during the probation, tenure, and promotion process. Lecturers are evaluated every semester to determine if they are performing satisfactorily. The faculty members use this information to improve their teaching and to help students improve their learning. Evaluations of the tutors also lead to improved services, sometimes immediately. The CSC faculty and staff continually improve the courses they offer and the services of the CSC and strive to better assess student achievement of the learning outcomes for the remedial English and math series of courses.
As part of a plan to deal with the English and Math success rates on campus, the Chancellor changed the locus of tenure for remedial Math and English faculty from the College Skills Center to the appropriate Math and English departments. Therefore, the College Skills Center has redefined its role, personnel and major functions.

**Educational Media Center**

The College meets the Standard.

As a result of both the individual surveys and the annual comprehensive survey, the following actions were taken:

- An increase of Center operating hours in support of evening and apprenticeship programs, without incurring additional personnel costs;
- Charge for Lui Conference Center use when media support was requested during non-normal hours, which paid for personnel costs on an OT basis, went towards the replacement costs of video projection systems and production equipment, and generated a profit, which was used for normal EMC operations;
- Change in DE delivery production. (from cable TV courses to sophisticated, media intensive, curriculum designed courses based on learning outcomes and performance standards)
- Change in types of media used in the classroom (VHS to DVD, overheads to PPT and visual presenters, no connectivity to web appliances, simple media systems to SMART technology and interconnected media components with digital switching systems);
- Change in teleconferencing mode (hard to use analog to immediate and easy to use computer based teleconferencing);
- Positive change in faculty perception that services contributed to their ability to teach successfully (faculty and staff have always rated our services, products, timeliness, and courtesy as above average to outstanding across the years);
- Positive change in faculty perception that services contributed to student learning (e.g., Fire students prefer online courses over classroom courses); and
- Reorganization of Academic Support, which included a separation and delineation of EMC production and support functions from a comprehensive media center to a Design Center, repair/maintenance classroom AV support to the ITC, and the remainder to a direct support EdTech Group, responsible for instructional design, curriculum development, and DE production.

Owing to a significant increase in the technical complexity of the media systems designed, developed and installed by the EMC, and given a total reliance of these networked systems on the campus network coupled with the fact that our technician staff was comprised of only two people for 128 systems, it was decided to move this function to the newly re-integrated Information Technology Center. The EMC, (now the EdTech
Group), has been tasked with providing direct academic and instructional support, and faculty training in new technologies.

**Actionable Improvement Plans**

The Library should expand or adapt its current student learning outcomes to better address its assessment efforts and results.

The EdTech Group, working with the ITC and Design Center, must ensure that all previous production services and capabilities are successfully transferred along with the personnel responsible.

The EdTech Group must develop a new mission statement and institutional function list.
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Library Evidence:

College Skills Center Website

Distance Education Library Services

Electronic book (e-book) collections

Faculty Survey - Library Instruction Follow-Up, Fall 2010

Films on Demand

Hawaii Voyager Circulation Steering Committee (HVCC) Website

Hawaii Voyager Systemwide Cataloging Coordination Committee (SCCC) Website

Information Technology Strategic Plan 2010-2015

Library Website

Library Guides

Library Annual Assessment Report, AY 2010-2011

Library Survey Questions, Spring 2011

Library Survey Results, Spring 2011

Subscription Periodical Databases

University of Hawaii Library Council Minutes

University of Hawaii Library Council Statistics

[University of Hawai`i Voyager Coordinating Committee (UHVCC) Website]
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Standard IIIA. Human Resources

The institution effectively uses its human, physical, technology, and financial resources to achieve its broad educational purposes, including stated student learning outcomes, and to improve institutional effectiveness.

III. A. Human Resources

III.A. The institution employs qualified personnel to support student learning outcomes and services wherever offered and by whatever means delivered, and to improve institutional effectiveness. Personnel are treated equitably, are evaluated regularly and systematically, and are provided opportunities for professional development. Consistent with its mission, the institution demonstrates its commitment to the significant educational role played by persons of diverse backgrounds by making positive efforts to encourage such diversity. Human Resources planning is integrated with institutional planning.

III.A.1. The institution assures the integrity and quality of its programs and services by employing personnel who are qualified by appropriate education, training, and experience to provide and support those programs and services.

Descriptive Summary

The process of assuring employment of qualifying personnel begins with a department or program providing justification of a need to fill either a newly appropriated position or an established budgeted position vacancy by completing the Form Request to Fill a Critical Need Position and a Form Request for Position Action (SF-1) for Board of Regents (BOR) position. For newly appropriated civil service positions, a request Form HRD1 is prepared and submitted to University of Hawaii Office of Human Resource for establishment and classification of positions. For BOR faculty positions, establishment and classification of position is delegated to the respective campus administration.

For Administrative, Professional and Technical (APT) positions there are four levels or bands. Approvals to establish and classify APT positions are delegated to the respective campus administration. However, position descriptions are categorized by four different levels or bands. Band A (Entry/Intermediate/Independent Worker) and Band B (Journey Worker/Senior Worker/Working Supervisor) are delegated to the respective campus administration. Position descriptions reflective of Band C (Supervisor/Subject Matter Expert) or Band D (Program Administrator/Manager/Foremost Subject Matter Expert in a Highly Specialized Technical field) are delegated to the Office of the Vice President of Community Colleges. For civil service positions recruitment, a UH Form 13 is prepared and sent to the University of Hawaii Office of Human Resources for internal recruitment as required by collective bargaining agreement. If internal recruitment is unsuccessful in attracting qualified applicants, the State of Hawaii Department of Human Resources and Development conducts an open competitive recruitment program.
The College is required to provide a certification statement that there are sufficient funds to support the establishment and filling of a position request, and that the position description is current or requires updating. For faculty positions, minimum qualifications are continuously reviewed by Honolulu Community College (HCC) to meet the needs of the programs. Any changes to the minimum qualifications being requested must have general consensus of all the seven community colleges’ Deans of Instruction and approval from the Vice President for Community Colleges’ (VPCC) office. For the Administrative, Professional and Technical (APT) classes, the UH Office of Human Resource reviews and develops the generic class specifications. Each Band level has its own generic minimum qualification requirements. Civil service class specifications together with the minimum qualification requirements are developed and established by the State of Hawaii Department of Human Resources and Development.

The recruiting, screening and selection processes are well defined and developed and are meticulously reviewed and approved by the HCC Human Resources EEO/AA Coordinator for the BOR positions. For civil service positions, applications are screened and qualified by the UH Office of Human Resources and/or Department of Human Resources and Development. All advertisements are prepared in accordance with Chapter 9: Personnel, Board of Regents policies, UH Administrative procedures, EEO/AA requirements, collective bargaining agreements and State and Federal non-discrimination laws. These procedures, policies, agreements, rules and regulations provide assurance that personnel hired by the College are qualified to guarantee the integrity of its programs and services.

In compliance with the EEO/AA standards, the screening committee is comprised of members with a balance of ethnicity and gender, is recommended by the hiring deans and directors, and approved by the EEO/AA coordinator of the campus. Based on the established policies and procedures prepared by HCC, the screening committee is provided with these guidelines to insure compliance. A committee Chair is selected to oversee the committee, and minutes are prepared and approved by the EEO/AA Coordinator.

The committee recommends the best-qualified applicants to the respective Dean for a second interview. For selection of a civil service respective appointee, a second interview by the supervisor is generally in order. The final approval to hire is done by UH Office of Human Resources. For the BOR positions, filling of positions is done by the respective campus administration.

**Self Evaluation**

The College meets the Standard.

The College is subject to various system requirements with respect to qualifications for each position. Board policies, University System, and civil service rules and requirements are examples. It should be noted that there have been changes to System Level Offices/Positions as well as HCC’s Offices/Positions. The Office of the
Chancellor for Community Colleges in now called the VPCC’s Office. At the community colleges level, the provost is now titled Chancellor. In addition to the terminology, the VPCC’s Office delegated additional personnel responsibilities to the campus level administration. However, for Executive/Managerial positions the delegation of authority continues to be responsibility of the VPCC’s office.

The College reinstated a critical hire review process in July 2005, which addresses decision-making on hiring priorities. A Request to Fill Critical Position form and Request for Position Action form, which serve as the first step in a formal request to fill vacancies, are required, and provide a basis for personnel hiring decisions. In addition, the Planning Council and other governing bodies on campus are actively involved in the process of prioritizing allocation and funding of new and vacant positions as the members set priorities in the Strategic Plan, which includes planning for personnel.

The Planning Council and administration have strived to implement a systematic budgetary flowchart and timeline that is transparent. Various budget requests and justification for the different areas of the campus is posted on the HCC intranet. According to the 2012 Institutional survey, 51.5 percent of respondents felt that the decisions, rationale and allocation of resources by administration were systematic and fair. Additionally, 62.1 percent of the respondents felt that there was sufficient level of participation in campus wide decision-making; 53 percent understood that the Program Review process is directly related to the budget allocation of this campus.

As part of cost-cutting measures, budget holds, and budget restrictions, the Planning Council is also involved in assisting the College in determining areas to be cut back, including areas involving hiring personnel. The criteria of the decision-making process were presented at Town Hall Meetings and at Planning Council meetings, which are open to all employees.

**Actionable Improvement Plans**

The College should continue to educate the campus about the importance of Program Review in the budgetary process to ensure that it is systematic and transparent.

The Planning Council should ensure that the timeline for budget and planning is adhered to, and that the information regarding the budget flowchart and timeline is communicated to the campus at the beginning of the budgetary process.
III.A.1.a. Criteria, qualifications, and procedures for selection of personnel are clearly and publicly stated. Job descriptions are directly related to institutional mission and goals and accurately reflect position duties, responsibilities, and authority. Criteria for selection of faculty include knowledge of subject matter or service performed (as determined by individuals with discipline expertise), effective teaching, scholarly, and potential to contribute to the mission of the institution. Institutionalized faculty plays a significant role in selection of new faculty. Degrees held by faculty and administrators are from institutions accredited by recognized U.S. accrediting agencies. Degrees from non-U.S. institutions are recognized only if equivalence has been established.

Descriptive Summary

When new positions are planned they are first listed in the College’s budget priority list via the implementation plan or identified through the Program Review process. The purpose of the budget priority list is to explain how the position relates to the mission and goals of the College, the justification, and any supporting data indicating the need and the possible consequences if the position is not approved. The Planning Council oversees the annual review and update of the College’s budget priority list, thus ensuring further review of positions before they are created and filled.

All regular positions are advertised on the University’s Web site in accordance with EEO/AA commitments, the University’s policies and procedures, and collective bargaining agreements. In addition, all positions, unless specifically exempted from recruitment, also appear in the local newspaper. Additional advertisements or extended recruitments are conducted as prescribed in order to obtain a sufficient and balanced pool of applicants. Advertisements are prepared utilizing the reviewed and updated position descriptions, which include minimum and desirable qualifications.

The EEO/AA Coordinator is responsible for overseeing the hiring and screening process. Prior to conducting interviews, the policies and procedures are reviewed at the initial meeting. All minutes, documents, screening committee compositions, and interview questions must be authorized and approved before proceeding to the next phase. The EEO/AA Coordinator takes appropriate action when the hiring and screening process does not meet the policies and procedures.

Filling of position vacancies involve screening committees. Screening committee members are recommended by the hiring supervisor and may be composed of members of administration, faculty, staff, and in some cases students. Screening committees must represent diversity in gender, classification, and ethnicity. For faculty positions, faculty member participation is further encouraged through the faculty evaluation process.

The screening process includes a detailed review of each candidate’s qualifications in
relation to the approved minimum and desirable qualifications. Applicants with foreign
degrees are required to provide certification of equivalency by organizations that perform
such certifications and are approved by the College. All candidates who are
recommended for interviews are asked a series of pre-approved interview questions,
which are developed by each screening committee. The EEO/AA Coordinator reviews
and approves all interview questions and practical exercises. Submitted with the
questions and practical exercises are expected responses, which are rated against range
finders related to the position’s MQs and DQs. Through this process the committee is
able to ascertain each candidate’s knowledge, skills and abilities as they relate to the
position duties and responsibilities. The EEO/AA Coordinator works with each screening
committee closely and provides suggestions to questions to elicit meaningful information.
For example, faculty candidates may be asked to present a lesson plan to assist the
screening committee in evaluating effectiveness in teaching

Applicants are provided with specific and detailed instructions in the advertisements
regarding the application process, which includes instructions regarding transcripts and
other documents necessary to establish the applicant’s qualifications. The final
recommended candidate is required to provide all necessary original documents, which
are sent directly to the College. The hiring supervisor is charged with contacting
references, while the EEO/AA Coordinator is charged with verifying the applicant’s
background as appropriate. References and background checks are included in each
employee’s file and maintained in a confidential manner. OHR performs a final check of
documents for the appointee.

Self Evaluation

The College meets the Standard.

The recruiting, screening, and selection processes are well defined and developed, and
are supervised carefully throughout the process. A review of recruitment files can be
requested to support the conclusion of a systematic and well-documented process. The
College has enjoyed a relatively stable workforce and there is no hard evidence that the
current process of employing personnel is ineffective. However, although there is a
systematic process regarding hiring committees, according to Staff surveys and the
Standard IV survey on governance done in 2012, there appears to be a concern with the
inconsistency of this process that has caused some to question to overall integrity of HR
programs and services. This perceived lack of consistency has caused some to avoid
screening committee service. [Staff Survey] [2012 Standard IV: Leadership and
Governance Survey]

Actionable Improvement Plans

The Office of Human Resources should ensure that there is a clear, transparent, and
consistent hiring process regardless of which position is being filled.

[Planning Council] [Strategic Plan] [Collective Bargaining Unit: 1(UPW), 2 (HGEA), 3
III.A.1.b. The institution assures the effectiveness of its human resources by evaluating all personnel systematically and at stated intervals. The institution establishes written criteria for evaluating all personnel, including performance of assigned duties and participation in institutional responsibilities and other activities appropriate to their expertise. Evaluation processes seek to assess effectiveness of personnel and encourage improvement. Actions taken following evaluations are formal, timely and documented.

Descriptive Summary

The method, timing, and presentation of performance evaluations is set forth by Board policies, University of Hawai‘i Administrative Procedures for APT employees, the State’s Department of Human Resources Development for civil service employees, and respective collective bargaining agreements and contracts. The University administration is responsible for the annual evaluation of all Executive and Managerial (E/M) employees. Pursuant to Board Policies Chapter 9-14, E/M personnel are to be evaluated annually between March and June.

In April 2010, UHCCP# 9.202 (Executive Employees Performance Evaluation) was adopted. This policy establishes the procedures for Executive employees to establish professional and administrative goals and objectives on an annual basis. At the end of the evaluation year, the Executive employee provides to the supervisor a self-assessment based on fulfillment of these objectives. This process is supplemented by survey results from an E/M employee’s subordinates, peers, and constituent groups, who are given the opportunity to comment and provide input about the E/M’s performance. This feedback process—the 360º Performance Assessment—supplements the E/M employee’s supervisory review by the Chancellor. Evaluators’ participation in the 360º Performance Assessment survey is voluntary, and the process is confidential for the E/M and the evaluators. The Chancellor determines whether this supplemental method of evaluation will be utilized for any given year. The Chancellor submits to the President the results of evaluations of E/M employees and recommendations on salaries, classification, and terms of appointment. E/M employees are subject to annual reviews and re-appointments.

Faculty reviews for purposes of reappointment during the probationary period are done by the Division Personnel Committees (DPC) comprised of tenured faculty within the individual’s respective division or unit, with subsequent review by the Division Chair. Additionally, reviews for purposes of tenure and promotion go on to the Tenure and Promotion Review Committee (TPRC) level, with committees the members of which are appointed system-wide. After these levels of review and feedback, the dossier is forwarded to the appropriate Dean; the document is ultimately reviewed and a recommendation is made by both the Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs (VCAA) and the Chancellor, who are responsible for the evaluation of instructional and non-instructional faculty and follow a prescribed process for contract renewal, tenure, promotion, and Continuing Review actions. Reappointment, tenure, and promotion are
evaluated according to the University of Hawai`i Community Colleges Faculty Classification Plan. This classification plan was updated in 2009. In addition to their primary responsibilities of teaching or institutional support, faculty members are evaluated based on their participation in college and community service and professional development activities. The timing and procedures for faculty evaluation follow established guidelines posted on the Honolulu Community College Faculty Evaluation Schedule 2011-12.

The OHR for the College oversees performance evaluations for APT and civil service employees. Newly appointed APT employees serve a three-year probationary period and are reviewed annually during the period of November 1 through October 31 of the following year. Performance evaluations, conducted for the APTs by their direct supervisors, are entered electronically into the University Hawaii APT evaluation system. The employee and supervisor are notified by email to inform each individual of web links to access previously discussed performance evaluations as well as goals and objectives to be evaluated in the next performance review cycle. Upon completion of the three-year probationary period, should an APT be appointed to another APT position, the probationary period will then be six months per the Collective Bargaining Unit 8 Contract Agreement.

Civil service employees serve an initial probationary period of six months and are reviewed minimally annually thereafter. Each employee’s supervisor, however, establishes goals and objectives for the employee. Civil service and APT employees may also be subject to partial evaluation periods due to an extension of an initial evaluation or appointment of a new supervisor. Evaluations are conducted in person and in a confidential setting. APT and civil service employees who do not meet the performance expectations of their position during their initial probationary period may either be recommended for an extension or be informed of their termination of employment without recourse. Performance factors for APT and civil service employees are provided by the University and the State of Hawai`i Department of Human Resources Development.

OHR is responsible for promoting, facilitating, and encouraging a fair, timely, and constructive performance evaluation process. Performance evaluations for all APT and civil service employees provide the evidentiary basis for an OHR review.

Management information tools such as turnover rates, absenteeism, injury claims, grievances and other complaints may be utilized to connect personnel evaluations and institutional effectiveness and improvement. For instance, OHR is responsible for looking at everything from job market trends and program or department ratios, to any tool listed above when assessing the effectiveness of an employee during their individual evaluation period.

**Self Evaluation**

The College meets the Standard.
Evaluations of E/M, APT, Civil Service, and Faculty members are conducted at regularly scheduled intervals.

The College has utilized the 360º Performance Assessment for supplemental performance review of E/M employees on an annual basis. The College’s Secretary to the Chancellor is the Chancellor’s designee for updating information, implementing the Chancellor’s method of selecting evaluators, communicating to each of the E/M personnel the method of selecting evaluators for the given evaluation year, and inputting the information. Based on UHCCP #9.202, there are established steps for the selection of 360º evaluators in place across the system. The Executive level employees are asked to update their 360 evaluators list on an annual basis and provide that list to the Chancellor’s office for review and approval.

A survey was conducted in Spring 2011 to assess Executive employee evaluations of the current UHCCP #9.202 process, including the 360º evaluations, of which, per OHR, the results are strictly confidential.

Civil service employees are evaluated by the OHR at the University of Hawai‘i during their initial probationary period; thereafter they are evaluated by their supervisors through the Civil Service Performance Appraisal System (PAS). Civil service employees should be evaluated yearly after their initial evaluation. A Performance Appraisal System Memo to Supervisors is send out by OHR to all supervisors requesting follow through. To date, the increase in PAS responses have gone up from 10 percent in 2006 to 46 percent in 2011. OHR is intent on increasing the response rate in accordance with civil service rules. A memo dated March 7, 2006 and emailed to all civil service supervisors, stated that “pre-printed performance evaluations for every civil service employee of HCC will be sent to their supervisors prior to the employees anniversary month. These PAS evaluations must be completed within 30 days of the end of the appraisal period or 30 days upon receipt”. Monitoring of non-compliance will rest with the campus OHR. Over the past years, there has been a slight increase in the response rate. The PAS rate of completed evaluations is minimally acceptable; however, there continues to be needed attention in the matter.

**Actionable Improvement Plans**

OHR should continue to develop new strategies to improve the Civil Service PAS response rate from the supervisors of civil service and APT employees.

III.A.1.c. Faculty and others directly responsible for student progress toward achieving
stated student learning outcomes have, as a component of their evaluation, effectiveness in producing these outcomes.

Descriptive Summary

Faculty applying for reappointment, tenure, and promotion are evaluated according to the University of Hawai‘i Community Colleges Faculty Classification Plan. The Classification Plan clearly delineates the primary responsibilities of instructional faculty and non-instructional faculty. All faculty members are responsible for the learning and academic growth of students. This Classification Plan was revised in November 2007 to include explicit language making it clear that identification and assessment of student learning outcomes is a required part of a Faculty member’s primary duties (instruction and academic support.) Since 2007, UHPA has updated the faculty contract to state instructional and non-instructional faculty additional duties and service to include active participation in the program review process.

The Faculty Development Coordinator and Faculty Development Committee (FDC) present frequent workshops on instructional improvement, coordinate discussions and symposiums (e.g., Teachers Talking to Teachers), and sponsor professional development opportunities.

The College has identified student learning outcomes (SLOs), and is actively developing and implementing Program Review for all programs and services.

In addition, curricular processes for certifying and recertifying individual faculty for courses meeting General Education categories explicitly require identification of and assessment of student learning outcomes to meet the General Education category hallmarks.

Faculty members, with assistance from Division Chairs, develop measurable learning objectives for the courses and their respective programs. Various training and discussion sessions have been organized campus-wide to allow the exchange of ideas, especially on the design of effective learning objectives, assessment methods, and ways to improve learning based on assessment results. In addition, both program and course learning objectives are part of the Program Review process. In each review cycle, faculty members are required to address how information from course assessment is used to improve students’ learning outcomes.

Self Evaluation

The College meets the Standard.

Honolulu Community College has made significant progress in this area. Faculty applying for reappointment, tenure and promotion are evaluated on their performance of instruction or academic support services. Instructional and support faculty are instructed to address assessment of student learning as part of contract renewal documentation. All
the College’s instruction programs have identified these competencies, now called student learning outcomes.

Faculty have participated in professional development activities relating to assessment and planning. Faculty members are utilizing methods of assessment, and applying their findings to improve teaching and learning effectiveness, including use of the Knowledge Survey, a pre- and post-test method of assessment and student evaluations. Focus area courses (e.g., WI, E, O and H focus) are required to administer evaluations that ask students to assess the extent to which they feel they have met the hallmarks for those courses. This is a shift from course-content specific to focus-area specific assessment of SLOs. Faculty members are provided the results of these evaluations, which are expected to be included in their dossiers for contract renewal, tenure, and promotion.

**Actionable Improvement Plans**

The College should ensure that every division and or department across campus posts their 5 year program review on the intranet.

III.A.1.d. *The institution upholds a written code of professional ethics for all of its personnel.*

**Descriptive Summary**

Professional ethics are addressed in the Chancellor for Community Colleges Memo CCCM #2600, “Statement on Professional Ethics (Faculty)”. The faculty senates of the Community Colleges adopted the “American Association of University Professors Statement on Professional Ethics” in 1989. Subsequently, the University of Hawai`i Community College System adopted the “Statement on Professional Ethics, University of Hawai`i—Community Colleges” in 1991. It was revised in 1998.

The Statement includes intellectual honesty, academic freedom, honest academic conduct, respect for colleagues, respect for students, and commitment to teaching and scholarship.

The Staff Senate approved a statement of ethics in 2009. *The staff code of ethics* includes conducting and behaving with integrity, honesty, respects, fairness, and civility in a work setting while dealing with others. Additionally, staff will remain current and competent within their areas of expertise.

E/M positions fall under the Hawaii *State Commission Ethics Guide for State Elected Official, State Employees and Commission Members.* Per The State Ethics Code, Chapter 84 applies if you are a legislator or employee of the State of Hawaii. “Employee” is defined as an appointed or elected officer, employee of the State, including a civil service
or an exempt employee.

In addition to the various code of ethics statements, the College collaboratively identified its institutional core values: student-centered philosophy, respect, quality/excellence, and community. It is transparent and serves as a reminder to employees of the college to treat others with respect, and value the reasons why we all work for a higher educational institution.

**Self Evaluation**

The College meets the Standard.

*CCCM # 2600*, the “Statement on Professional Ethics, University of Hawai`i–Community Colleges” is available online on the Community Colleges Web site. The College's *Faculty Development Website* links to the professional code of ethics for faculty from its “Teaching Tips” link. The “Tutor Code of Ethics” can be found at the same website under the "Policies and Procedures Directory." The Staff code of ethics is transparent and posted online under the *Staff Senate Committee*.

While there are written codes of professional ethics in effect, on-going, annual activities to develop and further ethical awareness and understanding are recommended to ensure the continuation of the College’s commitment to principles and fairness.

The institutional core values appear at the top of each page of the College's Intranet, and are explained in detail in the *Core Values* section. “Our institutional core values are at the heart of everything we do.” The core value of “Respect,” in particular, addresses ethical behavior:

- Conduct all communication with honesty, integrity and openness
- Support pluralism, diversity and equity in all College practices and activities
- Commitment to providing a safe, nurturing and inclusive environment based on fairness, trust, and mutual respect

All employees of the State of Hawaii including faculty, staff (APT, Civil Service), and EMs fall under the *Hawaii State Commission Ethics Guide for State Elected Official, State Employees and Commission Members*.

**Actionable Improvement Plans**

OHR should develop and systematize procedures for ensuring the dissemination and awareness of the “Statement on Professional Ethics” for faculty and staff and the Hawaii State Commission Ethics Guide for State Elected Official, State Employees and Commission Members to all employees.
III.A.2. The institution maintains a sufficient number of faculty with full-time responsibility to the institution. The institution has a sufficient number of staff and administrators with appropriate preparation and experience to provide the administrative services necessary to support the institution’s mission and purposes.

Descriptive Summary

Generally each program head reviews his/her programs to determine the staffing needs, and brings to the attention of the Vice Chancellor of Academic Affairs, Vice Chancellor of Administrative Services, and the Chancellor requests for any program changes. Staffing needs are also determined by reviewing the Critical to Fill Positions Form and the data provided by the programs heads. For instance, if a division identifies a class that is needed beyond what is being offered, then the respective Dean can take it into consideration.

Honolulu Community College employs a total of 425 individuals, according HCC Human Resources as of April 20, 2012. Of these individuals, eight are employed in E/M positions, fifty-six in APT positions, seventy-nine in civil service positions, one hundred thirty-three are Instructional Faculty, and Other Faculty account for eleven positions. Lecturers, because of their transient nature, are not included in this report but number about one hundred.

The collective bargaining agreement between the University of Hawai‘i Professional Assembly (UHPA) and the Board of Regents of the University of Hawai‘i addresses the responsibilities and workload of faculty. For example, since 2009, in the *UHPA 2009-2015 Collective Bargaining Unit Agreement* updated the community college teaching faculty workload amount to reflect 30 credit hours total teaching load: 27 of which relates to instructional time and 3 credit hours of which is non-instructional time. In addition to the primary responsibilities of “teaching, research, specialized educational services, and community service,” faculty have professional responsibilities of “advising students; registration of students; participation in campus and University-System committees; keeping regularly posted office hours which are scheduled at times convenient for students; and participation in traditional functions which have unique academic significance.”

Applicants for employment must supply credentials, including documentation of education and experience, which are subject to verification by the Dean, Vice Chancellor of Academic Affairs, and/or OHR before being hired. Final decisions on hiring are made at the Vice Chancellor and Chancellor level.

When a position is vacated by a retirement, termination or resignation, the Executive level employee (Dean or Director) determines if the position should be recruited for replacement. If so, the Executive level employee completes the *Critical Need Form* and the *Position Action Form* to be approved by the VCAA and/or VCAS and ultimately the
Chancellor. The justification for filling the position must supply data and other supporting evidence that make the case to fill the position after it has been vacated. Once that approval process takes place, the position goes out for recruitment and follows the standard recruitment procedures and processes. When a division plans to fill a newly formed position, it is introduced into the budget prioritization process by the Dean or Director, who identifies the position as a new position request. The justification for new positions can originate through three different venues: 1) the position is identified as a need through the program review process; 2) the position is identified as a need through the implementation plan, which supports the activities needed to meet strategic outcomes; or 3) the position is identified as a health and safety need, which rises to the top of the prioritization process. The division must explain how the position is related to the mission and goals of the College as stated in the Strategic Plan. Justification and the need of the position shall be clearly stated, as well as the consequences of not filling the position in relation to the impact on the College’s Strategic Plan.

A comprehensive list of all these requests, as well as non-personnel budget requests, go first to the Budget Planning Committee. Then the PC distributes the list for voting prioritization by four governing committees, which are the following: Faculty Senate Executive Committee, Staff Senate Executive Committee, Kupa Ka Wai, and ASUH. After each governing committee has reviewed and ranked the list of requests, it then goes back to the PC Budget Subcommittee for one final approval before sending it back to the Planning Council. Lastly, the Planning Council makes its final recommendations to the Chancellor.

In December 2010 a reorganizational plan was executed by the Chancellor and VCAAs office after an intensive and transparent process of identifying personnel needs to increase effectiveness and efficiency of the delivery of necessary instructional and non-instructional services. Since then, open town hall meetings provided the campus at large an opportunity to discuss their concerns and or support for various reorganizational plans. Furthermore, the VCAA set numerous meetings with specific departments and divisions to further discuss changes that may occur in their division. The VCAA solicited feedback and took into consideration justifiable requests and made the changes as appropriate with the overall direction of the college’s direction.

Through the reorganizational and budgetary planning process, there continues to be discussion of areas of need in relation to positions. Divisions and Departments continue to have meetings to work out their areas’ staffing needs to fulfill institutional mission and goals.

**Self Evaluation**

The College meets the Standard.

However, there are significant concerns. Although the institution maintains a comparable number of faculty members based on the full-time equivalent (FTE), there are some other conditions that should be taken into consideration. Some full-time tenured faculty
members work in one-person departments and have the added responsibility to mentor lecturers. Writing SLOs may fall to the tenured faculty member, since the success of the students and ultimately the department depends on these outcomes. These faculty members are often responsible for the department budget requests and other administrative duties, duties other full-time faculty may not have unless they serve as Division Chairs, which would then afford them release time. Although most do find the time to fulfill their contractual and professional responsibilities to the College, these conditions may severely limit their ability to serve on campus committees, or as members of screening or personnel committees.

The majority of faculty participates in campus activities. However, based on an examination of the membership of College committees, it is evident that some faculty members do not participate, even though it is both a professional and a contractual requirement.

There are times in the career of a faculty member where participation in campus activities including committee membership is thoroughly examined such as when a faculty member applies for promotion and/or tenure. Reviewing committees (DPC and/or TPRC) make decisions based in part on the value and substance of the faculty member’s contribution to the campus and the system based on committee membership. Thereafter unless a faculty member applies for promotion or is asked to submit a Post-tenure Continuing Review, which is not mandatory, campus participation is not questioned.

Ideally all faculty members would adhere to their contract and professional ethics by serving on campus committees. According to the “Statement on Professional Ethics” for the Community Colleges, “Faculty members accept their share of faculty responsibilities for the governance of their institutions.”

Honolulu Community College employs many lecturers who typically do not serve on committees, since their main responsibility to the College is to teach. Therefore the “pool” of faculty members who do serve on campus committees and have a responsibility to the institution is further limited. Although the College may have, at least on paper, an adequate number of full-time faculty members, the responsibility to the College for many of them begins and ends with teaching.

HCC employs a number of staff, which includes both APT and Civil Service positions, many of which are deemed essential to the college’s function. Often times they work at the front line with students and the campus at large. Many APT’s are found in supervisory positions managing various departments such as Records, Health Office, Financial Aid, and the Business office. Many of the staff hold very unique, specialized, and perform specific duties to their position, which limits their ability to participate in campus committees, professional development activities, to volunteer at various events, and or participate in campus wide events. In trying to promote and encourage supervisors to allow their staff members to actively participate in the governance of this institution, the Chancellor sent out a memorandum in 2008. The Participation of Staff in Campus Governance Activities was distributed to all Deans, Directors, Faculty and Staff.
Supervisors of APT and Civil Service and Operations and Maintenance Employees. Since the inception of this memo, there has been no increase in Staff participation to serve on the Staff Senate (SSEC) and Staff Development Committee (SDC). According to the 2012 Institutional survey, 25 percent of staff felt that SSEC did not adequately represent Staff in campus wide committees. Additionally, employees still feel that they were not supported by their supervisors to attend governance and campus-wide committees. (*2012 Leadership & Governance Survey, Standard III A committee meeting dated 04/17/12*)

Administratively, HCC currently has 8 Executive/Managerial (E/M) positions, several of which are currently in interim status, including the Vice Chancellor of Administrative Services, the Dean of Student Services and the academic Deans. As individuals sit in these interim positions, their primary job is to help keep the division personnel, projects, and communication moving forward. Advertisements for the Dean of Students and Dean of Tech I ads have closed and the selection committees are reviewing applications. Other searches will take place in Fall 2012. All of the executive/managerial personnel participate in both professional development and campus-wide committees.

**Actionable Improvement Plans**

Although the College meets the Standard, the Human Resources committee suggests it would significantly improve the morale of faculty, staff and administrators if the following actions were implemented:

The College should develop and implement a review process to ensure equitable treatment as it relates to professional responsibilities and workload for all personnel.

The College should continue to develop a more transparent assessment system to determine whether the College's staffing level is adequate and effective, and use the results to make improvements.

The College should create a more transparent policy and disseminate the information campus-wide regarding the filling of new and vacant positions utilizing the Program Review Process.

The College should continue to plan and implement systematic and ongoing leadership training to assist in the retention of administrators.

The College should ensure that the code of ethics statement, which governs Staff, Faculty, and E/Ms, is clear and posted on the intranet.

The college should develop a strategy for supervisors of staff employees to encourage and promote staff participation in campus governance committees.

[UHPA 2009-2015 Collective Bargaining Unit Agreement] [Request to Fill Critical Position Form] [Request For Position Action] [Committee Assignments] [CCCM #2600 -]


III.A.3. The institution systematically develops personnel policies and procedures that are available for information and review. Such policies and procedures are equitably and consistently administered.

III.A.3.a. The institution establishes and adheres to written policies ensuring fairness in all employment procedures.

Descriptive Summary

The College's policies and procedures for human resources are based on Board of Regents policies, and the historical practices based upon the previously used Chancellor for Community Colleges Memos (CCCMs), and reflect the applicable laws, codes, memorandum, and collective bargaining agreements. New policies are the result of a collaborative decision-making process, with participation and consultation, as appropriate. The College develops personnel policies and procedures that are readily accessible on the College’s Web site or through the various University OHR. There are reviews of complaints, which are required to be reported to the University System. Mechanisms, both internal and external, are in place for investigation.

To ensure fairness and consistency in adherence to policies and procedures, OHR utilizes the various system-wide administrative procedures and policies, executive policies, Board policies, and the CCCMs. It should be noted that in December 2002, a system-wide reorganization was approved by the Board, which eliminated the position of Chancellor for the Community Colleges, the developer of personnel policies for all Community Colleges at that time. The UHCCP #8.102A Policy dated June 2007, clearly defines the delegation of authority for the Vice President for Community Colleges as well as the Chancellors at the respected Community Colleges.

Self Evaluation

The College meets the Standard.

The Chancellor has actively created and re-established many HCC policies on campus. The policies can be accessed online at the Honolulu Community College Intranet. Fairness is one of the core values of the College. The University of Hawai‘i’s Community College Policy of nondiscrimination and equal opportunity emanates a sense of fairness. Honolulu Community College’s Philosophy and Mission statement embraces nondiscrimination and Affirmative Action. Faculty, staff and administrators agree to support the concept of nondiscrimination of anyone regardless of sex, race, sexual orientation, age, religion, political affiliation, disability or marital status.

Actionable Improvement Plans
No action is required.

III.A.3.b. The institution makes provisions for the security and confidentiality of personnel records. Each employee has access to his/her personnel records in accordance with the law.

Descriptive Summary

Personnel files for each employee are kept in confidence and maintained in secure files by OHR. Files are locked and secured at the close of the business day. Further, there is always a personnel staff member present during the workday. Employees have access to their records by contacting OHR, and making an appointment. Personnel files for faculty and APT employees are maintained at the College, while E/M and civil service personnel records are maintained at System OHR at the University of Hawai`i at Manoa. Confidential information is disclosed with the employee’s consent or following Hawai`i Office of Information Practices guidelines. HCC houses “shadow” files for easy access; however, any official authority with proper identification requesting review of files is referred to UH OHR.

Self Evaluation

The College meets the Standard.

Confidentiality and security of personnel records are assured. Employees can make a request to view their record with an OHR employee present in order to ensure integrity and confidentiality. Additionally, if an employee requests to meet with Human Resources, they have the option to meet either in the employee’s work area or the conference room. This is to ensure that the employee feels safe to address their concerns and or questions with HR staff members and or the EEO/AA officer. However, as shown in the Standard IV: Governance Survey 2012 and Staff Survey 2011, there is a concern for employees to communicate with HR. Many employees have expressed concerns regarding lack of confidentiality.

Actionable Improvement Plans

VCAS needs to assess the overall communication concerns regarding HR and the campus. From there an Action Plan should be created to ensure that communication challenges thus identified are resolved.

[Board of Regents Policies and Bylaws] [CCCM #2600 - Statement on Professional Ethics (Faculty)] [Executive Policy E9.112 - Delegation of Authority for Personnel Actions] [Hawaii Office of Information Practices] [Staff Survey] [Standard IV: Governance Survey 2012] [Personnel Records-BOR appointees]
Descriptive Summary

Honolulu Community College as a part of the University of Hawai`i system, values the diversity of its students, faculty, staff and administrators. There are both federal and state laws that govern employment practices to ensure an equitable and diverse workforce. Additionally, there are federal and state laws that ensure that students are treated fairly and equitably. The College has both an Affirmative Action Plan and an Affirmative Action Program Statement of Policy.

A commitment to diversity in employment begins with the Honolulu Community College employment advertisement, which states, “the University of Hawai`i is an equal opportunity/affirmative action institution. All qualified applicants will be considered, regardless of race, sex, age, religion, color, national origin, ancestry, disability, marital status, sexual orientation, or status as disabled veteran or veteran of Vietnam era.” Employment is contingent on satisfying employment eligibility verification requirements of the Immigration Reform and Control Act of 1986. Appointments to positions are subject to campus recruitment guidelines and the collective bargaining agreements.

The EEO/AA coordinator is instrumental in the oversight of every aspect of the employment process, beginning with the selection of screening committee members, and assistance with creating the interview criteria, including the approval of the interview questions before applications are even reviewed. Each aspect of the interview and hiring cycle takes into account the Affirmative Action Plan to ensure that equity is achieved and maintained. The University of Hawai`i also requires the University of Hawai`i Form 27 (PERS) Ethnic Background to be completed. This form addresses the applicants who were interviewed. Employee processes comply with the University of Hawai`i Board Of Regents Policy: Chapter 9 Administrative Procedures.

The purpose of the College's Committee on Social Equity is to “address existing and potential bias issues; present varied forums for issues to be discussed; provide a clearinghouse/non-structured platform for students, faculty and staff to voice concern(s) about biases within the College sphere whether real or potential; become a ‘weather-vane’ on campus for changes in attitude or increase in a potential bias amongst the population as a whole; act as a vehicle to pro-actively disseminate information on diversity.” Some of the recent presentations they have sponsored either singly or in conjunction with other campus groups and or individuals such as the Mental Health Counselor:

* Dr. Jaye Cee Whitehead (Assistant Professor at Pacific University), Guest Speaker on same-sex marriage

- Awarded SEED Grant for two consecutive years in 2007-2008
- "Diversity and Equity Library" for DVDs at HCC
- LGBTI Conference 2009
• LGBTI Movie Showing
• LGBTI Safe Zone Training (2009-2010)

The College is extremely fortunate to have Hulili Ke Kui, the Native Hawaiian Center and Poʻi Na Nalu to help one of the most disadvantaged groups of students, Native Hawaiians. The Center offers advising, tutoring, financial aid information, computer labs, and ongoing cultural activities and presentations that are co-hosted by Student Services departments and TRIO-SSS.

• Malama Aina Day
• Kumu Kahua Theater
• Polynesian Cultural Center
• Life Skills Workshops: Financial Aid Process and Scholarships
• Imi Na'auao: Uhane Tales with Lopaka, Makahiki Games with Laakea, Lomi with Alva
• Wahi Pana: Ku Kani Loko: Birthing Stones, Kanikapupu: Kamehameha IV Summer House, Moku o Loʻe: Coconut Island, Kapalama Walking Tour

There are a variety of clubs that do not limit membership to students of a specific ethnicity or orientation. These clubs include the Hui ʻOiwi, Suzume No Kai and Righteous Rainbow. There are clubs as well that base membership on an interest in specific career goals such as the Administration of Justice club, Early Childhood club, and Human Resources club.

**Self Evaluation**

The College meets the Standard.

Honolulu Community College strives to promote an equitable and diversified faculty, staff and student population. This is evident in our own institution’s mission statement. HCC’s campus mission has been reviewed and approved by every governing committee on campus which including, Students, Staff, Faculty and Administration. Our mission is in direct support of the UH SYSTEM’s Mission, which also promotes diversity. Thus, HCC is committed through its actions to encourage a supportive and understanding working and learning environment for our diversified population.

The campus of Honolulu Community College is diverse in students, faculty, staff and administrators as evidenced in the Demographic Report given by HCC Human Resources, which identifies the following ethnic/cultural affiliations: African-American, American Indian, Caucasian, Chinese, Filipino, Hispanic, Native Hawaiian, Indian/SE Asian, Japanese, Korean, Laotian, Samoan, Thai, Vietnamese, and others.

As with most institutions of higher learning, the goal to employ more minorities in administrative and faculty positions is often a challenge. The College does encourage members of underutilized or underrepresented groups to apply. The best-qualified applicants are considered for employment, should that include a member of an
underrepresented group, that would be a favorable addition to the applicant's standing.

Campus activities, which celebrate diversity, have been sponsored by various segments of the campus community including Staff Development Council (SDC), FDC, Student Services, International Affairs and Development, and Administration.

Students are recruited from almost every high school on Oahu, which translates to a very diverse student body population. There is an effort underway to also actively recruit students from the Neighbor Islands.

Scholarships and tuition assistance for minorities or underrepresented groups are offered to attract these students to the College. Once they are enrolled there are a variety of clubs and activities to celebrate the diversity of the campus. One successful tuition assistance program called the Non-Traditional Scholarship is geared to assist males or females wishing to enter non-traditional careers, such as women in the Auto Body Repair or Carpentry programs, and men in Early Childhood Education or Cosmetology.

**Actionable Improvement Plans**

No action is required.

[UH Form 27] [Board of Regents Policies and Bylaws - Chapter 9 Personnel] [Committee on Social Equity]

III.A.4.a. The institution creates and maintains appropriate programs, practices, and services that support its diverse personnel.

**Descriptive Summary**

Honolulu Community College provides programs and services to support its students, staff, and faculty. Many College departments serve students both directly and indirectly. The Office of Student Services, the Dean of Student Services, College Skills Center, Native Hawaiian Center, Computer Lab, Library, and the Health Center are some of the providers of these services.

The *Staff Development Council* (SDC) is a group of proactive staff members from various departments on campus that plans workshops, conferences, social gatherings, and fundraisers. The Council’s mission and objectives are to support the educational mission of the College and to provide a staff development program that will enhance the professional and personal talents, skills, and competency of Civil Service and APT employees. By respecting the dignity and work of all staff members, the SDC supports their inherent potential for growth and celebrates their accomplishments and contribution. The Council’s purpose includes the following:

- Encourage openness to new ideas and foster a spirit of cooperation.
- Support self-initiated programs of professional development by all staff members.
• Provide opportunities to develop skills and enhance career development.
• Promote life-long learning.
• Provide social events to build camaraderie among College employees.
• Provide financial and other resources to accomplish staff development goals.
• Support College-wide fund raising activities.
• Plan workshops and activities in the areas of Organizational and Management Development, and Professional and Personal Development.

The SDC has a professional development component, “to improve the professional competency levels of support staff.” SDC members conduct various fund-raising activities to fund these activities. The purpose of these fundraising events is to provide monetary support for institutional, professional, and personal development activities. Sources of funding include College funds in addition to contributions by College employees and members of the community, and funds raised by the Staff Development Council for this purpose. Types of activities that may be funded include conference registration fees, tuition for short-term classes, travel assistance, community service activities, and special projects that support the mission of the Staff Development Council at Honolulu Community College. A maximum amount of $3,000 may be spent on staff development awards for each fiscal year. The maximum amount of an award shall not exceed $500. Staff members may apply for one or more grants, the total of which shall not exceed $500 per fiscal year. Applications are considered on a first-come, first-served basis as long as the maximum annual amount has not been awarded. Procedures and criteria for funding are on the Staff Development Fund Web site. Some of the professional activities that SDC has funded in the past include: Records: Retention and Destruction, Communication at Work, How to Handle Conflict and Confirmation, Conflict Management, and Adobe Photoshop Workshops.

In addition to SDC ensuring professional development activities are funded, HCC's Human Resources as well as the Chief Personnel Officer is responsible to also provide information on various professional development activities for employees as stated in the Human Resources 5 year program review and the Chief Personnel Officer’s job description.

The Faculty Development Committee (FDC) primarily presents and coordinates professional development opportunities for the faculty. The Faculty Development charter was approved by the FDC and the Faculty Senate Executive Committee (FSEC) in September 2004 and re-approved by the FDC on September 7, 2005. FDC has supported workshops, campus events, and professional development for the HCC campus on topics such as:

- Hawaii Great Teachers Seminar
- High School to HCC (HS2HCC)
- WILD and WO Day: Excellence in Teaching day
- “Teaching Abstract Concepts to Concrete Learners”
- “Laulima Development Series”: Technology Integration Series, The
Digital Millennium, Copyright laws and University of Hawaii

- Brown Bag Session on “Battle of Gettysburg”
- “Caring and Sharing for Collectors”
- “Celebrate what’s Right with the World”

All Honolulu Community College personnel are eligible to apply for University of Hawaii tuition waivers. These waivers allow qualified employees to take classes at any of the University of Hawai`i campuses, up to six credits per semester. This practice encourages administrators, staff, and faculty to remain “life-long learners.”

By virtue of state employment the College’s employees enjoy a host of benefits including medical, dental, vision, and life insurance. State employees are eligible to utilize no-cost counseling for workplace or personal problems through the Resource for Employees Assistance and Counseling Help (REACH). Union membership brings additional benefits as well. [Human Resources]

Other services for personnel include:
- Campus Child Care Center – available to students, staff and faculty for a fee
- Health Office – health-related information and workshops, flu shots, blood drives
- University of Hawai`i Federal Credit Union – a representative provides services on campus each week
- Book Store – branch of the University of Hawai`i Bookstore
- Business Cards – printed at no cost for all College employees by the Print Shop
- IT Department – Laulima, Google Suite: gmail, documents and calendars, MS: Excel, PowerPoint, Word, Safe browsing Listserv, MYUH Portal, Thunderbird, Webmail

Self Evaluation

The College meets the Standard, but should continue to make improvements in the area of staff development and training.

The College’s employees have opportunities for professional development and continuing education. The FDC present a variety of workshops throughout the academic year, and offer funding to support participation in off-campus training and conferences. SDC and FDC often co-sponsor events, which allows a greater level of participation, as well as a division of costs. For example during the spring semesters, the FDC and SDC are responsible for creating and promoting Excellence in Education Day. This non-instructional day is set aside to enable the campus community to attend various workshops and lectures relating to current issues in education.

As stated in the SDC Charter, the SDC was an advisory body to the Personnel Officer who was responsible for coordinating staff development activities and handled most
aspects such as correspondence, meetings (agenda/minutes), disseminating info to campus, liaison to Community College re: staff development in identifying, designing and implementing workshops and activities for the campus/system, assist in coordinating and arranging presenters. The SDC members assisted in an advisory capacity to assess interests and needs of the campus, liaison to their departments, approved requests for funding, promoted the mission and objects and encourage staff participation in workshops/events.

However, since 2007, when the former Personnel Officer left, the responsibilities of this position as stated in the charter shifted, and members of the committee began to take on some of the duties of SDC coordination. Given the change in committee functions, the SDC is only able to provide a limited number of professional development activities to improve social relations among HCC staff, faculty and administration.

While SDC members have been more active than they were in the past, in June 2010 the governance of the SDC was asked to move under the aegis of the SSEC, comparable to the relationship between the FSEC and the FDC. Since then, SDC and SSEC have been reviewing their respective charters and working towards a more coordinated and collaborative arrangement.

In an effort to address some of these concerns, the Chancellor has delegated the responsibility of helping to identify staff training and development opportunities to Chancellor’s Executive Assistant. In turn, the SDC has been tasked with identifying the areas of training they desire for their constituents, and to work with the Executive Assistant in the coordination of such training. It is expected that this arrangement will help clarify the responsibilities of the SSEC and SDC. Since the College has identified in its Strategic Plan the need for professional development for both faculty and staff, it will align the necessary and appropriate resources for such activities, once training opportunities are identified by the SDC.

Services such as the Health Office, Child Care Center, and Credit Union make it possible for employees to receive assistance and support on campus. The Equal opportunity/Affirmative Action Personnel Officer handles disability and workplace accommodations for staff and faculty members. The College adheres to the non-discrimination policy and makes reasonable accommodations for employees with documented disabilities.

**Actionable Improvement Plans**

SDC should continue to work towards aligning their committee under the governance of the SSEC, similar to the relationship between FDC and the FSEC.

SDC should be given an annual allocation to help fund staff professional development activities, similar to the support provided the FDC.

The College and the SSEC/SDC should work together to ensure that there is effective
management and assessment of staff development and training, with equitable access to both in-house and extramural opportunities.

[Staff Development Council] [Staff Development Council Funding] [Faculty Development Committee] [Faculty Senate Executive Committee] [University of Hawaii Employee Tuition Waiver]

III.A.4.b. The institution regularly assesses its record in employment equity and diversity consistent with its mission.

Descriptive Summary

In its Mission Statement the College has the goal to “maintain a multicultural environment where ethnic and gender diversity is appreciated, respected and promoted.” This environment includes all of the stakeholders of the College: students, faculty, staff and administrators. As shown in the Demographic Data Report, Honolulu Community College does have a diverse group of stakeholders.

The College’s Personnel Officer explained that the “tracking, analyzing and utilizing of employment equity records” are achieved through various means, including the Affirmative Action Plan. The Affirmative Action Plan includes information “to track and analyze employment records, and to help identify areas that can be improved.” The College uses the Workforce Analysis, Job Group Analysis, Availability Analysis, Utilization Analysis and Goal Setting, and Personnel Activity Information sections of the Affirmative Action Plan to assess employment equity and diversity.

Self Evaluation

The College meets the Standard.

Personnel records are subject to intense scrutiny by various entities, including the University of Hawai‘i Equal Employment Office/AA and other state and federal agencies. Employment grievances may be subject to legal ramifications. Therefore, the OHR of Honolulu Community College takes its responsibility of ensuring equity and diversity on this campus seriously. OHR’s monitoring helps keep the College consistent with its mission as well as in compliance with personnel rules and regulations.

Actionable Improvement Plans

No action is required.

III.A.4.c. The institution subscribes to, advocates, and demonstrates integrity in the treatment of its administration, faculty, staff and students.

Descriptive Summary
The University and the College have labor union contracts with a majority of their employees. These contracts define and formalize working relations between the parties. The Hawai`i Government Employees Association (HGEA) represents civil service and APT employees and the United Public Workers (UPW) represents blue-collar employees. The University of Hawai`i Professional Assembly (UHPA) represents faculty. E/M employees serve at the discretion and appointment of the Chancellor. The Board of Regents selects a Chancellor after being forwarded a list of selectees by the campus screening committee. Although he does not have a union contract, he is entitled to a grievance procedure through the Governor of the State of Hawai`i.

All employees as well as students are subject to federal and state laws including the Sexual Assault and Harassment Policy. The EEO/AA Coordinator and Personnel Officers for each campus are charged with addressing any complaints. There is also a formal complaint process, which addresses other types of discrimination. The EEO/AA Personnel Officer would explain the process and direct any complaints to the appropriate person or office.

Student Regulations, also known as the Student Conduct Code, explain the rights and responsibilities of students. They are included in the Course Catalog and on the World Wide Web. The full-text of the Student Conduct Code is accessible on the Web.

The Office of the Dean of Student Services is responsible for enforcement of the Student Conduct Code. Students have several avenues of recourse when they have complaints or questions. These include but are not limited to discussions with their instructors, counselors, Division Chairs, Dean of Students, and the Chancellor regarding any unfair treatment they believe they have been subjected to. All students who file complaints can expect to be treated with respect and confidentiality.

**Self Evaluation**

The College meets the Standard.

There are avenues to address grievances of personnel at the College. Regardless of which union the employee works under, employees may bring up any problems to their supervisor or they may choose to register either an informal or formal complaint with the EEO officer who also serves as the Personnel Officer. At any level of the complaint process, the complaint is welcome to bring union representation.

OHR also provides mandatory sexual harassment workshops for all new employees once a year as part of the New Employee Orientation program.

There is also a formal complaint process for students who feel their rights as students have been violated. Students would seek consultation with the EEO/AA Personnel Officer who would explain the process and direct any complaints to the appropriate person or office.
Due to an increase in student conduct issues on campus, proactive measures have been implemented. Previously the college did not have a transparent procedure for handling reported incidents on campus. Thus, on September 1, 2011 the Chancellor sent out a campus wide memo, *HCCP #9.730: Workplace Non-Violence*, regarding the development of the Crisis Management Team and the procedures that faculty and staff need to adhere by. Since the inception of the crisis management team, incidents have been reported dealt with according to procedures outline in the policy document. Files are kept in a confidential and housed with the Vice Chancellor of Administrative Services. From the time of the reported incident, all parties involved are given updates until an incident is brought to closure.

**Actionable Improvement Plans**

The College should continue to identify in a timely manner the issues affecting campus employee morale and other challenges, and make the appropriate resources available to help employees deal with these issues.

The College should continue to provide adequate training and/or workshops in managing and handling disruptive students. Training should include what employees' legal and professional obligations are in managing and handling incidents of disruption and/or violations of the Student Code of Conduct.

The HCC Crisis Management Team should develop a transparent systematic flow chart, to be shared with the campus at large, including steps and timelines for handling formal reported incidents. The process should be inclusive, including procedures for notifying all those that are and/or could be involved (i.e. administration, division chairs, faculty, staff, and students.)

The Office of Human Resources (OHR) should refine, update and make transparent its new employee orientation program, and ensure that the following areas are covered: medical benefits, investment benefits, general employment, grievance policy, union information, sexual harassment and non-work place violence, employee and or faculty code of ethics, setting up user names and email, internet responsibilities, tuition waivers, faculty workload issues, sabbaticals, parking regulations, payment schedule and distribution methods, holiday schedules, probationary periods associated with position held, performance evaluation process and procedures, incident report process and procedures, EEO/AA and disability compliance rules and regulations, and other employment benefits and regulations such as FMLA, TDI, Workers Compensation, and familiarity with various online personnel forms and policies and procedures found on the HCC intranet.

[Collective Bargaining Unit: 1(UPW), 2 (HGEA), 3 (HGEA), 4 (HGEA), 7 (UHPA), 8 (APT’s), 9 (HGEA) pdf] [UH Systemwide Student Conduct Code] [Workplace Non-Violence - HCCP #9.730] [Human Resources Policies and Procedures] [Personnel Forms]
III.A.5. The institution provides all personnel with appropriate opportunities for continued professional development, consistent with the institutional mission and based on identified teaching and learning needs.

III.A.5.a. The institution plans professional development activities to meet the needs of its personnel.

Descriptive Summary

As previously noted (see III.A.4.a), the College has two professional development committees, the Faculty Development Committee (FDC) and the Staff Development Council (SDC), for faculty and staff members, respectively.

The FDC has representatives from each academic division of the College and an administrative liaison. The FDC conducts a needs assessment survey at the beginning of each academic year. The Committee members discuss and plan activities to address these requests and identified needs. The administrative liaison can also provide input on teaching and learning needs. The FDC receives training requests from other campus committees and programs, e.g., the Committee on Social Equity, the Information Technology Center, and the Native Hawaiian Center, and co-sponsors professional development activities with these groups.

The FDC also surveys the faculty, asking members what information they are willing to share and sessions they could present to the College. In addition, the Committee establishes criteria and procedures, solicits applications, and distributes the allotted College funding for other faculty professional development activities, such as participation in local and national workshops and conferences, and attendance at the annual Hawai`i National Great Teachers Seminar.

In support of the educational mission of the College, the SDC strives to provide a staff development program that will enhance the professional and personal talents, skills, and competency of civil service and APT employees. As an advisory group, the SDC plans, develops, and evaluates the staff development activities. It also provides monetary support for institutional, professional, and personal development activities that are not otherwise funded by the College.

In addition, all employees who work more than half time for the College are eligible for tuition waivers and can submit training requests to attend University of Hawaii and State of Hawai`i Department of Human Resources Development training sessions. These forms are readily available on-line and announcements on training sessions are made via campus e-mail. Training requests are screened for employee eligibility and job relatedness (current or promotion) along with equal employment opportunity considerations.

Self Evaluation
The College meets the Standard.

The faculty and staff are provided with various means for and a wide range of professional development opportunities. The FDC and SDC offer numerous workshops and training opportunities throughout the year and provide monetary support for faculty and staff to attend outside professional development activities.

The FDC plans and presents faculty development activities based on identified needs and requests expressed by faculty, and in support of the College’s goals. For example, the Teachers Talking to Teachers series has addressed retention of students and service learning. The Committee has also been active in assisting faculty with drafting student learning objectives and Program Review guidelines. The FDC sponsors sessions in information technology as well, such as using WebMail effectively, and introductory series in Microsoft Excel, Microsoft PowerPoint, and Adobe Photoshop. Presentations co-sponsored by the FDC and the Native Hawaiian Center have been very well received. In addition, the Faculty Development Coordinator maintains a nationally recognized Web site of faculty development resources.

The SDC’s activities are inclusive, including all segments of the College whenever possible. The SDC seeks to advance team-building and to develop cross-department relationships. The Council plans a variety of activities to fulfill the diverse needs and interests of the staff. The SDC has sponsored Excellence in Education Day for staff annually for many years. Topics have included customer service, telephone etiquette, and computer skills. Excellence in Education features a field trip to enhance understanding of the surrounding community and cultures.

The “Wo Innovation in Learning Day” and “Excellence in Education” conferences are presented at the College in alternate spring semesters. All staff and faculty are invited. The topic is determined by the College’s goals and needs at the time of the event. FDC, SDC, and the WO champions group sponsored events such as:

- A Journey to Hawaii’s Future, Hawaii Research Center for Future Studies
- Millennial Learners and Educational Technology
- Economic, Environmental and social sustainability
- Faculty Authors Reading
- Hydroponic and Wiki Gardens

**Actionable Improvement Plans**

The FDC and SDC should continue to research and evaluate various sponsored events.

SDC should develop a systematic way of identifying the professional development needs of staff employees.

[Faculty Development Committee] [Staff Development Council]

*III.A.5.b. With the assistance of the participants, the institution systematically evaluates*
professional development programs and uses the results of these evaluations as the basis for improvement.

Descriptive Summary

After each Faculty Development activity, an evaluation is conducted, and the results are shared with the presenter(s) and are also discussed at the FDC meetings. The evaluation references the core values and the mission of the College.

Applications by faculty for contract renewal, tenure, and promotion must include a personal evaluation of professional development activities. During these post-evaluation assessments, faculty are encouraged to show how the various professional development activities enriched their primary responsibility to the students and overall institution.

For professional development opportunities provided for staff, the SDC also requests that employees who receive professional development funding submit letters that explain how they are applying the training to their jobs.

Self Evaluation

While the College meets the Standard, more could be done in the context of assessing professional development for staff.

The FDC regularly uses training evaluations and committee input for planning purposes. FDC encourages faculty upon return from a sponsored event to present workshops on various professional development activities. The FDC has scheduled follow-up workshops for College participants of past Hawai‘i National Great Teachers Seminars. Participants will give feedback on how these professional development activities have improved their teaching and student learning outcomes.

Actionable Improvement Plans

The SDC should institute a systematic way to develop an evaluation program and use the results for basis for improvement.

[Staff Senate Executive Committee] [Faculty Development Committee] [Staff Development Council]

III.A.6. Human resource planning is integrated with institutional planning. The institution systematically assesses the effective use of human resources and uses the results of the evaluation as the basis for improvement.

Descriptive Summary

Honolulu Community College utilizes a staffing plan that is included in the strategic
planning and budgeting process. The Vice Chancellor of Administrative Services (VCAS) maintains a personnel inventory that accounts for and justifies all of the College's positions. Before a vacancy can be filled, the Request to Fill Critical Position/Amendment to Staffing Plan form and Position Action Form must be completed. These forms examine the position’s duties and responsibilities, description of and number of similar positions within the department, and justification (e.g., consequences if the position is not filled). Requests for new positions also require completion of the form. An action statement based on Program Review data or enrollment and impact measures must be submitted for the Deans' and the Chancellor's approval. Proposed new positions must be included in the Honolulu Community College Strategic Plan. OHR contributes to the planning process by providing information as requested.

HCC is currently awaiting the approval of the reorganizational plan which shows newly created departments, a change in the supervision and role of the IT department, among other personnel changes. The VCAA has hosted various Town Hall meetings since December 2010. Since then, the VCAA has created and attended many division meetings to discuss how the reorganization will affect each area. Currently HCC has submitted the reorganizational draft to the UHCC’s office awaiting union approval.

In the meantime, while the institution is going through a reorganization process, there have been areas and/or departments that have been able to maintain adequate staffing, while other areas have not. In some cases, there has been no movement to fill the vacancies in which the employee had left due to retirement or for other jobs. The Deans and the VCAS are responsible for evaluating the adequacy and effectiveness of the College's human resources. More information is progressively being gained through systematic reviews conducted by programs and units through the program review process; however at times the decisions to not fill positions have been seen as less than transparent. OHR also participates in a consultative capacity, such as in providing position descriptions, classifications, and cost data.

It is the right of management to reassign faculty personnel, relative to the needs of the programs. Faculty is subject to “retrenchment” which is defined in “Article XVI. Retrenchment” of the 2009-2015 Agreement Between the University of Hawai‘i Professional Assembly and the Board of Regents. While many personnel decisions are campus driven there are some policies which are mandated by the Board. Chapter Nine of the Board of Regents Policies delineates personnel status and conditions under which all University employees ultimately serve.

**Self Evaluation**

The College meets the Standard.

Human resources planning is a significant part of the College's strategic planning process, which includes participation by and input from administrators, faculty, staff, and students. The College’s Strategic Plan is reviewed and updated annually. The planning schedule and descriptions of how all members of the College participate are outlined in
the Timeline for Annual Review of Strategic Plan through the Integrated Planning Budget Cycle, which is posted on the Intranet. In addition, there are open meetings for administrators, faculty, and staff to discuss the contents and proposals of the Strategic Plan. The Strategic Plan is the basis for College budgeting. The relationship of planning and budgeting is delineated in the Strategic Planning and Integrated Planning Budget Cycle.

Proposed new positions must be included in the departmental program review in relation to the HCC Strategic Plan. Each proposal requires a written justification for the position, an explanation of its relationship to the College’s mission and goals, and a description of the potential consequences if the position is not developed and funded. Supporting documents and data, such as findings from Program Reviews and Annual Assessments, and recommendations from advisory boards and industry, are required.

The evaluation of human resources needs and effectiveness are being incorporated in the College’s guidelines and procedures for Program Review. Human resources decisions are tied to the results of these evaluations. The Annual Assessment Reports and Program Review Reports examine the number of full-time equivalent (FTE) faculty, the percentage of credits and classes taught by lecturers, the number of students per FTE faculty, and the workload per FTE, in the evaluation of program efficiency and health. Program effectiveness, including the effective use of human resources, is evaluated through the analysis of student learning and resource sufficiency required by the Reports. Human resources needs are identified through the Annual Assessments or Program Reviews that are submitted to the Deans, are addressed in the recommendations and action plans of the Reports. Potential funding needs are also described. All programs and service units are undertaking Annual Assessment and Program Review.

As employers, the Board of Regents has the authority to designate changes that define where campuses can choose to emphasize hiring needs. An example is the “high demand discipline” designation, which allows salaries in some disciplines to have a higher starting salary range in relation to other disciplines. The following have been identified as high demand disciplines, which will be reviewed once every three years to determine whether they should be continued to be identified as such: Computer Sciences, Aeronautics Maintenance Technology, Advanced Automotive Technology and Nursing.

While the Chancellor has the authority to shift positions between departments, there does not seem to be a well-defined policy regarding how this authority was derived, and how, and under what circumstances, it is exercised. Nevertheless, should the Chancellor decide to make changes in the institutions positions, a justification is recommended in the event that his or her decision goes against the recommendation of the planning council and budgetary process.

**Actionable Improvement Plans**

The College should explore systemic ways to include the Personnel Officer in planning activities.
The College should create a written policy and the appropriate transparent procedures for the shifting of positions between departments.
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Standard IIIB: Physical Resources

III.B. Physical resources, which include facilities, equipment, land, and other assets; supporting student learning programs and services; and improving institutional effectiveness. Physical resource planning is integrated with institutional planning.

Descriptive Summary

Facilities utilized by the College include a main campus on Dillingham Boulevard and six additional satellite programs at various locations:

- Automotive Mechanics Technology, Kokea Street
- Diesel Mechanics Technology, Kokea Street
- Marine Educational and Training Center, Sand Island Access Road
- Aeronautics Maintenance Technology, Lagoon Drive
- Commercial Aviation, Hangar 111, Kalaeloa Airport
- Pearl Harbor Apprenticeship Program, Pearl Harbor Naval Shipyard

The main campus is situated in the Kalihi-Pālama district, approximately two miles northwest of downtown Honolulu. Twenty-one buildings, including two six-story high-rise and several two-level structures, occupy a twenty-acre property. Most of these buildings were constructed between 1930 and 1980, with the exception of the Kokea Training Center, which was completed in 2008. A concrete pedestrian mall in the middle of the campus provides walking and emergency vehicular access to most buildings.

The majority of classes are held on the main campus. The Computing, Electronics, and Networking Technology Building and the Trade Industrial Complex are designed and furnished for specific program majors, while most of the other buildings are for mixed instructional activities.

Building 2, one of the two high-rise buildings, was constructed in 1979. Its ground floor houses the Bookstore, Student Life and Development and Student Government offices, the Student Lounge, and Health Office. The Norman Loui Conference Center, located on the second floor, has a maximum occupancy of 180 persons. The Center’s entryway includes a dinosaur exhibit built by volunteers from the College and the community. The Mike Curb studios and classrooms for the Music and Entertainment Learning Experience (MELE) program are on the fourth floor of Building 2. Construction of the MELE program facilities, completed in 2010, was funded by the Mike Curb Family Foundation.

Many of the instructional support programs are located in Building 7, another high-rise building. These include the Library, College Skills Center, Educational Media Center, the distance education studio, and the Technical Desktop Support office for information technology. The Library occupies the first and second floors and the other offices occupy the third floor. The print shop, operated by the Educational Media Center, is situated in another building away from instructional activities.
Building 7 has been scheduled for major improvements which include:

• Construction of a new six-story elevator and an elevator lobby.
• Construction of a new mechanical room stack.
• Removal of existing air conditioning system and installation of new A/C system.
• Removal of existing ceiling and lighting and installation of new ceiling and lighting.
• Construction of three new telecommunication rooms on Floors 2, 4, and 6.
• Installation of network conduits.
• Removal of the remaining vinyl asbestos tiles.
• Repainting of building’s exterior surfaces.

Renovation activities began in November 2011 and are expected to be completed in August 2014, prior to the beginning of the fall semester. In addition to elevated noise levels, dust, and debris generated by construction activities, students and personnel will have to be relocated during the renovation.

In order to minimize disruption to instructional and support activities, the College is exploring various options for classroom and office replacement spaces. These include adding portable buildings, leasing commercial property near campus, and facilitating mobile offices with wireless equipment. In addition, the Library may be relocated to Building 2, Room 201 during the last phase of the renovation, which will start in August 2013.

The Cafeteria is located in Building 4. It consists of a kitchen, food and supply storage area, food service counter, large dining area, and a main stage. The Cafeteria is open during most of the instructional hours including evenings and Saturdays.

The Operations and Maintenance (O & M) Department occupies its own one-story building that includes storage areas, a small maintenance shop, a staff lunch room, and a supervisor’s office. The building is the base-yard for the O & M staff whose work areas cover the main campus and satellite facilities. The Vice Chancellor for Administrative Services (VCAS) oversees all activities related to facility maintenance, repair, and improvement.

Four parking areas, with a maximum capacity 677 vehicles, are available for students at the main campus, as well as a small parking lot for visitors (18 stalls). Working with representatives from the student government, the VCAS office has expanded parking spaces and eliminated the students’ parking lottery system to accommodate all students. Currently, it appears that the parking is sufficient at the main campus and satellite facilities.

Six academic programs are located off the main campus:

• The Automotive Mechanics Technology and Diesel Mechanics Technology programs are located about half a mile southwest of the main campus, on Kokea Street. Spreading over a seven-acre property, the facilities include two one-story buildings and a large parking area. Both buildings are designed to accommodate specialized training activities in automotive and diesel mechanics technologies.
• The Marine Education and Training Center (METC), a 4.86-acre waterfront property, is situated on Sand Island Road. In addition to a two-story building, the facilities include two finger piers and a securable parking area. The Center’s building houses classrooms, offices, workshops, and specialized equipment appropriate for its instructional activities related to building, repairing, and maintaining marine vessels.

• The Aeronautics Maintenance Technology program is located on Lagoon Drive near the south ramp of the Honolulu International Airport. It occupies 4.77 acres and encloses nearly 46,500 square feet of hangar space, storage areas, classrooms, workshops, and offices.

• The Commercial Aviation Program, Hangar 111, is located on two parcels of land totaling six acres at the Kalaeloa Airport (the former Naval Air Station at Barber’s Point). The Center occupies 54,480 gross square feet, with 48,900 assignable square feet.

• All instructional activities for the Pearl Harbor Apprentice Program are conducted at the Pearl Harbor Naval Shipyard, a federal facility managed by the United States Department of the Navy. Although the College manages the Program under a contract with the Shipyard, it has no control over operations and maintenance of the facilities. Concerns regarding physical structures and equipment are addressed directly to the Shipyard administration.

The following lists include projects in various stages since the previous 2006 self-study.

Completed projects since the previous 2006 self-study:

• Building 2: Replacing air handlers; renovating the MELE room; conducting general structural repairs.
• Building 5: Constructing a greenhouse for hydroponic gardening.
• Building 6: Replacing air handlers.
• Building 7: Painting; replacing air handlers, floor carpets and tile (three bottom floors), fire doors; repairing electrical problems in Library; reroofing; retrofitting exhaust fans; conducting general structural repairs.
• Building 10: Replacing cooling towers.
• Building 12: Asbestos abatement.
• Building 14: Replacing air handlers, air compressors, exterior water drains, mezzanine, asbestos panels (Welding), elevator’s exhaust fan; retrofitting building exhaust fans; conducting general structural repairs.
• Building 20: Renovation to accommodate relocation of the Native Hawaiian Center.
• Building 27: Replacing air handlers, repairing walkways.
• Building 45 Kokea Training Center: Demolishing existing structure and constructing classrooms, restrooms, and offices.
• Building 50 (METC): Replacing air conditioning system.
• Hangar 111: Renovation of the second floor.
• Campus-wide: Buildings and grounds termite treatment; irrigation project-phase 1; installing emergency communication systems at various locations throughout the campus; improving lighting to enhance security.

• Replace FRP Ventilation System.

Ongoing projects with expected dates of completion:

• Buildings 6 and 27: Repainting (December 2011).
• Building 27: Upgrading electrical power for Cosmetology (December 2011).
• Buildings 57 and 52: Replacing floor tile (December 2011).
• Campus-wide: Upgrading PBX telephone system with VOIP (December 2011).
• Buildings 43 and 44: Replacing rain gutters (Spring 2012).
• Building 50 (METC): Repairing finger piers (Spring 2012).
• Building 27: Replacing interlocking tiles (Summer 2012).
• Building 7: Renovating entire building which will include replacing elevators and upgrading electrical system (December 2014).

In-design projects:

• Building 5: Retrofit air conditioning system.
• Building 17: Replace windows.
• Building 50 (METC): Replacing floor tiles.
• Building 52: Replacing fire suppression system.
• Buildings 3, 5, 14, 17, 18, 20, and 24: Repainting.
• Buildings 14 and 18: Repairing roll-up doors.

Self Evaluation

The College meets the Standard.

Two physical resources surveys were conducted during the Spring 2011 semester, one for students and another for staff/faculty. Eight hundred and sixty-two students responded to the survey and 101 faculty/staff members did. Both surveys used a rating scale of Poor-Fair-Good-Excellent.

Of staff/faculty respondents, 60%-80% rated the quality of offices as Good and Excellent in terms of size, furnishings, location, equipment, safety, security, and cleanliness. Results show similar ratings for quality of the classrooms. Adequacy of classroom number and classroom furnishings shows the highest percentage for the Poor and Fair ratings (43% and 41%, excluding the “Do not know/Do not use” answer).

Student respondents expressed more appreciation for quality of the classrooms. Between 79% and 88% of student respondents rated classroom size, appropriate location, furnishings, equipment, safety, and cleanliness as Good and Excellent.
Respondents appeared satisfied with the quality of laboratories and shops. Approximately 70%-90% of respondents who utilize the facilities rated them as Good and Excellent regarding their adequacy in number, size, location, furnishings, equipment, safety, and cleanliness.

Results from both surveys showed disproportionately low ratings for quality of the elevators. More than 80% of respondents rated the elevators as Poor and Fair. Forty percent of faculty/staff respondents found the quality of elevators to be Poor.

Cafeteria, restrooms, study areas, leisure areas, sidewalks, stairways, and campus signs/maps received high ratings by student and staff/faculty respondents. Between 62% and 86% of the respondents rated these facilities as Good and Excellent.

Because results of the previous surveys in 2005 indicated a lack of appropriate signs and maps, the College has installed various signs and maps throughout the campus. Ratings from the 2011 surveys for signs and maps have improved significantly. Sixty-two percent of staff/faculty respondents rated signs and maps as Good and Excellent in comparison to the 2005 survey in which more than 76% rated signs and maps as Fair and Poor. Seventy-two percent of the students also gave high ratings, Good and Excellent, for the campus signs and maps.

Although 60%-70% of the respondents are satisfied with the cleanliness of restrooms (Good or Excellent), 11% of staff/faculty rated it as Poor and 30% rated it as Fair. Twenty-four percent of students rated the restrooms' cleanliness as Fair.

The survey results also included numerous comments on improvement needs for work areas, offices, classrooms, laboratories, shops, parking spaces, planning, and assessments. [Fall 2011 Physical Resources/Facilities Survey (Students), Fall 2011 Physical Resources/Facilities Survey (Staff/Faculty)]

In comparison to the 2005 surveys, ratings for parking have shown a significant improvement. More than 90% of faculty/staff rated parking availability as Fair, Good, or Excellent, compared to the 2005 survey where 62% of faculty/staff rated it as Poor. Approximately 80% of student respondents rated parking availability as Fair, Good, or Excellent, while nearly half of the respondents rated parking as Poor in the 2005 survey. Parking location and security also received high rating among students (more than 70% rated Good or Excellent).

Student parking was identified as an area needing improvement during the previous self-study. Using the survey results and additional feedback from students, the VCAS’ Office, in collaboration with the student government, has been able to make substantial improvements in parking availability, location, safety, and security.

Although 88% of students rated the College’s environmental responsibility as Good and Excellent, only 30% of staff/faculty shared that feeling. Approximately 50% of the staff/faculty (excluding “Do not use/Do not know) rated it as Fair.

The College has increased its effort toward environmental sustainability through various venues. These include improving recycling of solid waste, managing and properly disposing of electronic
waste, and energy conservation. Large receptacles for recyclables conveniently located near Building 7 and regular collections/disposals of electronic waste have contributed to the “greening” of the College.

The current Strategic Plan addresses energy conservation and sustainable development as well as the commitment to maintain and improve the existing physical environment. Specific actions and responsible parties, identified in the Implementation Planning Framework, allow a meaningful monitoring system for the progress of the College’s goals. [Strategic Plan 2008-2015]

The College’s current Energy Management Program is primarily focused on the control of the central air conditioning system (A/C). The Honeywell software system controls 90% of the buildings on the main campus. The software system allows the campus to schedule (turn off and on) the A/C system for each building. Other buildings at the main campus and satellite facilities are controlled by mechanical timers. The integration of the College’s Facilities Use Application System with the current energy management system allows the College to effectively control the utilization of the A/C system, and therefore, reduce electricity costs. Since July 1, 2011, the College has implemented a new Energy Management Program via Johnson Controls, Inc. (JCI). JCI is responsible for reducing energy costs through a performance-based agreement. JCI is also tasked with developing an educational component and renewable projects for the Campus. Furthermore, the College is pursuing the utilization of new class scheduling software that will integrate with the University's Banner Student Registration System. When implemented, this will allow the College to assess and utilize its facilities more efficiently.

The environmental sustainability concept has been integrated into classroom instruction as well. In 2010, the College was awarded a grant from the National Institute of Food and Agriculture/U.S. Department of Agriculture to build a greenhouse facility to support hands-on training on environmental sustainability. The main purposes of building a greenhouse on campus were to generate community interests in food cultivation for enjoyment and in achieving food sustainability. Dr. Kakkala Gopalakrishnan, the grant’s principal investigator, along with students and faculty members from the Carpentry, Welding, and Apprenticeship Programs, assembled and installed the greenhouse structure behind Building 5, along the pedestrian mall. Since its completion, the greenhouse has served as a place to train students in agricultural and botanical fields. The greenhouse is designed to support instructional activities in conventional gardening techniques as well as various food production systems such as urban gardening, aquaponics, hydroponics, and aeroponics. In addition to their educational values on sustainability, these activities are meant to inspire and guide students to higher studies in food and agriculture-related fields.

In 2011, the College received a grant from the Office of Hawaiian Affairs to fund the Native Hawaiian Center’s Māla project. The māla (a cultivated garden) is located behind Building 2 and the Children’s Center, and is planted with varieties of taro and ti leaves. The project is designed to instruct students in a holistic and traditional Hawaiian approach and to model mālama‘āina, caring for the land. The māla was dedicated on October 14, 2011. [Grant from Office of Hawaiian Affairs to Support Māla (Garden) Project, Mala Ceremony]
In addition to the physical resources surveys discussed above, in February 2012, faculty and staff participated in a survey of College issues for this self-study. The majority of respondents rated the safety, healthfulness, and security of their workplaces as Excellent or Good. Cleanliness of buildings and grounds were also rated as Excellent or Good by the majority, but as Fair by approximately one-third of the respondents. [Accreditation Self-Study Spring 2012 Executive Summary]

The College systematically evaluates adequacy of its physical resources through individual program reviews, committees’ assessments, safety walk-through surveys, meetings with individual department heads, and institutional self-study surveys.

Program reviews are conducted annually by the program’s personnel. Results from the program reviews are collected and analyzed to identify priorities and improve allocation. Each instructional and support unit is required to conduct an annual program assessment that addresses the issues of adequate facilities, supplies, and equipment to meet student learning outcomes.

The Committee on Disabilities Access - Honolulu (CODA-H) meets monthly to discuss access issues including the adequacy of facilities, supplies, and equipment to meet the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) requirements. Additionally, members of the Health and Safety Committee conduct regular walk-through surveys of high hazard areas. Written reports sent to the respective departmental heads provide additional input on the need for upgrades of facilities, equipment, and tools to ensure compliance with the safety and health regulatory requirements.

Budgetary needs for the following fiscal years are discussed annually among the Vice Chancellors, Deans, Directors, and Division Chairs. At the meeting, each program’s head presents his or her programmatic needs, justifying the budget request as well as elaborating on the adequacy of facilities, equipment, and supplies.

The Standard IIIB Self-Study Committee conducted students/faculty/staff surveys, interviews, and planning process analysis to evaluate the adequacy of facilities, equipment, and supplies. The results are used to prioritize physical resources and improve the planning process. Funds are allocated based on the availability of funds and the nature of the request. Items needed to meet the health and safety requirements are normally given the highest priority for funding.

Faculty, staff, and student involvement varies, depending on the type of evaluation. Program reviews involve faculty, staff, and students to indicate whether student learning outcomes are achieved. Similarly, the annual budgeting meetings and safety walk-through surveys require the involvement of faculty and staff. In addition, students in the Occupational and Environmental Safety Management (OESM) program conduct safety inspections of program facilities every semester as part of a class assignment. Faculty, staff, and students are usually involved in the various campus committees, such as CODA-H.

Providing a positive environment that enables the students to achieve the learning outcomes is the College’s major goal. Results from various evaluation venues are used to prioritize new facility construction, facility upgrading, and facility maintenance. All major mechanical items such as air conditioning and elevators are maintained via service contract. Health, safety, and
building code items are given the highest priority for facilities upgrading and repair. Programmatic needs and facilities conditions are also given the highest considerations for funding. For example, due to the age of the Science Building (Building 5, built in 1963) and the need to provide an environment essential for positive student learning outcomes, the Advanced Technology Training Center building (includes Science Programs) has been the College’s top priority for many fiscal years.

Similarly, prioritization of equipment acquisition and repair is based on health, safety, and code needs; program improvement identified through annual program reviews; achieving Strategic goals; and other operating needs such as the replacement of defective equipment essential to the program. In the event that funds are insufficient, prioritization is completed by either the Planning Council or the Campus Leadership Team.

Effective use of individual facilities and equipment to meet student learning outcomes is identified through the program review process. Scheduling of instructional rooms is tied to the mission of the College. This means the credit programs are given first priority, then Apprentice programs, and lastly, non-credit programs.

The strengths of the current evaluation and prioritization process are that 1) program review/assessment can lead to additional funding, 2) various stakeholders are involved in identifying facility and equipment needs, such as CODA-H and the Health and Safety Committee, and 3) faculty, staff and students are included in the evaluation process.

However, the current process allows limited student participation. It is difficult for students to participate in these processes because of their class schedules, working hours, and personal responsibilities.

Beginning in 2010, the College initiated a process of updating its Long Range Development Plan (LRDP) or facilities master plans. The last LRDP was completed in 1996. Various opportunities were initiated to allow input from faculty, staff, administration, students, and the community. “The outcome of the LRDP planning process and community involvement is a comprehensive plan that guides physical development such as the location of buildings, open space, circulation, and other land uses. In addition, the plan addresses issues related to traffic, parking, and other forms of infrastructure, as well as a heightened commitment to environmental sustainability. The 2010 LRDP envisions a campus that will have greater definition at its edges, improved facilities for the campus community, more sustainable infrastructure, and enhanced landscape—all well-integrated to create a setting that meets the ever-evolving needs of a modern college.”

The updated LRDP was submitted and approved by the Board of Regents in February 2011.

Actionable Improvements Plans

Although the College meets this Standard, there are several things that should be done to ensure continued compliance:
• The Vice Chancellor of Administrative Services should ensure that results from the 2011 Physical Resources Surveys, especially the specific comments, are evaluated and used to improve the quality and adequacy of facilities and equipment.

• The College should continue to seek feedback from students, staff, and faculty regarding its physical resources, especially those that received Poor and Fair ratings, including quality of the elevators, cleanliness of the restrooms, adequacy of classroom furnishings, and environmental sustainability. Feedback information should be used as basis for future improvements.

• The College should continue to communicate its efforts on physical resources improvements and environmental sustainability to the students, staff, and faculty.

III.B.1. The institution provides safe and sufficient physical resources that support and assure the integrity and quality of its programs and services, regardless of location or means of delivery.

Descriptive Summary

The College strives to comply with the safety and health regulations established by the Hawaii Occupational Safety and Health (HIOSH)/Department of Labor and Industrial Relations. Although HIOSH regulations apply only to employees, the College applies the same safety and health standards to classroom and workshop activities involving students. Instructors at the main campus and all satellite locations are responsible for ensuring that students follow safety rules strictly and that equipment is in safe, operable condition.

The College’s Health and Safety Program prescribes safety responsibilities, hazard identification and correction, injury reporting, and other safety management principles to ensure a safe and healthful learning environment. The Vice Chancellor of Administrative Services (VCAS), with assistance from the Health and Safety Coordinator and the Health Nurse, is responsible for the implementation of the College’s Health and Safety Program. [Honolulu Community College Health And Safety Program - September 2005]

The Health and Safety Committee is comprised of representatives from the Administration, each academic unit including off-site programs, and student organization. The Committee meets once per semester at the Safety Meeting, which is open to the entire campus. The main purposes of the meeting are to provide update information on safety issues and facility improvements; to communicate key safety, health, wellness, security, and emergency preparedness issues; and to solicit feedback from the programs’ Safety Liaisons.

Two subcommittees meet regularly to address specific issues on emergency planning and wellness. The Emergency Planning Subcommittee is in the process of finalizing the College’s Standard Operating Procedures: Emergency Operations while the Health and Wellness Subcommittee plans regular activities to promote wellness, reduce stress, maintain a healthy lifestyle, and improve productivity. [Emergency Action Plan (EAP) Draft - April 2008]

The Health and Safety Steering Committee consists of the Vice Chancellor for Administrative Services, the Health and Safety Coordinator, and the Health Nurse. They meet regularly several
times during the semester to conduct safety and health walk-through surveys of the main campus and satellite facilities, to evaluate and prioritize hazards, and to follow up on corrective actions. Throughout the semester, the Steering Committee also maintains regular communications with members of the Health and Safety Committee and the campus at-large via electronic means.

Faculty and staff members are responsible for day-to-day accident prevention activities including safety surveys of facilities and equipment, hazard and injury reporting, preliminary incident investigation, and hazard correction. Safety training is required for all classes involving equipment, machinery, or hazardous tasks. In addition, health and safety competencies are included in the Technical Standards for many of the CTE programs. The Health and Safety Coordinator provides safety consultation and training for all members of the College when appropriate.

The College’s room use is generally at full capacity during the morning hours, including Saturdays, and during the late afternoon hours until 7:00 p.m. Many of the Apprenticeship classes begin in the late afternoon, Monday through Thursday. Enrollment in Apprenticeship classes rises and falls with the status of Hawaii’s construction industry. When enrollment increases, classroom space for these Apprenticeship classes is not adequate.

Activities related to distance education are performed in Building 7, including production of web-based and televised courses, academic support services, and student testing. Programs for courses broadcast via cable television are developed, produced, and edited on the third floor. Recordings of the cable course programs and DVD/VHS viewing stations are available in the Library on the first floor of Building 7.

Self Evaluation

The College meets the Standard. However, there are areas that need improvement.

Safety and health issues are given the highest priority during a planning process. The College uses various means to evaluate the safety of facilities and equipment. Instructional faculty and staff, especially in the CTE departments, provide direct feedback to the Division Chair, Dean, or the Health and Safety Committee on the need for the safe and up-to-date equipment. Regular safety walk-through surveys, both at the main campus and at the satellite facilities, are conducted to ensure HIOSH compliance and to obtain first-hand information from the CTE instructors. In addition, students from the Occupational and Environmental Safety Management Program conduct safety inspections as part of class assignments. The results from students’ inspections are submitted to the Health and Safety Coordinator and deficiencies are corrected as appropriate.

Many of the large equipment such as air conditioning, elevators, and exhaust hoods are on maintenance contracts with third-party vendors. These vendors maintain and recommend various repairs to the respective systems. The VCAS and Operations and Maintenance (O & M) staff conduct periodic visual inspections as part of the equipments’ preventive maintenance schedule.
Ninety-seven students from various satellite facilities responded to the Physical Resources/Facilities survey conducted in the Spring 2011 semester. Between 80%-90% of the students rated safety, security, and emergency preparedness of the sidewalks, stairways, and general facilities as Good and Excellent. However, students’ knowledge of the College’s emergency procedures varied. Among the 10 respondents from the Marine Education and Training Center, only three students were familiar with the emergency procedures. More students in the Automotive Mechanics Technology, Aeronautics Maintenance Technology, and Diesel Mechanics Technology Programs were aware of the procedures (60%-80%).

The College has invested significantly in emergency preparedness. Faculty and staff were given opportunities to provide suggestions on the College’s Emergency Action Plan and the Plan continues to be updated through the Emergency Planning Subcommittee. To improve their visibility, key response procedures are printed in the colored section at the front of the College’s Telephone Directory. Copies of the Directory are distributed to all offices on the main campus and satellite facilities.

Recognizing the importance of emergency notification and communication, the College has installed an emergency telephone system (Blue Phones) at the main campus, established an emergency broadcast system via cellular phones and email, and upgraded the telephone system.

Building emergency evacuation drills and table-top exercises are scheduled periodically to evaluate the effectiveness of the emergency response procedures.

Sufficiency of the College’s facilities is determined by whether they meet the needs for classes. Scheduling and space assignments are based on program and curriculum needs. Credit courses are given first priority, Apprenticeship classes are second, and non-credit offerings are third.

Students, faculty, and staff evaluated College facilities in the Physical Resources/Facilities surveys administered in the Spring 2011 semester. Faculty and staff were generally satisfied with their offices and work areas: 66.3% rated the size of their work space as Good or Excellent, 80.2% rated the location as Good or Excellent, and 69.3% rated the cleanliness as Good or Excellent. Classrooms were also generally considered adequate. Of the respondents, 42.6% rated the number of classrooms as Good or Excellent, and 33.7%, Poor or Fair. (The total is less than 100% because some of the respondents identified themselves as non-instructional.) The size of classrooms was rated Good or Excellent by 58.4%, and location was Good or Excellent for 65.3%. Nearly half of the respondents evaluated their classrooms as sufficiently clean and their furnishings and equipment as adequate. Students’ perceptions of their classrooms were very positive, with a majority of Good or Excellent ratings: classroom size received 87.6% Good or Excellent, location 87.1%, furnishings 78.4%, equipment 77.9%, and cleanliness 82.8%. In their survey comments, students most frequently requested improvements to desks and chairs; chalkboards, whiteboards, and/or SMART boards; and air conditioning.

As a result of the current slump in the construction industry, Apprenticeship enrollments in recent years have decreased to approximately half of what they during the last construction boom. Final enrollment in Spring 2008 was 3,878 and enrollment in Fall 2011 was 2,007. Therefore, classroom availability for Apprenticeship is presently sufficient. However, due to the
cyclical nature of the industry, enrollments will most certainly rise again in the coming years with the next resurgence in construction jobs and there will again be a shortage of classroom space. In regard to laboratories, even with the current reduced enrollments, shop space is inadequate. Apprenticeship hands-on training is being conducted in areas not designed or intended for training. For example, the lab for a plumbing class is held in a locker room that had been long abandoned due to crushed waste water lines and some Apprentice painters are painting campus buildings because they do not have shop space. Building 12, which is regularly used by Apprenticeship, is outdated and in need of major repairs and renovation. Many training programs including the Associated Builders and Contractors, Inc. (four trades), Building Maintenance, City and County, Hawaii Electrical Workers, Hawaii Electricians, Oceanic Cable and Kawikas/Color Dynamics have no shop space on campus and could improve their programs with laboratory activities if space were available. Other programs including the Masons, Roofers, Painters, and Elevator Constructors currently have shop space on campus but are still unable to offer all of the training that they would like because their spaces are too limited. Overuse of shops, such as the welding facility, which is used for the Welding program as well as the Apprenticeship classes, results in accelerated deterioration of the equipment. Storage space is also lacking. In the Long Range Development Plan, the College acknowledged the need for a building and outdoor space that are dedicated solely to Apprenticeship training and storage.

The Media Specialist generally develops and produces three new cable television courses per year and revises existing courses as needed. Cable course production is done in three areas: the pre-production and post-production office, the studio where the programs are filmed, and the control room adjacent to the studio. Although the space is sufficient, there are difficulties. The placement of electrical outlets in the studio is problematic, requiring cables and power cords to run along the floor. Since this is not a public area, however, the hazard is limited. Electricity is insufficient, resulting in overloaded circuits. The lights in the studio are inadequate and are over twenty years old. Perkins Grant funds were used to upgrade some equipment to enable HDTV quality, but additional cameras are needed. The equipment in the control room is similarly outdated. For example, it is not possible to make backups and archives. According to the Dean of University College, some equipment for cable course production has been upgraded as of Fall 2011.

Many of these deficiencies can be attributed to the way in which cable course production is funded. The College has relied largely on grant funding and end-of-year monies. State of Hawaii law dedicates a percentage of cable television revenue to educational purposes. When distance education via cable television was initiated in the 1990s, the participating community colleges built and equipped studios with State dollars. The cable revenue (known as the ‘Olelo Grant), however, is strictly for personnel costs. ‘Olelo funds, therefore, are for the Media Specialist's salary and for paying student assistants, but cannot be used for video and editing equipment, furniture, materials such as DVD’s, repairs and maintenance, or construction in the studio. The College does not have a budget for cable course production, as do Kapi'olani and Leeward Community Colleges. Furthermore, there has not been a program review for distance education, and consequently, it cannot receive higher cost items, since program reviews are the basis for identifying funding needs.
The Media Specialist produces disc copies of each cable course program. These DVDs are sent to University System libraries for students who miss the telecasts. HCC Library holds the cable course DVD’s in the Circulation department and provides four viewing stations and headphones on the first floor. Because many students choose to check out the DVD’s for overnight loan rather than watch them at the Library, the number of viewing stations is sufficient. In addition, the University of Hawai‘i provides video-on-demand (VOD) services for the most current episodes of many cable courses; students must have computers with broadband connections to access VOD. The DVD/VHS viewing stations were provided by and are maintained by the Educational Media Center (EMC). The Library staff monitors the condition and performance of audiovisual equipment and coordinates maintenance and replacement with the EMC.

The Testing Center is in room 316 of Building 7. It is scanned by a multi-camera security system that was upgraded in 2009. A pan-and-zoom system would provide fuller coverage, but would have been more expensive to purchase. In addition to exams for distance education students, the Testing Center administers make-up and placement tests (over 3,000 annually). The facilities are currently adequate for these multiple testing functions. There are 25 computers and numerous combo chair-desks, as many distance education courses use paper-pencil tests. A closed door separates the intake and testing areas; this has significantly improved testing conditions. Additional soundproofing for the testing room would be helpful, however. In addition, rooms 314 and 315 are testing rooms for special needs students who utilize authorized accommodations. These rooms are equipped with security cameras as well. Room 319 can be used as a backup during busy periods, such as finals week. The Testing Center plans for and manages its physical resources well. It has its own printer and uses the College Skills Center’s (CSC) all-in-one scanner/facsimile/photocopier machine. Funding for Testing Centers varies at University campuses. Organizationally, the HCC Testing Center is part of the CSC. The security system, furnishings, equipment, and the computers used for exams are provided and maintained by the CSC. Equipment is currently sufficient, and should be included in the maintenance and replacement cycle to ensure that they remain satisfactory.

**Actionable Improvement Plans**

Although the College meets this Standard, there are several things that should be done to ensure continued compliance.

- As recommended in the 2006 Self-Study, the College should establish a Health and Safety Office with at least one full-time Health and Safety Officer. Currently, the College is relying on a faculty member whose responsibilities include instructional and safety duties. Given the current size of the College and the types of hazards associated with the CTE programs’ activities, a full-time Safety Officer is needed to effectively manage the College’s accident prevention program.

- As recommended in the 2006 Self-Study, the College should grant assigned time or reduction of workload for the Programs’ Safety Liaisons. This will allow the Safety Liaisons to perform their safety duties as prescribed in the College’s Health and Safety Program, which include coordinating all health and safety activities in their programs, keeping direct and regular communication with the Health and Safety Coordinator and the Health and Safety Committee on health and safety issues; attending the meetings of the Health and Safety
Committee; acting as liaison persons between faculty and staff in their program and the Health and Safety Coordinator/Health and Safety Committee; assisting faculty and staff in their programs in enforcing the health and safety rules; assisting faculty and staff in investigating and keeping records of all near-misses, accidents, injuries, and illnesses that happen in their programs; and assisting faculty and staff in corrections of hazardous conditions and behaviors.

- The Administration must ensure that the College’s emergency management system is being implemented at the main campus and at the satellite facilities. Implementations must include regularly scheduled communication and training for students and employees; evaluations of emergency communication systems’ effectiveness; table top exercises and drills for the Emergency Management Team; assessment of strengths and weaknesses of past response activities (debriefing); and other activities that will improve the College’s ability to respond to and recover from an emergency. Results from the exercises and activity assessments should be used to improve the College’s ability to prevent and respond to emergencies.

- The College must continue to earnestly explore acquiring suitable off-campus sites for Apprenticeship training.

- The College should assess distance education through program review, and should develop a budget specifically for distance education, with ongoing funding for cable course production.

- Distance Education should encourage the development of a University-System budget to assure that each Testing Center has a printer, document scanner, photocopier, and facsimile machine, and a sufficient budget for materials.

III.B.1.a. The institution plans, builds, maintains, and upgrades or replaces its physical resources in a manner that assures effective utilization and the continuing quality necessary to support its programs and services.

Descriptive Summary

The VCAS and staff from the Operations and Maintenance (O & M) department serve important roles in setting priorities for the maintenance of common facilities, including buildings, grounds, and parking areas. Repair and maintenance requests are prioritized based on their impact on occupants, safety and health, input from faculty and staff, and the VCAS's knowledge of the facilities. The Facilities Renewal Reinvestment Model (FRRM) is being implemented to optimize analysis of maintenance and budgetary needs. Requests can be reported to the O & M department with an online or hard copy form. Compliance to building codes, HIOSH regulations, and ADA/ADAAG regulations are given a higher priority. Planning for, building, maintaining, upgrading, and replacement of physical resources for the campus should be based on the College’s mission, so the replacement and upgrading of program equipment and improving facilities are addressed in the Strategic Plan. Evaluating the resources needed to support the achievement of program SLO’s is part of the program review process. Information from these evaluations is used to identify action steps that are added to the Strategic Plan, so the prioritization of equipment and facilities will be directly linked to SLO’s. Planning for facility construction, upgrading, and maintenance is included in Capital Improvement Plan (CIP) at the University system level. Scheduler Plus has been used to allocate classroom space to accommodate student and program needs. This process is being upgraded with a new system, Resource 25.
The College relies on its faculty and staff to communicate to Administration through their respective Division Chairs, Deans, and Directors regarding their equipment needs. Equipment purchases are acquired with year-end money, vocational-education funds, and from each department’s base budget. Priorities are determined based on information from Division Chairs, Deans, and Directors. Needs and sufficiency of equipment and facilities are identified through program reviews and annual reports.

Building 7, the College’s primary instructional building, has been subject to recent space reallocation in support of curricular changes. It is also scheduled for a major multifaceted renovation project spanning the next three years.

The College has initiated activities toward improving environmental sustainability through recycling, eWaste disposal, and energy management. Honolulu and the other Community Colleges on Oahu have a multi-year contract with Johnson Controls, Inc. (JCI) for comprehensive energy conservation and energy savings services.

Self Evaluation

The College meets the Standard.

However, there are areas that need improvement. These include more updated equipment in classrooms, shops, and classroom-program computer labs, and deferred repair and maintenance projects. The College should address these needs in order to continue to meet the Standard.

As primary technical training centers for transportation, information technology, education, communications, construction, and public and personal services, an increasing number of classrooms are being converted to high-tech multimedia rooms, each containing a computer with Internet access and projector, a visual presenter, and video player. However, some classrooms are traditional chalk or whiteboard rooms; instructors obtain television monitors, video players, and overhead projectors from the Educational Media Center, Library, or division on an as-needed basis. Students who have taken classes in the multimedia rooms compare their experiences with those in traditional classrooms. Students’ comments in the Physical Resources/Facilities survey calling for improved electronic learning devices in their classrooms demonstrate the high priority that students place upon these physical resources. Similar responses were expressed for updated and more computers and software for classrooms, computer labs, and offices.

In 2011 surveys were conducted to assess student and faculty/staff perceptions of the physical resources/facilities on campus. The results provide support that the College meets the Standard. The survey instrument asked respondents to rate the physical resources on campus as Poor, Fair, Good, or Excellent and included a series of questions for each of several physical resource categories. The mean percentage of respondents that answered Good or Excellent is a majority across the categories with elevators affecting the mean (Table 1). Plans are in place to replace the elevators in Building 7 in a major renovation effort. The elevators in Building 2 are also being addressed. Classroom number was also a concern for faculty.
Table 1. Mean percent of survey question responses rated Good or Excellent by category.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Topic</th>
<th>Questions</th>
<th>Students (862)</th>
<th>Faculty (101)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Classrooms</td>
<td>6,7*</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Labs/Shops</td>
<td>6,7*</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parking**</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Campus Areas</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>69***</td>
<td>58***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emergency Preparedness</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>70***</td>
<td>63***</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Faculty received an additional question regarding the number of facilities.
**Questions for each were focused on the target group.
***Elevators scored very low and affected the mean.

Plans for building and upgrading facilities are in place. A new science and technology building, the Advanced Technology Training Center (ATTC), is intended for Parking Area 1. When the new building is completed, science classrooms and offices will be moved there from Building 5, and Building 5 will then be demolished. Planning for new facilities involves consultation with faculty whose programs will use the proposed facilities. Science faculty, for example, participated in plans for the ATTC. The LRDP includes a multi-story parking structure to replace parking stalls in the current Student Parking Lot 1 and the adjacent temporary parking area in the former incinerator site (Lot 1C).

Students expressed interest for paving the largest parking area on campus. This is planned for and included in the Capital Improvement Plan.

Plans to improve or replace the exterior elevators in Building 7 led to the discovery of other maintenance concerns. Additional improvements are planned, including replacement of the air conditioning, ventilation, and lighting systems; installation of new telecommunications infrastructure; reflooring and painting; and construction of a six-story mechanical room stack. The estimated cost is $8.6 million. Renovations are projected to address two floors at a time and will require the temporary relocation of classes, offices, the academic support services of the third floor, and the Library. Discussions and planning for relocation are underway.

The College has been focusing on improving the success of underprepared students in mathematics and language arts. New curricula were selected and designed for math, reading, and writing. These Math Essentials and English Essentials courses require the students to participate in computer laboratories. Adding these computer labs involved reallocation of classrooms in Building 7 and relocation of departments and offices. For example, math tutoring, labs, and the consolidation of the Mathematics department on the fourth floor of Building 7 were achieved with the migration of the Native Hawaiian Center (NHC) from the fourth floor to Building 20, where the NHC has designed a welcoming learning environment. Classrooms and lab space were provided for the English Essentials courses in portable buildings formerly occupied by the Employment Training Program, which has been consolidated with Windward Community College.
The College has increased its efforts in recycling and responsible disposal since the last self-study. A City and County recycling container for the collection of aluminum cans, glass and plastic bottles, corrugated cardboard, newsprint, and office paper has been located near Parking Lot 1 since 2010. It is available to the O & M staff, members of the College, and the general community. The VCAS initiated the collection and disposal of inoperable and outdated computers, peripherals, and electronic equipment, familiarly known as “eWaste,” in 2005. In 2006, the Apple computer company partnered with the University of Hawai‘i system in the Apple Recycle Pickup Program. Apple funds the cost of transporting the University’s eWaste to the mainland for disposal. The Apple program is now held quarterly. The College’s initial eWaste collections were massive, but have decreased as eWaste collections have become a routine and accustomed part of the technology lifecycle. In addition, community collection of household eWaste is offered biannually, sponsored by the University and funded by Apple.

The energy conservation contract with Johnson Controls Inc. (JCI) encompasses an extensive range of conservation and savings efforts, including replacements for interior and exterior lighting, significant improvements to air conditioning and ventilation, and the implementation of a central energy management control system. Other projects are refuse management with a trash compactor, water conservation and irrigation systems, synchronization of the power settings of the College's networked computers, solar water heating, vending machine controls, a photovoltaic system shade structure, and an electric vehicle charging station. It is estimated that the energy efficiency solutions will create combined energy savings, for the University of Hawai‘i Community College (UHCC) system, of over $58 million during the 20-year performance contract period.

The UHCC-JCI partnership includes an educational component as well. It is designed to provide “integrated” sustainability experiences for students, personnel, and visitors through instruction, service learning, and kiosk learning centers.

The UHCC-JCI Fellowship program was initiated in 2011. Student “Fellows” were recruited from all four community colleges on O‘ahu. Along with the Hawaii Educational Consultant, the JCI National Program Director of Higher Education, and JCI subject matter experts, they hosted the first UHCC Renewable Energy Training Summit. More than 150 participants attended the conference, which included training on the latest in solar technology and trends. The Fellows are expected to continue their work, which includes assisting with a summit every semester and administering a survey to generate student awareness of sustainability. Future training will include LEED® –Green Associate Training. Participants completing the training will have the opportunity to pursue a LEED® Green Associate certificate. [UHCC Renewable Energy Training Summit]

**Actionable Improvement Plans**

Although the College meets this Standard, it should do the following to ensure continued compliance:

In addition to upgrading structures, the College should continue to improve classrooms by installing electronic and multimedia learning devices in classrooms where they are lacking.
III.B.1.b. The institution assures that physical resources at all locations where it offers courses, programs, and services are constructed and maintained to assure access, safety, security, and a healthful learning and working environment.

**Descriptive Summary**

The Hawaii Occupational Safety Health Division (HIOSH) requires employers to provide a safe and healthful working environment that is free of recognized hazards. The College applies HIOSH standards for instructional and support activities at all locations. Students, employees, Administration, and visitors are required to follow safety rules and specific precautions. The College’s Health and Safety Program sets forth policies on hazard identification, reporting, and correction. It also specifies steps to be taken when there is an accident, including accident reporting and investigation.

The campus-wide Health and Safety Committee is composed of about forty designated Safety Liaisons from all academic units, including those from satellite facilities. Safety Meetings are held once a semester, during the non-instruction duty period, to provide members with updated information on facility changes, safety, security, and emergency preparedness issues as well as to obtain input from the members on those issues. Safety communications during the semester are mostly through electronic means.

The Health and Safety Steering Committee, consisting of the VCAS, the Health and Safety Coordinator, and the Health Nurse, meets several times during the semester to conduct safety walk-through surveys, evaluate hazards identified from the surveys, explore corrective options, and prioritize actions. The walk-through surveys are conducted at the main campus and satellite facilities. Survey reports listing hazards and recommended corrective measures are sent to the VCAS, the Deans, and the Division Chairs responsible for the areas where the hazards are discovered.

Instructors, especially in the high-hazard programs, must provide safety training to students prior to allowing them to engage in hazardous activities. They are also responsible for ensuring that the equipment and tools are equipped with appropriate guards and are in safe operable condition. Faculty and staff members are encouraged to report hazards to the Health and Safety Coordinator, the VCAS, the Deans, or to the Division Chairs. Injuries and illnesses are reported to the Health Office and documented by the Health Nurse. The Health and Safety Coordinator reviews the injury reports to spot trends and to identify areas that need immediate attention. Recommendations on preventive strategies are submitted to the VCAS for implementation consideration.

The VCAS directs ongoing renovations for the main campus and satellite facilities to ensure equal access as prescribed by the Americans with Disabilities Act/Accessible Guidelines for Buildings and Facilities (ADA/ADAAG) and by the College’s multiple programs and committees. The Disability Specialist conducts an annual facility inspection to ensure compliance. Results of the inspections are reported to the Committee on Disability Access - Honolulu (CODA-H), and the Committee’s meeting minutes are posted on the College’s
Concerns regarding any issues are placed on a maintained list of access concerns. When possible, facilities with dated original designs are improved to address access and safety concerns. Otherwise, accommodations are made to relocate classrooms and offices to further access and to demonstrate a culture of providing fair opportunity across the College’s community.

The Student ACCESS office for servicing students with special needs was established in 2005 and was relocated to its current location in Building 5 Room 107B in the summer of 2011. The relocation has improved accessibility for students with disabilities in comparison to the previous location on one of the “half-floors” of Building 7. A full-time Disability Specialist coordinator and an Educational Specialist staff Student ACCESS. They coordinate disability services provisions such as parking, elevator, and mobility access. They also provide disability-related academic support services which include note-taking, testing and interpreter accommodations, and assistive technology. Foremost, the College’s providers are accessible, informative, and outcome-oriented.

Six academic programs are located off the main campus: Aeronautics Maintenance Technology at Lagoon Drive near the Honolulu International Airport; Commercial Aviation at Hangar 111 Kalaeloa Airport; Automotive Mechanics Technology and Diesel Mechanics Technology at the Kokea campus; Small Vessel Fabrication and Repair at the Marine Educational and Training Center; and the Pearl Harbor Apprentice Program. Since the Pearl Harbor Naval Shipyard is managed solely by the U.S. Department of the Navy, it is not included in the Self-Study.

Disability parking and mobility access are available at each of the five satellite locations. The Automotive Technology, Diesel Mechanics Technology, and Marine Training and Education Center facilities provide disability parking stalls near the main entrance. All doors at satellite facilities, including toilet stalls in both men’s and women’s restrooms, are wheelchair accessible. Most building signage includes a description in Braille and/or raised lettering for the vision impaired. The Aeronautics Technology Program on Lagoon Drive, the Commercial Aviation Hangar 111 Kalaeloa Airport, and the Marine Training and Education Center are equipped with elevator access for those physically challenged. Elevators at these facilities are inspected annually.

The College continues to upgrade satellite facilities to improve security, safety, and disability access. For example, the roof at Hangar 111, Kalaeloa Airport, was extensively refurbished and updated with new steel sections, cleaning and painting of the trusses, and complete replacement of the overlayers and waterproofing materials. New security gate locks were also installed. New hangar doors and an air conditioning system were installed at the Aeronautics Technology building. The ventilation system for the Marine Education and Training Center was renovated and air quality monitored to ensure regulatory compliance. The dust evacuation system for the woodworking bay was completely rebuilt with user-friendly controls. The vacuum system, used for composite fabrication, is now equipped with a timer to automatically shut down when the resins reach their curing stage. A new air conditioning compressor system was installed at the Diesel Mechanics Technology facility.
The Operations and Maintenance (O & M) staff provides janitorial services to all off-campus facilities on a part-time basis. Maintenance issues are identified by faculty members and maintenance services are provided by O & M staff and outside contractors as needed. Portable fire extinguishers and wet extinguishing systems are inspected annually. Faculty and staff members at each satellite facility follow regulatory requirements on the appropriate handling, storage, and disposal of all chemicals used at the facility.

Security services at the Automotive Mechanics Technology program, Diesel Mechanics Technology program, and Marine Education and Training Center are provided by the College’s security personnel. All three facilities are secured by a perimeter fence and have a monitored security system for both break-ins and fire. In addition, the Marine Education and Training Center has a night security service that surveys the property multiple times each night.

After the departure of the Employment Training Center in 2010, the Cafeteria on the main campus is being managed by a new vendor, Creations in Catering. Creations redecorated the interior to create a more inviting environment. The Cafeteria is slated for air conditioning in 2012.

**Self Evaluation**

The College meets the Standard.

The VCAS is actively involved in the safety, health, security, and emergency planning aspects of the College. For personnel and students in the CTE programs, exposure levels to chemical and physical agents are periodically evaluated by a contracted Certified Industrial Hygienist. Results of the monitoring are used to identify the effectiveness of the existing control measures such as chemical fume hoods and welding booths. The ventilation system in the Welding program was recently repaired and upgraded when the air monitoring results identified its deficiencies. In addition, chemical and electronic wastes are regularly collected and properly disposed. A recycling bin is on-site to facilitate recycling efforts of non-hazardous wastes.

Due to students’ security concerns at the main campus, a security escort service is provided. Students may call a security officer to accompany them from the classroom to the parking lot. To improve its emergency communication system, the College has installed an emergency telephone system (Blue Phones) at the main campus. The system allows public announcements as well as emergency notification throughout the main campus.

About 70%-80% of survey respondents rated safety, security and emergency preparedness for sidewalks, stairways, and general facilities as Good and Excellent. Elevators were the single item that received the Poor rating. More than 20% of students rated elevators as Poor while more than 30% of the faculty/staff rated them as Poor.

Almost 40% of the students are not familiar with the College’s emergency procedures. However, the majority of faculty and staff are familiar with the emergency procedures, and only 6% are not aware of the procedures.
Security at the main campus appears adequate. Besides the College’s security staff, additional support is provided through a private security contractor.

Upgrades of facilities and equipment to improve and maintain access, safety, and security at satellite sites are ongoing. Air conditioning concerns have been met and major building maintenance projects undertaken and completed. These facilities are included in LRDP and are integrated into the overall campus building maintenance oversight.

Security services are adequate at the Automotive Mechanics Technology (AMT), Diesel Mechanics Technology, and the Marine Education and Training Center. Hangar 111 and Aeronautics Technology on Lagoon Drive are surrounded by secured perimeter fences with restricted access and are patrolled by the State of Hawaii Department of Transportation’s Airport Security, although there is no formal agreement between the College and the Department. At these satellite sites remote from the College’s security staff, removal of a disruptive or threatening student will require action from the Honolulu Police Department. AMT has expressed interest in security cameras to monitor its facility when it is closed.

Analysis of the 2011 survey responses by students in off-campus programs indicates adequacy in all areas except posting of emergency procedures. The size, location, furnishings, safety, and cleanliness of classrooms, labs, shops, and equipment were rated Good to Excellent at all satellite campuses. Parking and common areas such as the elevators, restrooms, sidewalks, stairways, and signs were also rated Good to Excellent. While security response ranged from Fair to Excellent, posting of emergency procedures is not adequate at any satellite facilities and was rated either Poor or Fair.

The Committee on Disability Access (CODA-H), Student ACCESS, and the VCAS work together to identify needs and to improve accessibility. The Campus is compliant to the Americans with Disability Act and its Amendments (ADA), Rehabilitation Act Section 504, and with the Accessible Guidelines for Buildings and Facilities (ADAAG).

The College makes corrections and renovations to improve access. Since the 2006 Self-Study, projects in progress, such as the installation of accessible elevator control panels in Buildings 5, 6, and 27; the renovation of restrooms on two floors of Building 7; and signs designating wheelchair accessible pathways have been completed. The College is still in the process of improving Braille signage across the entire campus and addressing counter heights in the Records Office. Though the campus meets compliance regarding accessibility, it continues to address areas of safety concerns and improved access for both students with and without disabilities. Through CODA-H, constituents from all departments and/or divisions have the opportunity to discuss areas of improvement in their respective areas. CODA-H, which meets monthly, has direct contact with the VCAS, the Vice Chancellor of Academic Affairs, and the Dean of Student Services; all have been extremely supportive in improving access. Through CODA-H, a list of accessibility concerns is compiled, discussed, and addressed. Some of the other projects completed within the reporting years include improvement of thresholds to improve access to Student Life and the Student Lounge; the renovation of the sidewalk surrounding building 27; widening of accessible restrooms in Building 7; eliminating the slope when entering/exiting the elevator in Building 5. Additionally, an Access Map has been created.
to highlight accessible paths and features at the College, as recommended by the previous Self-Study, and a Guidebook on Academic Accommodations has also been completed. Both the Access Map and the Guidebook are available in print and on the College’s website. [Disability Access Website]

In the summer of 2011, the Student ACCESS office was relocated from Building 7 Room 319 to a ground floor office located in Building 5 Room 107B. This new location provides students with special needs a more accessible, convenient, and discrete location to access services. Prior to the move, in the Spring 2011 survey students with special needs indicated there were challenges in getting to the Student ACCESS office in Building 7 due to the unique elevator situation and having to walk through a learning lab to reach the ACCESS office.

Access is satisfactory at the satellite facilities as well. Disability parking, elevator access, and mobility access are provided. Elevators at these facilities are inspected annually. All doors are wheelchair compliant, including restroom toilet stalls. Signage includes Braille and/or raised lettering.

All satellite facilities are regularly evaluated for compliance with federal, state, and local requirements such as fire codes, workplace safety regulations, and ADA/ADAAG. The Disability Specialist conducts annual visits of each satellite location during the summer and reports concerns to the VCAS. To date, there have been no access-related concerns reported.

Signage at the main campus has increased and improved. As recommended in the previous self-study, the College has completed and posted two prominent signs and maps at the east and west ends of the mall walkway. These maps depict the main campus and the off-campus sites. In addition, campus maps with locator markings are posted at many buildings. For public safety and health, “No Smoking” signs are mounted on the exterior of every building. State of Hawaii law prohibits smoking within buildings operated by the State, and within twenty feet of the entrances and windows of these buildings. [Hawaii Revised Statutes 328J-2, 328J-6]

The College is also in the process of installing digital signage through a project initiated and funded by the Student Media Board (SMB). Three to five digital signs will be placed in high-traffic areas on the main campus. These will be controlled by a central server that will allow updates in real-time. The server will be maintained by the SMB and Student Life and Development. All College groups will have opportunities to post announcements and the signs will be linked to the University of Hawai‘i emergency alerts system.

The College has continued to address parking concerns raised by students. During the 2008-2009 academic year, the President of the Student Government (ASUH-HCC) proposed changes to the way parking had been assigned to students. Because of students’ dissatisfaction with the lottery-based parking system and with permits restricted to specific parking lots, the President initiated a petition which was signed by over one hundred students. The parking proposal was continued by the succeeding ASUH-HCC President in the following academic year. The students worked with the VCAS to revise student parking for the main and Kokea campuses. The new parking policy took effect in the Fall 2010 semester. There is no longer a lottery and
Students’ permits are valid in all four parking lots for the main and Kokea Street campuses.  

Students evaluated parking in the Physical Resources/Facilities survey in Spring 2011. “Availability of student parking” was rated Poor by 12.2%, Fair by 22.3%, Good by 27.0%, and Excellent by 22.5% of the respondents. These scores indicate that the addition of Lot 1C and the new no-lottery method of student-parking allocation have resulted in greater satisfaction: in the 2005 survey, nearly half (47.5%) of the student respondents rated “Availability of student parking” as Poor. “Location of student parking” also shows improvement. In the 2011 survey, it was rated Poor by 8.2%, Fair by 16.4%, Good by 36.0%, and Excellent by 25.3%; in 2005, 67.6% of the respondents rated it Poor or Fair. Students’ comments in the 2011 survey noted fewer stalls were available at certain times of the day and frequently requested that Lot 1C be paved. Such paving is included in the College’s capital improvement plans. “Safety/security in parking lots” was rated 6.1% Poor, 18.75% Fair, 36.1% Good, and 24.5% Excellent by the students, again showing improvement since the last Self-Study. Students’ survey responses about parking were positive overall and indicate that parking is adequate.

For students with special needs, the College meets the standards as required by law regarding the number of disability parking stalls. The main campus has also implemented overflow parking needs for students with disabilities who hold a valid disability parking placard. Should there be no available disability parking stalls, students with a valid parking pass and disability parking placard may park in any available non-reserved stall.

Parking is not identified as a problem at the satellite facilities.

The College's facilities are regularly evaluated for compliance with federal, state, and local requirements. The Honolulu Fire Department assists with the fire code compliance and emergency evacuation drills are conducted periodically. A staff member from the Community College’s Environmental Health and Safety Office provides assistance on the management of hazardous materials and wastes. The VCAS has been responsive to directing funding toward improvements needed.

**Actionable Improvement Plans**

Although the College meets this Standard, there are several things that should be done to ensure continued compliance.

- The College should ensure that emergency procedures are posted at all satellite campuses.
- The College should schedule emergency response and evacuation drills at its satellite facilities. Results should be used to improve emergency planning efforts.
- The College should require faculty and staff at the off-site facilities to conduct regular safety inspections. The inspections should be documented and items needing improvements should be submitted to the Administration.
III.B.2. To assure the feasibility and effectiveness of physical resources in supporting institutional programs and services, the institution plans and evaluates its facilities and equipment on a regular basis, taking utilization and other relevant data into account.

Descriptive Summary

The College is able to track both enrollments and the number and types of classes that are offered each semester in classrooms and shops via Banner, the University's class scheduling and student records software. The number and types (nature) of facilities requests, approved by the VCAS and entered in the Scheduler Plus software, are also available in printed reports generated weekly. Included in these reports are all credit and Apprenticeship classes, non-credit courses, and special events and activities. This system allows an up-to-date and comprehensive evaluation of facility usage at any point in time.

Additionally, information on the adequacy and condition of facilities is available from various other sources. The Deans, Directors, and Division Chairs solicit and receive frequent on-going feedback from faculty regarding the condition and adequacy of their teaching facilities, and more formal evaluations are obtained from annual assessments and program reviews.

Information on required repairs and indications of the general condition of facilities are available from processed maintenance requests. To better manage the maintenance requests and to improve efficiency, the request process was converted from the submission of hard copy forms to an online system (AiM). The electronic submission has also made it easier to collect data and generate summary reports. Since this process includes requests from virtually all segments on campus, it provides broad data on the state of the College’s facilities.

The Committee on Disabilities Accessibility - Honolulu (CODA-H) meets monthly to discuss issues related to the adequacy of facilities and equipment in meeting ADA/ADAAG requirements. Members of the Health and Safety Steering Committee meet monthly to perform inspections and investigate problems associated with facilities and equipment that may pose health and safety hazards. Both committees report their findings to VCAS and the appropriate groups on campus for action.

Until 2007, the Campus Beautification Committee (a subcommittee of the Recruitment and Retention Committee) surveyed campus buildings and grounds and developed a list of proposed projects that would improve the appearance and appeal of some campus facilities. The intent was to make the campus more inviting for students, to create an atmosphere conducive to learning, and to improve working conditions for faculty and staff. Their efforts resulted in a list of recommendations that were to be reviewed and approved by Administration. The committee was disbanded in 2007 but may be resurrected shortly.

Johnson Controls, Inc. has been contracted to help the College save energy and develop processes that are more focused on sustainability. Some of their activities leading up to these goals include monitoring the lighting, temperature, and water usage both in campus and off-campus buildings. These surveys have provided the VCAS with information about the adequacy of these elements in offices, classrooms, and labs/shops.
VCAS’s on different campuses have recently gained access to Pacific Partners Consulting Group’s (PPCG) facility evaluation reports. Included in these annual reports is information on the “useful life” of buildings with depreciation tables and costs of building repairs. These reports provide VCAS’s with building deterioration rates, a schedule of upcoming required maintenance and repairs, and estimates of costs. These reports are used as the bases for repair and maintenance funding requests to the Legislature.

College accreditation committees collect information on the adequacy of facilities during the self-study process with surveys, interviews, and research. Findings of conditions that need to be addressed are included in the resulting planning agendas. Surveys were administered during the Spring 2011 semester to obtain student and staff/faculty feedback on the adequacy of College facilities. The results of the Student survey revealed predominantly “Good” ratings (on the scale: Poor-Fair-Good-Excellent) in regard to the perceived quality of classrooms and labs/shops. The results from the Staff/Faculty survey were similar with the largest numbers indicating “Good” ratings of office/workspace and classrooms. Responses on labs/shops were most heavily clustered in the “Don’t Know/Don’t Use” category because it appears that the majority of respondents do not work in labs/shops. However, of those who did submit ratings, most indicated “Good” ratings. Many useful comments and remarks were received on both surveys in regard to these spaces.

The Vice Chancellors meet annually with each program to discuss budgeting priorities for the following year. Some of the discussion is focused on the adequacy of their facilities and their needs in this area. Health and safety concerns are addressed immediately and other needs are incorporated into program review reports.

In prioritizing repair and maintenance projects, the VCAS presents a compilation of deferred projects (not funded) to the Campus Leadership Team (CLT) and requests their recommendations for additional projects and assistance in prioritizing the projects. CLT members poll their constituencies for needed maintenance and repairs and reach an agreement on the ranking of these projects. These projects generally exceed $100,000 in cost and require hiring consultants. The VCAS then meets with VCAS’s from other campuses to discuss their deferred maintenance projects and come to an agreement on which projects will be funded. Health and safety projects and those needed to meet what have been identified as urgent programmatic needs are given priority. The Associate Vice President of Administrative Affairs ultimately decides on how funds from the Vice President of Community College’s Office are allocated.

The primary responsibility for evaluating the condition of equipment and identifying the need for new equipment rests with the individual programs/departments and their divisions. Faculty formally communicate their equipment requirements to the College through the processes of annual assessment reports and program reviews in which they evaluate, among other areas, how their equipment meets their needs in regard to achieving student learning outcomes. They also evaluate priorities for replacement and new equipment requests based on how these support the College’s strategic goals and/or remedy health and safety issues.
The effective delivery and presentation of course material are becoming rapidly more dependent on web access and the availability of computers and other electronic learning devices (e.g., SMART board, Sympodums, etc.) in the classrooms. Instructors are responsible for reporting their needs in these areas through annual assessments and program reviews, and dialogue with the Division Chairs. The Educational Media Center (EMC) in particular has been receiving instructors’ requests and has foreseen emerging needs in these areas. EMC staff have been communicating to Administration the importance and urgency of equipping rooms with the technologies needed. Additionally, a Director of Information Technology was hired and is working with key administrators, faculty, and staff to recommend and implement policies and procedures to unify IT and Media infrastructure and to improve how classroom equipment needs are evaluated and met.

In addition, the Vice Chancellors, Deans, and Division Chairs meet with faculty to obtain regular updates on equipment needs, and feedback from campus groups about the adequacy of equipment in classrooms and shops/labs was obtained through the accreditation self-study surveys. Information from these sources supplements what is received through the other processes.

Self Evaluation

The College meets the Standard.

Several means for obtaining information on the use of primary facility spaces are available and this enables the College to extract, compile, and evaluate facilities use at any time. However, Scheduler Plus does have its limitations. Fortunately, the College plans to transition from Scheduler Plus to Resource 25 in Fall 2012. This more sophisticated and versatile software will enable more detailed analyses and comprehensive reports on facilities usage and will improve the ease, efficiency, and effectiveness of space use evaluations. Additionally, with this software, office spaces, storage spaces, common work areas, and other types of work and service spaces can also be systematically evaluated for adequacy and optimal utilization.

Current initiatives and efforts to repair and improve facilities are based on information gathered from many different sources. Currently, assessments are conducted on an ongoing basis. In combination, the information gathered provides a detailed picture of both what is adequate and what needs to be addressed in regard to the campus’ primary facilities. The College, through the office of the VCAS, has been able to acquire funding to address the most pressing needs for facility maintenance and improvement. These recently include repair of the air conditioning system in Building 27, replacement of ceiling tiles and outside walkways in Building 27, repair of the exhaust system in the Welding shop, increasing the electrical power to Building 27, replacing the transformer in Building 14, replacing the rain gutters on Buildings 43 and 44, and repairing the finger pier at the Marine Education and Training Center.

Funding was also secured for a major renovation of Building 7, which includes new elevators, air conditioning system, and refurbishing of classrooms, offices, and hallways. Additionally, the planning and design of a new Science building (ATTC) is underway and its building will be initiated when funds become available. The VCAS maintains a spreadsheet with details on
In addition to what was accomplished with available and acquired funding, small-scale improvements and expansion of facilities were also done with in-house resources (i.e., Apprenticeship classes, credit classes, Operations & Maintenance staff). Many of these projects were repairs and minor renovations to quickly remedy health and safety issues. Fortunately, the College is able to take on and complete many small projects by utilizing the wide array of expertise and equipment available on campus.

The procedures for repairing and acquiring new equipment are satisfactory. Repairs and maintenance of equipment used in instruction are usually managed through department budgets. Emergency repairs that become necessary due to health and safety problems are funded through the VCAS or Deans’ office. The process for securing funding for new equipment begins with justifications in program reviews and continues with a review by the Planning Council budget committee that includes input from the Faculty Senate Executive Committee (FSEC), Staff Senate Executive Committee (SSEC), Associated Students of the University of Hawai‘i-Honolulu Community College (ASUH-HCC), and the Kupu Ka Wai Council, with a final ranking by the full Planning Council. This process is fair and ensures that the equipment purchased supports important program and College goals.

Development of an efficient method of assessing and meeting the classroom multimedia needs of instructors is underway. All equipment purchases will now be routed through ITC and there will be cooperative development of technical specifications for standardized classroom technology. The evaluation of existing equipment for replacement will be completed in two ways. First, existing equipment will be monitored via GLPI (Gestionnaire Libre De Parc Infomatique), the College’s new equipment inventory, incident, and request system. This will provide data on problem reports and age. Replacement decisions will be made based on that data. Second, new equipment will be purchased with three-year service contracts. Items will be replaced based on the proportion of the cost of service contract renewal against equipment replacement. If service contract renewal is greater than 50% of the replacement cost or is unavailable for the item, it will be replaced. Life expectancy of end user computer equipment for classrooms and offices will also be greatly increased because processing and storage will be removed from individual machines by replacing machine-based desktops with virtual desktops.

**Actionable Improvement Plans**

No action is required.

*III.B.2.a. Long-range capital plans support institutional improvement goals, and reflect projections of the total cost of ownership of new facilities and equipment.*

**Descriptive Summary**

The College's capital and financial plans are founded on policies of the University, the Community Colleges, and Honolulu Community College, and are part of the College's Strategic
Planning process. The Strategic Plan supports the University of Hawai‘i Community Colleges System Strategic Plan, and the University of Hawai‘i System Strategic Plan. This ensures that core values are shared and that the University operates as a unified system. The Planning Council reviews and revises the Strategic Plan annually. The Council examines units’ resource needs and budget requests based on program reviews and annual reports, as well as information from Deans and Directors, additional operational needs, and feedback from faculty and staff. Funding priorities are determined by the Planning Council and College's governing groups (FSEC, SSEC, ASUH-HCC, and the Kupu Ka Wai Council), and approved by the Chancellor.

Future planning for physical resources is the purview of the Long Range Development Plan (LRDP) and the Plan Review Use (PRU) application. The previous LRDP was dated 1996. The revised and updated LRDP was completed in 2011, with College-wide participation. The LRDP is a comprehensive plan to guide the improvement, growth, and expansion of the College’s facilities and environment for the next twenty-five years. It is based on the College’s academic needs and objectives and considers the campus as a network of interconnected physical systems. The next update will be in five to ten years. The PRU is a ten-year plan extracted from the LRDP and is required for City & County building permits. The PRU application was coordinated by the VCAS and completed and subsequently approved by the City Council in 2010.

Self Evaluation

The College meets the Standard.

The “HCC Operational Model for Integrated Planning, Implementation, Budgeting, and Assessment” describes how the College's financial planning process is rooted in University of Hawai‘i Executive Policy and Community College Systems policies, as well as Honolulu Community College policy, specifically, HCCP 4.101, “Integrated Planning, Resource Allocation, and Assessment,” which ensures that academic and facilities planning is consistent with the College's mission. Financial planning is integrated with institutional planning as specified in the Strategic Plan. Needs are determined through program reviews; with input from faculty and staff; by impact on occupants’ safety and health; and compliance with building codes and safety, health, and disability regulations. Requests are subject to restriction and reduction depending on the current financial situation and estimates of future revenue from enrollment. Long-range facilities plans are part of the College's Strategic Planning process. In the Operational Model, strategic planning, implementation strategies and cost estimates, resource allocations, and assessment proceed in a continuous cycle. [FY 2012 Budget Plan - Presentation to the Planning Council, September 9, 2011: "The HCC Operational Model: Integrated Planning, Implementation, Budgeting, Assessment", Integrated Planning, Resource Allocation, and Assessment - HCCP # 4.101]

Capital plans and facilities master plans are conceived and developed based on College input and needs. The LRDP is the College's master plan for the future development of its facilities and physical resource assets. The LRDP has been updated as recommended by the previous self-study. The process was very inclusive, with participation from all College constituencies (including students, staff, faculty, and administrators), the community, and the City and County
of Honolulu. With this inclusive participation, the LRDP meets program needs. Funding for Capital Improvement Projects (CIP) requires the approval of the LRDP by the University Board of Regents. BoR approval was granted on March 17, 2011, enabling the College to seek CIP funds at the Legislature.

The VCAS develops the College's capital and financial plans based on the College’s Strategic Plan, with information and prioritization provided by the Planning Council, the Campus Leadership Team, the Administration, and the College's governing groups. The VCAS uses the Facilities Renewal Reinvestment Model (FRRM), a framework to systematically assess ongoing and future capital needs for repair, renewal, and replacement of the College’s facilities and infrastructure. The FRRM report is provided to the Community Colleges annually by the Pacific Partners Consulting Group, Inc. (PPCG). It delivers an inventory of the University's buildings, their condition, and replacement value; a maintenance history for major building systems (e.g., air conditioning, plumbing, roofing); the estimated cost of maintenance backlogs; and a forecast of building and facilities needs to apply in the planning, scheduling, and funding of future projects. FRRM also suggests models for addressing the maintenance backlogs. The FRRM is an important planning tool for the VCAS. Because all University campuses are included, FRRM contributes to decision-making for funding allocations. The VCASs of the Community Colleges meet annually with their Colleges' priorities to decide which major projects will be funded. [Facility Renewal Reinvestment Study, Pacific Partners Consulting Group (PPCG) - 2011 Update]

In the “total cost of ownership” of the College's facilities and equipment, all facilities and equipment purchased by funds controlled by the University belong to the University. There may be a few exceptions for items purchased from extramural funds. These funds may require the University to request for title after the grant or contract terminates.

**Actionable Improvement Plans**

No action is required.
III.B.2.b. Physical resource planning is integrated with institutional planning. The institution systematically assesses the effective use of physical resources and uses the results of the evaluation as the basis for improvement.

**Descriptive Summary**

Honolulu Community College integrates physical resource planning with institutional planning. Physical resource sufficiency and needs, such as for equipment and facilities, are identified and assessed by annual assessment reports, program reviews, and periodic inspections by the Health and Safety Steering Committee. Planning, prioritization, and budgeting for maintenance, replacement, upgrades, renovation, and construction are addressed by the College's governing groups and the Planning Council. Membership of the Planning Council is comprised of representatives of College students, faculty, staff, and administrators. The Planning Council examines and updates the College's Strategic and Implementation Plans annually. There is a direct link between assessment and the Strategic Plan. [HCC Statement on the Relation Between Assessment and the Strategic Plan]

Comprehensive, long-range plans for the College’s facilities are the scope of the Long Range Development Plan (LRDP), which was significantly updated in 2010-2011, as recommended by the last Self-Study. The LRDP was discussed by and unanimously approved the Board of Regents in March 2011. [Minutes, Board of Regents Meeting, March 17, 2011]

The updated LRDP includes the main campus on Dillingham Boulevard, the Kokea Street campuses where the Automotive Mechanics Technology and Diesel Mechanics Technology facilities are located, and the proposed Advanced Technology Training Center. The previous Self-Study also recommended a Plan Review Use (PRU) application to the City and County (C & C) of Honolulu, required by C & C ordinance for major expansion of public use facilities. The PRU application was coordinated by the VCAS and completed in 2010. This ten-year plan was approved by the City Council, which is critical because the PRU is required for building permits.

The Scheduler Plus software, which is used to manage room assignments, and the “Application for Use of Buildings, Facilities or Grounds,” which is completed by credit, non-credit, and Apprenticeship programs, as well as College committees and organizations, both provide information that can be applied in determining room use and planning for space utilization. Repair and maintenance needs are submitted by College faculty and staff with the “HCC Maintenance Service Request” form. These requests are recorded and tracked, and provide an ongoing log of the state of the College's facilities. The “Application for Use” and “Maintenance Service Request” forms are both available online on the HCC Intranet as well as in paper format. Requests for maintenance, janitorial, and grounds services have recently been converted to the University of Hawai‘i’s AiM On-Line Work Request System.

In addition, the College conducts surveys to evaluate physical resources. Two surveys were offered in the Spring 2011 semester: Physical Resources/Facilities (Students), and Physical Resources/Facilities (Staff/Faculty). The surveys were designed to evaluate the effectiveness of and satisfaction with HCC’s facilities, buildings, equipment, and safety, and to determine needs. The results are being used to plan for and prioritize improvements.
Self Evaluation

The College meets the Standard.

Program review is at the core of assessment, and the College has refined and significantly extended the program review process since the last Self-Study. Academic programs and support units participate in annual program reviews which include evaluation of their physical resources. Programs have identified needs such as classroom and shop/lab space, storage, furniture, lighting and increased electrical demands, mechanical equipment, consumable supplies, and tools. With the College's specialized career-technical programs, equipment repair, replacement, and upgrade are continual challenges. In program reviews, the CTE programs also consult with their Advisory Committees about resource needs. Workforce development data may also be considered.

The Vice Chancellors meet with each program annually to discuss programmatic needs and budget requests for the next fiscal year. Program reviews are examined by the Deans and the Assessment Committee. Division Chairs and Deans determine resource needs based on the program reviews of their respective divisions, prioritize these, and submit them to the Planning Council and to the Vice Chancellor for Academic Services (VCAS), who compiles all requests. The resource requests are evaluated and prioritized by the FSEC, the SSEC, the Kupu Ka Wai Council, and the ASUH-HCC, who are the College's governing bodies. Their rankings are submitted to the Planning Council. The Planning Council reconciles the prioritized requests and makes recommendations to the Chancellor. As the program review process has developed, program evaluation and needs assessment have become very clearly integrated with College planning and priorities. In the Spring 2011 semester, the Chancellor introduced College Policy HCCP 4.101, “Integrated Planning, Resource Allocation, and Assessment,” a planning, resource allocation, and assessment process for academic and facilities planning. [Integrated Planning, Resource Allocation, and Assessment - HCCP # 4.101]

In addition to the program review process, facilities and equipment concerns are raised at division meetings and meetings of the Campus Leadership Team (CLT). Deans, Division Chairs, and unit heads are members of the CLT. Students provide input to their instructors, who communicate to their Division Chairs. Space utilization, specifically with regards to classroom assignments, is the responsibility of the Deans and Division Chairs. In order to improve the coordination of room assignments and course registration, the VCAA and VCAS investigated replacements for Scheduler Plus, seeking software alternatives that can interface with Banner. Resource 25 (R25) was selected and will be implemented in the Fall 2012 semester. R25 will improve the College’s assessment of space utilization and class scheduling. Repair and maintenance of facilities are the responsibility of the VCAS, with input from faculty, staff, and students. Health, safety, and code items have the highest priority for upgrade and repair. Major mechanical items, such as air conditioning and elevators, are maintained with service contracts. Program needs and the condition of their facilities receive highest considerations for funding because of their impact on student learning. The proposed Advanced Technology Training Center, for example, has been a College priority, due to the age and condition of the Science Building (Building 5).
Purchasing of equipment is prioritized similarly: health, safety, and code needs receive the highest priority, followed by program improvement as identified through program reviews and achievement of strategic goals. Operating needs, such as the repair or replacement of equipment essential to a program, is also high priority.

In the Physical Resources/Facilities (Staff/Faculty) survey, “effectiveness of planning and prioritization for equipment and facilities” was rated as Fair by 31.7% of the respondents, Good by 23.8%, Excellent by 6.9%, and 29.7% selected “Don't Know/Don't Use.” These results indicate the potential for greater inclusion of faculty and staff in the College's planning for and allocation of equipment, space, and facilities.

The College has also made progress in developing the “comprehensive facilities master plan…to best serve the programs offered” recommended by the previous accreditation visiting team. The LRDP was produced by Helber Hastert & Fee and coordinated by the VCAS. The planners identified the College's academic goals and the functional relationships between programs and translated these into space needs. [Long Range Development Plan]

All College constituencies were invited to participate in developing the LRDP and were encouraged to share ideas and discuss needs. Of the respondents to the Physical Resources/Facilities (Staff/Faculty) survey, 53.5% rated “opportunities to participate in facilities planning, e.g. LRDP” as Good or Excellent. Four workshops were held for students, faculty, staff, and administrators to provide input. Helber Hastert & Fee also conducted an online College-wide survey. Consistent architectural style, parking on the campus periphery, a prominent College entrance, and attention to green space and landscaping were some of the desires expressed. In addition, the VCAS and Helber Hastert & Fee coordinated with the C & C of Honolulu's Department of Planning and Permitting and consulted with the Kalihi-Pālama Neighborhood Board. The LRDP process demonstrates that the College integrates physical resource planning with long-range institutional planning. The completed LRDP report and graphic depictions of the future campus were presented to the College in a display at the Library. The Planning Council has begun discussions about how to achieve the LRDP.

The LRDP includes the Kapālama Stations of the City's future mass transit route. The fixed rail system will run on Dillingham Boulevard adjacent to the campus. The main and Kokea campuses are within the Transit-Oriented Development (TOD) Zone. The C & C Department of Planning and Permitting is responsible for plans for the TOD zones. The College intends to remove the Auto Body and portable buildings, as these would be closest to the anticipated rail stations. The Committee on Disability Access-Honolulu (CODA-H) hosted representatives from the C & C Department of Transportation Services, who gave a presentation and answered questions at the College on May 7, 2010. The speaker was interested in how the rail system could benefit students who are enrolled in courses at multiple UH campuses and who could commute between them. In June 2011, the City held community meetings to inform and consult with stakeholders about the rail system and the stations proposed for their neighborhoods. Members of the College were invited to participate at the meeting held for the Kalihi area at Kalākaua Middle School on June 27, 2011. Input from participants included requests for better lighting, bike and pedestrian paths, and other infrastructure improvements. The consultant from
Keyser Marston Associates suggested that the Kapālama Stations offer much development potential because the University and Kamehameha Schools are major landowners of the surrounding area.

Planning groups and open meetings have also been convened for other major College projects, including the proposed Advanced Technology Training Center (familiarly known as the “Science Building”) and the renovation of Building 7. These groups included administrators, faculty, and staff of the program and service areas of these buildings to promote understanding of their needs and exchange of information. The Disability Specialist was consulted to ensure accessibility. Throughout the planning process, the VCAS placed copies of plan drafts in the Library for College members' review and response.

**Actionable Improvement Plans**

No action is required.
III.B. Evidence

Access Map

Administration Office Hours: Ken Kato (Vice Chancellor of Administrative Services), Erika Lacro (Vice Chancellor of Academic Affairs), Ralph Kam (Dean, University College)

Administrative Service Updates: Presentation by VCAS Brian Furuto to HCC Planning Council, January 2012

Advanced Technology Training Center: Charrette Report - Library Reserve

AiM eFacilities Buildings, Operations, & Work Request Management

Application for Use of Buildings, Facilities or Grounds

Banner

Campus Leadership Team (CLT)

Campus Map: Security Cameras and Emergency Phones

Capital Improvement Plan (CIP)

Chancellor Mike Rota’s Presentation at the General College Meeting Fall 2010

Committee on Disability Access – Honolulu

Community College Inventory: Focus on Student Persistence, Learning, and Attainment 2009

Community Recycling Bins

Contract No. 59799, Energy Savings Performance Contracting Services, Energy Conservation Projects, Oahu Campuses, University of Hawai‘i - Community Colleges, Project No. CC-09-8129

Criteria for Items in the Implementation Plan

Distance Learning at the University of Hawai‘i

Distance Learning at the University of Hawai‘i - History

Dr. Kakkala Gopalakrishnan, Email communication, February 22, 2012 (available upon request)

Emergency Planning Subcommittee
Energy Conservation Measures for Honolulu Community College - Johnson Controls - Notice to Proceed

Energy Conservation Measures for Honolulu Community College: Schedule 1

Executive Summary – Learning Infrastructure (Survey) – Students 2005

Facilities Repair and Maintenance Plans for FY 2012

Facility Renewal Reinvestment Study, Pacific Partners Consulting Group (PPCG) – 2011 Update


Gestionnaire Libre De Parc Informatique (GLPI)

Grant from Office of Hawaiian Affairs to Support Māla (Garden) Project

Guidebook on Accommodations

Hawaii Revised Statutes 328J-2, 328J-6

Accreditation Self-Study Spring 2012 Executive Summary (Survey Results)

Building 8807 Upgrade Infrastructure, Three Week Schedule, Ralph S. Inouye Co. Ltd.

Facilities & Grounds Maintenance Service Request Form

Parking Information

HCC Statement on the Relation Between Assessment and the Strategic Plan

Upgrade Infrastructure Building 8807, Project No. CC-09-1292, Ralph S. Inouye Co. Ltd.: Construction Schedule

Health and Safety Committee Charter

Health and Safety Committee Members

Health and Safety Committee

Health and Wellness Subcommittee

Current Funded Repairs and Maintenance Projects for the Period Ended June 30, 2011 and 2012

Honolulu Community College - Disability Access
Honolulu Community College eWaste Summary - provided by William Lau (available upon request)

Honolulu Community College Health And Safety Program - September 2005

Emergency Action Plan (EAP) Draft - April 2008

Strategic Plan 2008-2015

Honolulu Rail Transit Project: HCC Workshop announcement and materials (available upon request)

New Resource Requirements Planning Period FY 2011 thru FY 2015

Implementation Planning Framework

Integrated Planning, Resource Allocation, and Assessment - HCCP # 4.101

Interviews: Cory Takemoto (Former Chair, Planning Council), Cynthia Smith (Coordinator, Distance Education), Gregg Gruwell (Media Specialist), Hanwell Kaakimaka (Educational Specialist, Testing Center), Jonathan Wong (Former Chair, Planning Council), Julia Ching (Student Media Board Chairperson), Lianne Nagano (Coordinator, College Skills Center), Poima Sataua (ASUH-HCC President, 2009-2010), Sharon Isa (Administrative Officer, Business Office), William Lau (Information Technology Specialist)

“Kalihi Has Say on Rail Development.” Honolulu Star-Advertiser. 28 June 2011

List of Access Concerns - available from the Disability Specialist upon request

List of Repairs and Renovation Projects, Honolulu Community College, from 2006 to 2011

Long Range Development Plan (LRDP) - March 2011 Update or Library Reserve

Māla Ceremony

Mike Meyer, Email communication.

Minutes, Board of Regents Meeting, March 17, 2011

Minutes of Safety Meetings, reports on repair and maintenance status from VCAS

Pacific Partners Consulting Group (PPCG)

Parking Lot Capacity, November 1, 2011

Participation in College Decision-making Processes - HCCP # 1.101
Performance Contract: Johnson Controls Inc. & University of Hawai‘i

Physical Resources/Facilities Survey Results (Staff/Faculty) – Self Study 2012

Physical Resources/Facilities Survey Results (Students) – Self Study 2012

Physical Resources/Facilities Survey Results (Students) 2011: Interpretation (available upon request)

Physical Resources Survey 2005 (Staff/Faculty)

Physical Resources Survey 2005 (Students)

Physical Resources/Facilities (Students) - Self-Study 2012

Physical Resources/Facilities (Staff/Faculty) - Self-Study 2012

Plan Review Use (PRU) Application (C & C Honolulu) by Helber Hastert & Fee Planners, Inc. - Library Reserve

Planning Council

Planning Council Charter (2008) - to show membership

Pre-Construction Meeting, Upgrade Infrastructure, Building 8807

Program Outcome Requests 2010-2011

Program Review Reports

Project Development Report (PDR) for Advanced Technology Training Center - Library Reserve

Quarterly University of Hawaii eWaste Pick-up Program

[UHCC Renewable Energy Training Summit]

Reports of safety walk-through surveys and minutes of the Health and Safety Steering Committee - available upon request

Resource 25

Scheduler Plus

Scheduler Plus at HCC
Self-Study Questions for Deans, Directors and Division Chairs: Eric Shaffer

Self-Study Questions for Deans, Directors and Division Chairs: Kerry Tanimoto

Self-Study Questions for Deans, Directors and Division Chairs: Russell Uyeno

Self-Study Questions for VCAS: Ken Kato


Summary of the UHCC-JCI from: Judith Mouton, Johnson Controls Inc., Program Director, Higher Education. Via Email, February 28, 2012

UH DL Proctoring Office Information (Testing Centers)

Facilities Repairs and Maintenance Plans for FY 2012

UHCC Oahu Development Schedule (Johnson Controls Inc.)

UHTV Video On Demand: Honolulu Community College

University of Hawai‘i-Community Colleges, Current Funded R&M Project Listing, FY2007

University of Hawai‘i-Community Colleges, Current Funded R&M Project Listing, FY2008

University of Hawai‘i-Community Colleges, Current Funded R&M Project Listing, FY2009

University of Hawai‘i-Community Colleges, Current Funded R&M Project Listing, FY2010

University of Hawai‘i-Community Colleges, Current Funded R&M Project Listing, FY2011

University of Hawai‘i Community Colleges Energy Savings Performance Contract Honolulu Community College Water Conservation Schedule

University of Hawai‘i-Community Colleges, General Funded Strategic Initiatives Status, FY 2006-2007

Current Funded Repairs and Maintenance Projects and CIP for the Fiscal Years Ended June 30, 2007 to 2012

“Workshops Cover Development Near Transit Stations.” Honolulu Star-Advertiser. 26 June 2011
STANDARD IIIC: RESOURCES: TECHNOLOGY RESOURCES

Co-Chairs

Sally Dunan
Assistant Professor, Computing, Electronics & Networking Technology

Gregory Witteman
Assistant Professor, Biological Science

Committee Members

Michael Cress
Instructor, Information and Computer Science

Rob Edmondson
Assistant Professor, Anthropology

Mike Meyer
IT Specialist, Information Technology

Patrick Patterson
Associate Professor, History
III.C. Technology Resources

III.C. Technology resources are used to support student learning programs and services and to improve institutional effectiveness. Technology planning is integrated with institutional planning.

III.C.1. The institution assures that any technology support it provides is designed to meet the needs of learning, teaching, college-wide communications, research, and operational systems.

Descriptive Summary

The College supports a wide variety of campus-wide technology services including computer labs, the College’s public web site and the internal Intranet web site, printing services, graphics services, services for distance education, and network services. The campus-wide technology services are currently being functionally realigned in response to needs identified in the Accreditation Self Study of 2006 [2006 Institutional Self Study Report in Support of Reaffirmation of Accreditation].

In response to the previous self-study, the College contracted a Technology Consultant to review Campus technology support and make recommendations for improvement. The results of this review and related recommendations were presented to the College in April 2010 [William Pritchard, Technology Consultant, "Strategic Technology Plan for Honolulu Community College," Presentation - April 29, 2010]. A key recommendation was to consolidate Information Technology services for the campus. A corresponding IT Strategic Plan was also developed [Information Technology Strategic Plan 2010-2015]. Following a period of extensive campus dialog including two rounds of campus-wide Town Hall meetings [Campus Communication], the College is in the process of implementing the recommended structural realignment of the IT Strategic Plan. The College reorganization proposal is described in the Executive Summary for the Reorganization Proposal Request for University of Hawaii Honolulu Community College [Executive Summary for the Reorganization Proposal Request University of Hawaii Honolulu Community College], associated charts for the reorganization [Charts for Reorganization], and functional statements for the units of the proposed organizational structure [Functional Statements for Reorganization]. The reorganization proposal is currently in the process of review by the UHCC System and bargaining units. Any comments and concerns will be addressed and incorporated into the proposal as needed, and the reorganization is expected to be approved during spring or summer 2012. Pending final approval, the College is proceeding informally to implement the functional realignment. While not all elements of campus technology resources for student learning and institutional effectiveness are being changed, a significant portion of them are now in transition. Overall organizational changes with newly identified goals are summarized here.

Different elements of Information Technology, educational media, networking, telecommunications, desktop support, and student computer labs that were administered
by individuals working in different campus departments, now operate under one Chief Information Officer. Previously the Information Technology Center (ITC) was functionally located within the Pacific Center for Advanced Technology Training (PCATT), an organizational unit of the College that provides noncredit training in advanced technologies of interest to the local professional community. The alignment of ITC under PCATT and the existence of multiple technology support units in different academic units was confusing to many faculty and staff at the College. As part of the Campus reorganization, the CIO now reports to the VCAA instead of the PCATT Director. This realignment of the organizational reporting chain is currently pending formal University System and bargaining unit approval. This functional realignment has centralized the management of information and data communications with a clearer focus on educational effectiveness and campus efficiency.

Campus-wide technology services are now managed in the following functional areas:

1. The Information Technology Center (ITC) under the direction of the Interim CIO provides:
   a) Network Services that include campus network and Internet connectivity both wired and wireless for students, faculty and staff.
   b) Operations providing campus server maintenance, IT security in conjunction with the university, telecommunications with Voice-Over-IP telephony, and all network cabling plus new equipment installation including standard replacement.
   c) User Support providing open student computer labs, computer (desktop) maintenance, classroom educational media (audiovisual) maintenance, faculty/program support, and all incident and request reporting through the new ITC Call Center.
   d) Purchasing and Planning consolidating all IT/network connected technology purchasing and provisioning campus wide. This is designed to implement controls on technology purchases to improve technology selection for effectiveness, implement new technology campus wide, and develop a detailed budgeting model based on centralized purchasing.
   e) The CIO is an administrative level position providing strategic planning and management as well as operational management of ITC and other elements of technology on the campus.

2. A new Academic Support Division includes the following organizational units to provide improved support for student academic success.
   a) The Design Center includes the print shop and graphics services that were previously provided by the Educational Media Center (EMC), and the campus Web Master, who provides technical, design and content support for public campus web sites and for the internal intranet portal that provides administrative, operational, and governance support for all campus units and communities.
   b) The Student Success unit provides student learning assistance such as access to computer labs, study rooms, make-up testing, and other learning assistance previously provided by the College Skills Center (CSC).
   c) The Library is responsible for planning, developing and delivering a
variety of educational resources, information and learning services that are applicable across various academic programs. This includes the development of online materials for student use and instruction in the use of library material and information services and maintenance of hardware and software of systems used in performing library functions. The Library receives support for their computer resources from ITC.

d) Policy, Planning and Institutional Research maintains the student information system, prepares management information reports, and coordinates with university Institutional Research under administrative direction.

e) The Educational Technology unit provides Distance Education support and other instructional media support, with close coordination with and support from ITC.

This represents a very different structure for technology management and is primarily focused on improving efficiency and coordination of technology support services while designing the next stages of Internet based educational tools and services for the campus and its evolving communities. The campus reorganization of all components of information technology is a serious effort to clearly delineate the needs of the College and to create efficient procedures and new attitudes and skills among faculty and staff to meet them in a rapidly changing technology environment.

In addition to the centralized campus administration of technology services, various academic programs, such as Computing, Electronics, and Networking Technology (CENT); Communication Arts (CA); Architectural Engineering and CAD Technologies (AEC); Auto Body Repair and Painting (ABRP); Electrical Installation and Maintenance (EIMT); Refrigeration and Air Conditioning Technology (RAC); Sheet Metal and Plastics Technology (SMP); and Welding Technology (WELD), manage and maintain their technology requirements as required by the technology area of the program. The technology requirements for these disciplines are identified through the Program Review process. As these technology requirements are primarily managed internally by the programs, the focus of this study is the management of campus-wide technology services and support.

The process of Program Review has been increasingly emphasized as the means for programs and units to identify their improvement needs, including needs for technology resources. Program Review has been more clearly integrated into the College’s planning and budget processes with the clear intention that Program Review is the fundamental method for programs and units to identify and obtain funding for improvement items. [Integrated Planning, Resource Allocation, and Assessment - HCCP # 4.101; Review of Established Programs - HCCP # 5.202]. Additionally, the functional role of the Information Technology Center will include providing centralized procurement for information technology resources for campus-wide support services, and consultation for programs and units seeking to procure technology resources. This approach will provide oversight and support to ensure that programs and services are able to obtain the technology resources they need consistent with College and University procurement
policies.

Self Evaluation

The College meets the Standard.

Because of concerns previously identified about the structure of technology resource management, the College has initiated significant organizational changes to realign and improve delivery of technology support to the campus. Even though this reorganization is still in process, it is clear that the objective of the reorganization is to provide improved support for academic achievement on the campus.

There are some concerns that need to be resolved as the Campus Reorganization and the implementation of the IT Strategic Plan occurs. The first concern is that, the former Technology Advisory Committee (TAC), which still formally exists, has fallen into disuse. A temporary IT Working Group and subsequently a Technology Users Advisory Group (TUAG) were established in conjunction with the consulting study and development of the IT Strategic Plan. Both of these temporary groups have served their purpose. A new, informal faculty interest group has been created and has been meeting weekly with the Interim CIO in an advisory capacity. With the campus reorganization, the Interim CIO needs to reconnect with the formally established TAC. The TAC needs to review and propose changes to its charter to ensure that it is able to effectively serve in an advisory capacity to ITC.

The second concern is that the process for obtaining budget approval for replacing and upgrading computer technology related to the specific needs of an academic discipline needs to be clarified. The program review process, in which programs identify their needs for technology replacement and upgrades, is the foundation for the budget process in which program needs are ranked and prioritized for funding. ITC's role as a consultant comes into play in the procurement process when the program is preparing to submit, or has submitted, a purchase order to use allocated funds to procure equipment. Based on this year's budget process, it appears that the distinction between the budget process and the role of ITC in the procurement process is not clear to everyone. This distinction needs to be clearly stated, to ensure that academic programs that have specialized requirements for upgrading and replacing computers specific to their academic discipline continue to receive appropriate funding priority within the Program Review and Budget cycle for the Campus. The Campus procurement policy for IT is to be issued by the Chancellor's office as a formal College policy.

The third concern is that, even though we are optimistic that the current reorganization will tremendously improve the management and delivery of technology support services for the Campus, there will still be a period of transition following the formal completion of the reorganization during which the full implementation of the IT Strategic Plan is carried out. The current situation is still unsettled with many unfinished details. It is necessary to ensure that the Campus continues to be informed regarding the changes in ITC, and that the IT Strategic Plan is systematically implemented. To this end, the ITC
needs to provide Annual Reports or Program Reviews to the Campus that discuss the progress with respect to implementing the IT Strategic Plan. This annual report should also report on completion of relevant user/customer satisfaction surveys, as a means of assessing the degree to which the consolidation of technology services is achieving the major objective of improving the delivery of technology services for the Campus. This concern is being addressed with an annual IT Strategic Plan Report covering survey results on IT performance and Strategic Plan implementation, along with semi-annual strategic project presentations to the campus. The first of these will be available online in August 2012, covering all current IT projects related to strategic goals and objectives.

**Actionable Improvement Plans**

The College must complete the organizational restructuring of technology management for the campus. The formal approval of the Campus Reorganization, which will complete this agenda item, is expected to be obtained during spring or summer 2012.

The College must continue to implement the goals provided in the IT Strategic Plan 2010-2015. The consolidation of information technology support into one organizational unit has already been informally completed and is expected to be formally approved as part of the Campus Reorganization during spring semester. However, the IT Strategic Plan also delineates other goals including Student Success, Collaborative Decision-Making, Effective Resource Management, Assessment and Evaluation, Environmental Responsibility, Commitment to Innovation, Current Technology, and Diversity and Collaboration for the 2010-2015 time frame. These goals go beyond the scope of consolidating information technology support into one organizational unit. The ITC should report on the achievement of these goals as part of an ITC Annual Report or Program Review.

As part of implementing the IT Strategic Plan, ITC and the College must issue the College's IT Procurement policy describing the policy and process for procuring and replacing IT equipment.

The Technology Advisory Committee must review and update its charter to ensure that it is able to provide the necessary dialog between faculty, staff and the College’s Technology Support organization. It should be noted that the IT Strategic Plan includes a goal to establish a Technology Governance Group to help provide oversight or feedback to campus technology practice. Inasmuch as the Campus already has a formally established governance body for this purpose, the charter for the TAC needs to reflect its proper, intended role as a governance body for technology. [Technology Advisory Committee]

In accordance with the existing IT Strategic goals pertaining to implementing new technologies to improve and streamline classroom support, the College should implement virtualized classroom support, enabling faculty and students to benefit from 24 hour, 7 days per week access to course-related materials.
III.C.1.a. Technology services, professional support, facilities, hardware, and software are designed to enhance the operation and effectiveness of the institution.

Descriptive Summary

The College provides a wide range of technology services, facilities, and support including computer labs and classrooms, audiovisual services, advanced technology training, distance education, and technology to support student disabilities services.

As a result of the Campus reorganization, the Information Technology Center (ITC) is the single organizational unit responsible for providing campus-wide technology services, support, and maintaining facilities with appropriate audiovisual equipment and computer hardware and software. ITC maintains records of computer systems and loaded software. Software is either purchased directly for small orders or is acquired through UH software licensing agreements in large quantities.

The Pacific Center for Advanced Technology Training (PCATT) offers noncredit training in advanced technologies to support the needs of the local community. PCATT determines its technology needs based on evaluation results from customers and staff members. PCATT abides by the recommendations of UH’s Information Technology Services in its selection and use of application software, with some consideration to what similar offices at other community colleges in the UH system are using. [Interview with Rose Sumajit, Interim Director for PCATT - March 2, 2012]

Distance Education is offered through both Cable Television and online courses. Some Distance Education courses use both Cable Television and online technologies. The UH System has adopted the use of Sakai, an online open source learning management system, as a replacement for the previously used WebCT and Blackboard systems. The Sakai implementation in Hawaii has been locally named Laulima. Cable courses require students to be cable subscribers residing in areas that receive ‘Olelo, the public access station for higher education programs. Cable classes are offered on Channel 355 from the various islands’ (O‘ahu, Kaua‘i, Maui, Kona/Hawai‘i) cable providers. Cable telecourses are filmed and produced in the Education Technology center television studio, which includes video cameras, switches, wireless microphones and receivers, lighting system, and computers with special software. Specialized nonlinear digital editing software is used for post-production. The finished product is transmitted from the UH Manoa master control server ‘Olelo. For online classes, a student must have Internet access, experience with computer applications and e-mail, a UH e-mail account, and a current Web browser. This information is explained on the College’s Distance Education web site. [Distance Education; Distance Education Interview]

Student ACCESS provides equipment, resources, and services for students with visual, hearing, and reading disabilities. These include closed-circuit-television magnification systems, computers with assistive software, ergonomic and one-hand-use keyboards, large screen monitors, trackball mice, scanner, talking scientific calculator, Perkins Brailler, Pocket Talker Pro voice amplifier, sign language, and audio cassette recorders.
and players. Information about Student ACCESS services are posted on the Student ACCESS web page. Student ACCESS is identified as Disability Services on the Campus Reorganization chart. Its functions are not changed by the reorganization. [Student ACCESS]

Self Evaluation

The College meets the Standard.

Technology Support: The structure of technology support has been completely overhauled in response to the previous self-evaluation. The previous self-study found many inconsistencies and much confusion regarding which department was responsible for different aspects of technology support. Faculty and other users of technology support reported that they were not sure whom to contact for their specific technology needs, and unsure of the responsibilities of the different organizational units that provided technology support. The previous structure appeared to be unusual and unique to the College. This structure had evolved over time as the College’s computer and network needs developed and grew. The different services provided by Computer Services and ITC were very confusing to faculty and staff. [2006 Technology Resources Survey; 2006 Institutional Self Study Report in Support of Reaffirmation of Accreditation]

Subsequent surveys conducted by ITC in fall 2009 and spring 2011 echoed the dissatisfaction with the unclear organizational structure and inconsistent delivery of technology support. In order to address the results of the previous self-evaluation regarding technology services, and to provide a more clear, consistent and uniform approach for the end users of technology on the campus, HCC embarked on a complete structural overhaul of the various departments that provided technology support. This reorganization was a complex and well-planned response to the criticism of technology support found in the last self study. [ITC Fall 2009 Survey Results; ITC Spring 2011 Survey Results]

HCC hired an independent, outside consultant to evaluate how information technology was incorporated and used. Working with the consultant, HCC set out to develop a comprehensive information technology strategic plan. Developing the strategic plan was a large process with many involved. The goal of the process was to design a strategic technology plan that was: (1) aligned with the college’s mission, vision and culture, (2) tied to realistic assumptions about the future, and (3) lays out specific goals. The development of the strategic plan took place over the three month period from January 2011 to March 2011. It involved over 65 people from groups including: the Technology Task Force, faculty, staff, administrators and students. Three day-long planning sessions were held, along with 10 brown bag lunch sessions open to all interested parties. Six web conferences and discussion boards were also conducted.


In support of its mission, Honolulu Community College will provide a positive and robust
technology experience to students, faculty, staff and the larger community through careful planning and implementation. It will help them learn, teach, explore, collaborate, communicate and work effectively in a secure, accessible and dynamic environment. HCC will support technology training, innovation and exploration to enhance learning and the HCC experience via collaboration and sustainable practices.1

The result of these meetings was the formation of a comprehensive Information Technology Strategic Plan. One of the major initiatives to come from the strategic plan to address the previous issues regarding technology support is the creation of a central IT organization with a Chief Information Officer. This reorganization consolidates all information technology support under the Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs (VCAA), in one organizational unit thus eliminating the confusion over the overlapping responsibilities and services of different organizational units. [Information Technology Strategic Plan 2010-2015].

HCC has begun implementing the strategic plan goal of consolidating technology support under one organizational unit. Currently the ITC is the sole organizational unit responsible for supporting media (audiovisual) and information technology. Computer Services has been incorporated into the ITC. ITC has been relocated from PCATT to the VCAA, and is now headed by its own administrator. This reorganization streamlines, simplifies and clearly delineates the responsibilities regarding technology support.

As part of the reorganization the Educational Media Center has been relocated to the Design Center under the new Academic Support Division. The Design Center functions are focused on printing and graphics support, coordination and production of graphics, print, and audio-visual materials, media production, and support for HCC nonacademic website design and development including the official Internet site and the internal intranet site. [Executive Summary for the Reorganization Proposal Request University of Hawaii Honolulu Community College; Charts for Reorganization; Functional Statements for Reorganization]

With one technology support organization, the confusion regarding technology support providers should be eliminated. ITC is responsible for technology support. In efforts to further streamline and provide a single source for technology support needs, ITC has developed a Help Desk, with one phone number now provided for all support needs. Now, instead of wondering whom to call for technology support, faculty and staff can simply call the Help Desk at extension ‘333’. This provides one common channel for all support problems and questions, and greatly simplifies the process of getting the technology support users need. [ITC Help Desk Strategic Plan]

The development of a Help Desk for technology support was a significant undertaking. The Help Desk Strategic Plan was developed to describe the goals and strategic objectives of the newly formed Help Desk. The stated goals of the Help Desk that should greatly enhance technology support are: (1) to provide timely computer services for the

entire campus, (2) to incorporate continual improvement, (3) to build a knowledge base, and (4) to provide training to faculty and staff. For computer services, the Help Desk has stated goals of responding to 90% of technology requests within 24 hours, and 100% within two working days. [ITC Help Desk Strategic Plan]

The Interim CIO has been a visible communicator regarding the changes in information technology services due to the reorganization. Faculty and staff have been informed of the creation of the Help Desk for technology support. ITC personnel have given briefings about new developments, held open meetings for the faculty and staff and updated the hard copy phone directory page that lists the guidelines for whom to call for computer assistance. ITC has set up an online site for creating and submitting “Trouble Tickets” via the web, using an open source software product named GLPI. This software product is designed for use as a free IT and Asset Management software that includes an administration interface. [GLPI Description] The HCC ITC Support web site for entering trouble tickets is a secured site and requires an authorized username and password for access. A screen capture of the interface is provided for reference. [ITC GLPI Screen Capture] The ITC web site that previously included the ITC missions and objectives, in addition to other information, has been taken off-line temporarily to be updated and has not yet been restored to service.

The Interim CIO has been implementing several new technologies on campus, and regularly sends information regarding such changes directly to the end users. [ITC Email]

While ITC is now the sole department providing information technology support, some departments with classroom computer labs have their own technology liaisons to perform day-to-day maintenance, troubleshooting, installation, and equipment procurement. Technology liaisons include faculty or staff who accept these duties in addition to their primary responsibilities, as well as staff for whom this is a primary duty.

Based on the 2006 focus-group survey of classroom/program labs, the adequacy of hardware, software, and technical support varied between units. Some departments considered their hardware and software sufficient for course assignments, but others did not have adequate resources. [2006 Technology Focus Group Survey on Classroom Labs] As of spring 2012 semester, some of the academic units reporting technology labs, including computer labs and labs supporting other technologies, include: ICS, CENT AEC, COSM, CA. Some of these labs are directly supported by ITC and some are supported by the program. Other computer labs on campus, supported by ITC include: CSC, the Native Hawaiian Lab, and the Library.

Previously there was a disparity in the support received by classroom/program labs. Some labs such as those with their own APT position rated their support as excellent while others need much more assistance. In some cases, units were not able to provide services due to insufficient support. The current status of the adequacy of support for the various labs on campus is currently unknown. A new survey is needed to identify all of the technology labs on campus and to assess the adequacy of the level of support for all labs.
Two major issues related to technology support were reported through the 2006 Technology Focus Group Survey on classroom/program labs. The first issue identified a lack of technology support personnel specifically for programs that provide College-wide services. The most recent Program Reviews for two of the organizational units that previously reported inadequate technology support now reflect that the technology support issues seem to have been resolved. The most recent Program Review conducted by the CSC, now the Student Success Center, describes a Computer Purchase Replacement Plan developed based on consultation with their own IT specialist and Campus IT specialists. This Program Review also reported that electrical upgrades needed to support additional computer requirements had been completed pursuant to the previous year’s Program Review. The most recent Program Review for the Library reported that 17 computers are available for students to do research, write papers, and access the MyUH portal, Laulima and the Internet. Additionally, the Library has its own wireless network for students to access library resources and the Internet from their personal laptop computers. The Library indicated the need for additional funds to replace staff computers, printers, and to procure new ergonomic chairs for student computers. [Annual Program Review Report for College Skills Center, 2010-2011; Annual Program Review Report for Library, 2010-2011]

The second issue identified by the 2006 focus-group survey related to the fact that the College’s technical support is largely PC oriented. The concern was that there were no technical support personnel specializing in Macintosh computers, even though there were 150 Macintosh computers on campus. Some of the College’s programs are Macintosh based, and when problems occur, the programs had to hire an outside consultant, using the programs’ operating budget. [2006 Technology Resources Survey] According to the Interim CIO, ITC now requires that all new purchases of computers, whether PC or MAC, should include a minimum of a three year maintenance agreement. Because it is difficult to maintain MAC computers, it is more practical to obtain professional support from an authorized Apple service center than to provide in-house support. At the end of the original three-year maintenance agreement, a determination will be made regarding whether it is more cost effective to extend the maintenance agreement or to replace the equipment.

EMC, now the Design Center, has consistently completed program reviews including survey results of EMC services since the 2006 self-study. From the survey results provided, it is evident that personnel who have requested assistance from EMC are satisfied with EMC’s services. [Annual Program Review Report for Educational Media Center, 2010-2011; Comprehensive Review for Educational Media Center, 2004-2009]

Distance Education: Distance Education support is now provided by the Education Technology Center in the Academic Support Division. Distance Education assessment surveys have been performed each semester, except for Fall 2010 and Spring 2011, to assess Distance Education support. During the 2010-2011 academic year there was a different focus for assessment. The content of this survey is not specific to any particular course. The results of the Distance Education assessment surveys are posted on the HCC
Distance Education site. [Distance Education Assessment] The structure of this survey will be changed next year to reflect changes in services and technology. Distance Education will also be providing an electronic version of the standard course assessment survey instrument (Form G) used at HCC for online use. Until now, the course assessment form has only been available in hard copy. [Distance Education Interview]

**Actionable Improvement Plans**

ITC must complete a new survey to establish a complete inventory of technology labs on campus and determine the purpose of these labs, what type of equipment they provide, where they are located, and how they are currently supported and maintained.

Upon completion of the survey of campus labs, ITC should assess the adequacy of support for the labs identified, and recommend and implement corrective actions as needed. The results of this assessment and recommended corrective actions should be provided to the Campus as a report, ostensibly on the ITC web site, as part of ITC communication.

**III.C.1.b. The institution provides quality training in the effective application of its information technology to students and personnel.**

**Descriptive Summary**

The IT Computer Lab is the primary provider of IT training in support of Campus information technology services for students, faculty and staff. The Computer Lab offers beginning-level classes at the beginning of each fall and spring semester for a period of one to three weeks, depending on demand as indicated by registration for courses. Training is announced via email to faculty through the hcc-admin-announce mailing list, with the intention that faculty will post the information to make it available to students. The schedules for training sessions are posted and a sign up list is maintained outside the IT Computer Lab [Student Computer Lab Training Announcements]. This training is targeted toward students, but is also available to interested faculty and staff. The range of training offered during the past several years includes web browsers; the Google suite of applications including gmail, documents and calendars; Laulima, the online course ware used to support courses throughout the UH System; list servers; different versions of Microsoft applications including Excel, PowerPoint, and Word; the MyUH Portal web site used for registration, calendars, access to email, and access to Laulima; safe practices for browsing and computing; Thunderbird email; UH webmail, and training to move users of HCC email accounts to UH email accounts. The need for training is initially based on updates to existing software, migration to new software, or new software products that become widely used. Training for individuals and groups can also be requested, including training tailored to specific needs. The Computer Lab has not been performing training assessments, because the training is not intended as academic training, but agreed that user satisfaction surveys could be implemented as an assessment technique suitable to the intent of the training provided. [Student Computer Lab IT Training and telephone discussion with Kay Grimaldi on March 2, 2012]
The Native Hawaiian Center also provides a Computer Lab and related training that is available to students [Native Hawaiian Center Computer Lab]. According to the website, applications available include word processing, spreadsheets, databases, presentation software, streaming media players, graphics software, and web design software [Native Hawaiian Center Computer Lab Services]. The Native Hawaiian Center Technical Specialist provides software training workshops for a variety of applications. Based on email discussion with the Information Technology Specialist assigned to the Native Hawaiian Center who is currently providing the training, he bases the training on applications he knows will be useful for students. He uses an evaluation sheet at the end of each presentation to determine whether the participants are satisfied with the session. [Native Hawaiian Center IT Training]

The Faculty Development Committee maintains an extensive web site with relevant and useful information for faculty. The committee also surveys faculty each semester to determine their interests and desires for training. Not much response is received, and technology training has not been requested for quite some time. [IT Training – Faculty; Faculty Development Committee]

The Staff Development Committee (SDC) strives to provide a staff development program that will enhance the professional and personal talents, skills, and competency of Civil Service and APT employees. [Staff Development Council]. The SDC's process for training is not yet as well developed as the Faculty Development Committee's process and the SDC is attempting to establish a systematic process for identifying and obtaining training for Staff. The Committee performed a survey in May 2011 to identify training needs. Training for computer applications, software and products has been identified as a need, as well as learning more about navigating the recently revised College Intranet web site [Minutes, SSEC/SDC - October 12, 2011]. As part of the effort to build a process for providing training, the SDC held an All Staff meeting in July 2011 focused on this agenda item. A survey was used to collect feedback and comments from participating staff [APT, Civil Service, and Operations & Maintenance Meeting Evaluation Form - Friday, July 29, 2011 Session I]. The SDC also compiled an activity log from their records regarding the activities that have been requested and sponsored by the Staff Development Committee, including some technology related training items. [Staff Development Meeting & Activity Log as of 11/2/11] One of the issues that has been discussed and resolved as a result of this process has been availability of funds for professional development opportunities for staff. The relevant procedures have been discussed and clarified through various venues, including the Faculty Senate Executive Committee [Minutes, FSEC - September 2, 2011]. A frustration the SDC has encountered with respect to establishing a process for identifying and procuring training has been lack of participation and support by Human Resources personnel, who are essential to the success of any effort to provide sustainable professional development for staff. In addition to the training provided through the SDC, staff may also obtain training through their departments, which provides an additional source for funding for training. The SDC would like to see more training sponsored by the SDC as a means of clearly establishing the SDC as one way for staff to obtain funding support for professional
development. The SDC has not been emphasizing internal training, such as that provided by the IT Computer Lab, because of the current need for the Computer Lab staff to support other activities and the organizational changes related to the current Campus reorganization.

In addition to the training provided by the Computer Lab and the Native Hawaiian Center, the Pacific Center for Advanced Technology Training (PCATT) provides specialized training opportunities such as the Apple Summer Institute and IT Summit each year. PCATT also provides training for a wide variety of technologies including Cisco Networking, Red Hat Linux, SUSE Linux, UNIX, and others. These training opportunities are open for faculty and staff from all of the Community Colleges in the UH Community College System, including HCC faculty and staff. Opportunities such as the Apple Summer Institute and IT Summit are targeted toward the needs of educational users including Department of Education high schools and the UHCC campuses and provided with no charge. PCATT sponsored training, such as Cisco Networking, is available to faculty and staff from all community colleges for free on a space available basis. PCATT assesses the effectiveness of all training it provides by means of user satisfaction surveys at the completion of the training. The most recent PCATT Program Review, for the 2009-2010 academic year, illustrates the range of training options PCATT provides that are potentially available to interested faculty and staff of the Community Colleges in the UHCC System. [PCATT Program Review 2009-2010]

PCATT publishes a periodic catalog of the courses scheduled for the upcoming calendar quarter [PCATT Quarterly Catalog, Jan-Mar 2012]. The PCATT website also provides the schedule for current course offerings [PCATT Course Schedule].

As part of the Campus reorganization, the PCATT Director will also be assuming responsibility for Continuing Education at HCC, which consolidates the operational support for all noncredit training at HCC into one centralized location. The expectation is that this change will provide better support and coordination for Continuing Education for the College, and the opportunity to expand the types of noncredit offerings available. [Interview with Rose Sumajit, Interim Director for PCATT - March 2, 2012] The Continuing Education and Training web site provides additional information regarding the courses currently available. [Continuing Education and Training]

The Education Technology Center, in the Academic Support Division, plans, develops and delivers Distance Education support and other instructional media support. This support includes, among other things, training faculty in the use of instructional support media technologies. This training is delivered one-to-one and tailored to the interests and needs of the faculty. Distance Education assessment surveys are performed each semester to assess the support for Distance Education. The survey includes items allowing students to provide feedback regarding the technology support for Distance Education at HCC. The results of the Distance Education assessment surveys are posted on the HCC Distance Education site. The structure of this survey will be changed next year to reflect changes in services and technology. [Distance Education Assessment; Distance Education Interview]
Self Evaluation

The College meets the standard, but there are areas in which improvement is needed.

A wide range of technology training is provided by the Computer Lab and topics are determined based on the technologies and software currently being used by the campus, including updating the training as software is updated. Specialized training sessions are created to support new technology, such as training that was performed during fall 2011 semester to support the transition to Voice Over IP (VOIP) Technology and to orient users regarding how to use the telephone instruments that would be provided in the transition. The campus maintains records of attendance for such training, but has not performed customer satisfaction surveys to document how well the training meets the expectations of users.

The Native Hawaiian Center Computer Lab provides training of topics of potential interest to students and has participants complete user satisfaction surveys for this training.

The Faculty Development Committee has a structured process for soliciting faculty input for professional development training that is not used extensively. The Staff Development Council is attempting to develop a structured process for providing professional development training, including technology related training, and needs to continue that process with improved support from Human Resources.

The Pacific Center for Advanced Technology Training (PCATT) provides specialized technology training that is available to all faculty and staff on a space available basis. PCATT routinely administers user satisfaction surveys to assess their training.

The Education Technology Center provides support for Distance Education courses and the design and development of instructional media at HCC. Surveys that include items related to technology support are given each semester to assess the satisfaction of students taking Distance Education courses.

Actionable Improvement Plans

The ITC Computer Lab will implement user satisfaction surveys as a means of documenting the degree to which technology training meets the needs and expectations of users. This will provide evidence of the effectiveness of the training being provided to students, faculty and staff.

The SDC must continue its efforts to establish meaningful and effective process for staff to obtain relevant professional development training.

The College HR staff must participate and provide required support for professional development training through the SDC.
The new Design Center must work with College committees to ensure that the Intranet sites for each committee are updated in a timely manner. Currently, the Intranet sites for several committees include out-of-date information, or do not include up-to-date information such as current committee assignments and current minutes.

III.C.1.c. The institution systematically plans, acquires, maintains, and upgrades or replaces technology infrastructure and equipment to meet institutional needs.

**Descriptive Summary**

The new organizational structure of ITC provides a clear, working structure aimed at meeting systematic planning, acquisition, maintenance and support for the technical infrastructure of the campus. The implementation of this structure makes possible the establishment of overall technology goals which will drive technology maintenance, upgrade and change as educational needs change as a partial result of technologically driven change in the communities that we support. The following goals are framework for this change:

1. To deliver services within the ITC Service Catalog in a timely fashion, including the following:
   a) Plans, maintains, and procures computing and communications infrastructure.
   b) Provides network architecture and design expertise.
   c) Deploys and maintains networking equipment.
   d) Provides data center and server operational expertise.
   e) Deploys and maintains servers and distributed computer systems.
   f) Provides and maintains voice and video network services.
   g) Deploys and maintains virtual computing services.
   h) Provides computer, server, and network software services.
   i) Manages a campus-wide Call Center for students, faculty, and staff.
   j) Develops standards for mobile productivity.
   k) Develops and maintains information technology based educational support systems for classroom and online use.
   l) Implements mobile device standards on equipment.
   m) Provides classroom and lab computing, software and network support.
   n) Installs and maintains the telecommunications system in coordination with the system provider.
   o) Provides budgeting and procurement for all digital, data, network, voice, and video technology.

2. To continuously update the ITC Service Catalog so that campus IT needs are met.
3. To provide training for faculty/staff wishing to upgrade their computer technology skills.
4. To develop/maintain a base level of expertise that allows common problems to be solved by all ITC personnel.
5. To develop and migrate the Campus information architecture to a Virtual Desktop Infrastructure that allows any course to have an online component that is accessible with any computing device over the Internet. The first goal of extensive virtualization and centralized management and distribution of services, software, processing resources and
storage is to alleviate the need for continuous replacement and upgrade of computing hardware. The implementation of Virtual Desktop Infrastructure breaks the link between information processing hardware and actual information processing. This reduces the need to maintain thousands of (currently over 2,000 on campus) dedicated computers while allowing end users (faculty, staff, and ultimately students) to have complete control of their ever changing needs in information processing power and storage. An additional goal is to slowly blur the boundary between institutionally provided devices for display and control of data and personal devices. This must happen at the Campus in the same way as it is already happening throughout the networked society that is coming to dominate the planet.

6. All end user IT equipment will be evaluated and replaced based on the following criteria. The evaluation of existing equipment for replacement will be completed in two ways: a) Existing equipment will be monitored via GLPI, our new equipment inventory, incident, and request system. [GLPI Description; GLPI Screen Capture] This will provide data on problem reports and age. Replacement decisions will made from that data. b) New equipment will be purchased with three year service contracts. Items will be replaced based on the proportion cost of service contract renewal against equipment replacement. If service contract renewal is greater than 50% of the replacement cost or is unavailable for the item the equipment will be replaced. The procurement policy for IT will be issued as a new policy by the Chancellor.

**Self Evaluation**

The College partially meets the standard.

Previous decentralized and unmanaged purchasing of technology by departments and programs produced extensive waste and, often, the purchase of inadequate or inappropriate technology to meet educational needs. In addition the lack of centralized planning did not allow the development of innovative goals in overall campus technological development. This is now being clearly addressed and corrected with effective goals and strategies.

**Actionable Improvement Plans**

The College must fully implement the ITC Service Catalog described above and Strategic Objectives to ensure timely delivery of services. [ITC Strategic Objectives]

In accordance with the existing IT Strategic Plan goals pertaining to implementing new technologies to improve and streamline classroom support, the College should implement virtualized classroom support, enabling faculty and students to benefit from 24 hour, 2 days per week access to course-related materials. [Help Desk Strategic Plan]

**III.C.1.d. The distribution and utilization of technology resources support the development, maintenance, and enhancement of its programs and services.**

**Descriptive Summary**
The centralization of all IT helpdesk, operations, planning and acquisition under ITC allows effective and expanded support for all educational programs and campus services. This improvement is based on the following changes:

1. Previously the establishment of specialized computer labs or classroom services were handled by faculty or one to two assigned technical staff with no coordination, the new model provides up to fourteen full time technical staff who can be assigned to projects or problems campus wide.

2. Maintenance has been a major problem with poor utilization of technical staff positions. This resulted in some programs being overstaffed for technical support while other programs and faculty in general were understaffed. This is now being corrected with a new centralized Call Center and web based inventory, incident tracking and request tracking system (see below). This allows assignment of nearly forty technicians, including student help, interns, and part time staff who can be assigned to projects or problem incidents to provide faster response to and resolution of reported problems.

3. Implementation of the GLPI open source inventory tracking, incident and request reporting system with intranet based direct web access for faculty and staff will provide a centralized management system providing extensive reporting and permanent records of all IT purchased hardware, software, incidents and history. This will allow data driven management decisions on specific system sustainability, performance and utilization. This will also allow efficient reallocation of hardware and system resources that become underutilized in their original environment but may be used for new projects and programs in other departments. [GLPI Description; GLPI Screen Capture]

4. Centralized purchasing of IT resources including telecom and security appliances is designed to provide direct support to departments and programs in acquiring IT technology to meet educational goals. Proposed purchasing policy changes require all IT related procurement to begin with ITC consultation on goals, objectives, and necessary specifications for the desired educational result. This will prevent the purchase, from college general funds or grant monies, of inappropriate or poorly performing technical resources due to lack of knowledge of the rapidly changing IT infrastructure market. And, as previously stated, this also allows internal college reallocation of existing resources that may be available for new uses. It should be noted that determining academic improvement goals and requirements occurs in the program review and budget request process, which precedes the procurement phase. So, the ITC consultation described here would normally occur after the budgeting process has been completed while the program is preparing to submit purchase orders for procurement.

5. A significant component of new IT resources for the Campus is planned to be provided by virtualized IT systems and hardware. Virtualization technology is transforming all elements of the IT world by removing the link between data processing power and specific pieces of computer hardware. This has a range of very positive benefits for campus utilization of technology resources for educational programs. The primary and basic difference is in the efficiency of IT infrastructure. The standard campus (or business) server and almost all desktop computers normally operate at approximately 10% of capacity. This is not only wasteful but the unused capacity is not available to anyone else or at any other location. Physical systems in virtualized data centers operate at approximately 80% capacity and can create virtual machines, either
servers or virtual desktops, at any location with Internet connectivity to the campus virtual data center. For educational programs this allows provisioning fully-managed, personal virtual desktops for all faculty, staff and students. These are secure as they are actually stored in a fully protected data center and not on distributed machines that may be moved to any location on or off campus and may be stolen at any time. User files and content are always safe and under the control of the college IT staff preventing disastrous loss of department, program, faculty or student data. And the dog cannot eat a virtual report.

6. The evolving IT infrastructure being implemented on this campus will allow a new freedom to move the educational process of our departments and programs to an integrated physical and virtual reality. Specific options include the creation of extensive virtual environments for specific disciplines to allow project-based learning without the need to worry about expensive and quickly outdated hardware. For comprehensive community colleges offering a wide variety of technical programs, this will allow the expansion of engineering and technical simulations that can become increasingly realistic with efficient and scalable technical infrastructure common to all departments and programs. In addition, virtualized desktops for students in specific programs can be displayed on any Internet connected device creating a permanent virtual classroom environment for the duration of enrollment in the program or college. This will tremendously enhance the ability to work with new groups in target communities previously under served by the college. ITC is involved in pursuit of grants specifically targeting this development in line with College and System goals and objectives.

Self Evaluation

The College partially meets the standard.

The college has struggled with appropriate and effective technology utilization. The biological evolution of IT infrastructure in different parts of the college system could not and did not create effective technology for education. There are a number of areas that have been specifically identified as clearly inadequate:

1. Classroom technology has created a large number of classrooms with video, projectors, smart boards, Elmos and other devices but without a consolidated plan of purchase or implementation. This has resulted in differences from classroom to classroom making it very difficult for faculty to move comfortably from classroom to classroom with confidence in the technology that will be available. This needs to be corrected to make it possible to train faculty to use standard classroom technology while providing a consistent upgrade policy. Interviews suggest a significant number of faculty do not use classroom technology due to unfamiliarity with equipment in the different classrooms to which they may be assigned.

2. Unused technology stored in various rooms and classrooms around campus indicates the failure of the previous purchasing policy. This has been exacerbated by open purchasing policies which attempted to control manufacturer and model for desktop computers and laptops but which were ignored easily by departmental approval of other manufacturers and models of equipment. This has created a legacy of unhappiness among support staff, who could not support equipment that had been purchased.
**Actionable Improvement Plans**

The College must fully implement the ITC Service Catalog and Strategic Objectives to ensure timely delivery of services. [ITC Services Catalog; ITC Strategic Objectives]

ITC must complete implementation of new IT purchasing policy in line with the goals listed above to achieve improved technology utilization and effectiveness for all disciplines, programs and departments.

In accordance with the existing IT Strategic Plan goals pertaining to implementing new technologies to improve and streamline classroom support, the College should implement virtualized classroom support, enabling faculty and students to benefit from 24 hour, 2 days per week access to course-related materials. Implementation of the IT hardware virtualization plan as part of the ITC reorganization will open technology resources to all campus faculty as workable option. This will also encourage the development of completely new programs to utilize IT technology to achieve campus educational goals. The active collaboration of departments and programs with a centralized ITC organization allow both assessment and continuous data driven analysis of the effectiveness of these tools.

**III.C.2. Technology planning is integrated with institutional planning. The institution systematically assesses the effective use of technology resources and uses the results of evaluation as the basis for improvement.**

**Descriptive Summary**

The HCC Policy document on Integrated Planning, Resource Allocation, and Assessment, HCCP 4.101 [Integrated Planning, Resource Allocation, and Assessment - HCCP # 4.101] formally establishes an integrated planning, budgeting, and assessment process for the campus. Some components of the process, such as the Implementation Plan, have been renamed to eliminate duplication and possible confusion between similar names. This policy provides a high-level description of the planning and budgeting process for the campus, including an example of the Implementation Plan document and a flow chart illustrating the Annual Budget Development process.

Instructional programs and academic support units perform Annual Program Reviews to assess performance relative to the UHCC System performance indicators. Comprehensive Program Reviews are completed at least once every five years to assess performance over several years [Review of Established Programs - HCCP # 5.202]. The UH Community College System has implemented a system wide web site for programs and student support services units at all Community Colleges to prepare and submit annual program review reports [UHCC Annual Report of Program Data (ARPD)]. This site was first used for reports by the College's instructional programs in 2010. In 2011,
the Student Services annual program review report has also been included on this site. The Honolulu College finalized executive summaries and reports for academic year 2011-2012 have been released for public viewing.

Of the assessment reports currently posted for academic year 2011-2012, several programs identify needs for technology-related resources including Architectural Engineering & CAD (AEC); Auto Body Repair and Painting (ABRP); Computing, Electronics, and Networking Technology (CENT); Cosmetology (COSM); Early Childhood Education (ECE); Electrical Installation and Maintenance Technology (EIMT); Fashion Technology (FT); Human Services (HSER); Refrigeration & Air Conditioning Technology (RAC); Sheet Metal and Plastics (SMP); and Welding Technology (WELD).

Annual Assessment Reports from years preceding the establishment of the system wide ARPD site are posted on the HCC Intranet web site [Program Review]. Reports posted on this site include Student Services reports for years prior to and including academic year 2009-2010; assessment reports for academic support units including Apprenticeship, College Skills Center, EMC, and the Library for years prior to and including academic year 2010-2011; and assessment reports for instructional programs and other support units such as PCATT for years prior to and including academic year 2008-2009.

The assessment reports posted for academic year 2010-2011 includes reports by the Apprenticeship program, College Skills Center, EMC, and the Library. The College Skills Center and EMC both included results of assessment surveys performed for their services. Both the College Skills Center and the Library included action plans that identified needs for technology resource improvements. The EMC report did not provide an Action Plan. The Apprenticeship report included an action plan that indicated a need for updating equipment, which includes technology resources related to the hard trades supported by Apprenticeship.

For the current year, each organizational division has generated budget requests for fiscal year 2013 based on the items identified in the current annual program review reports. The majority, but not all, of the budget requests have been posted on the Campus intranet web site for review by the members of the governance committees that have been ranking the requests. The reason that some budget proposals are not posted is because not all of the proposals were available at the time the VCAS made the information available for publication and the page has not been updated since the initial posting. This is the first year that this budget request form has been used. The form itself is comprehensive and designed to include review and comment by entities affected by the budget proposal. [Planning Council Budget Information]

Once the budget requests have been submitted, the College budget review process calls for the budget requests to be ranked by various governance committees including the Faculty Senate Executive Committee (FSEC), Staff Senate Executive Committee (SSEC), and Planning Council (PC). The FSEC has posted data related to the first round of the ranking process of these requests [FSEC Budget Rankings - February 24, 2012].
Upon completion of rankings by these governance committees, the Planning Council will review the rankings and provide recommendations to the Chancellor regarding funding priorities. The Chancellor makes the final determination regarding funding priorities. If the Chancellor's decision is different from the recommendations of the Planning Council, the Chancellor must provide a written explanation for the changes made.

**Self Evaluation**

The College partially meets the Standard.

There is an established budgeting and planning process that integrates technology resource planning with institutional planning. The budget process has also been modified to ensure that the needs identified through the program review process are being ranked and prioritized for expenditure of campus funds.

The budget process is evolving on a year-to-year basis. There are some concerns about the budget process, based on this year's progress, that reflect the unfinished nature of this developing process. As an example, the budget requests for the Tech II Division were assembled by the Tech II Dean. Instead of creating one budget request for each item identified on the program review reports for Tech II, the Dean chose to bundle multiple items together. Consequently, only 10 budget requests were submitted for Tech II as compared to 22 budget requests for Tech I. The Tech I Dean also prepared the budget requests on behalf of the Tech I programs. The instructions provided by the VCAS to the governance committees for ranking were that no more than 1/3 of the budget requests could be ranked as high priority, and the remaining items were to be split between rankings of medium priority and low priority. The ramification of bundling the budget requests, as the Tech II Dean did, is that the governance committees then could not rank each item individually based on need/importance. As an example, the sole budget item for the MELE program (TII-10) included funding for positions as well as operating budget. In order to give a high ranking to one part of the budget request, the entire budget request had to be ranked high. The end result of this bundling was that it was not possible to rank the individual requests independently.

A related concern about the process for submitting budget requests is that the program or organizational unit submitting the request has no place to identify its own ranking for the priority of the item. As a result, neither the Administrative Reviewers nor the governing bodies performing the ranking know how important the request is to the affected program. Consequently, there is nothing in the ranking process, as currently defined, that verifies the overall ranking obtained through the review process corresponds to the internal priorities of the program or department that is requesting the funding.

Another example of a problem with this year's budget process is budget request TII-5, a request for classroom computers for the CENT program in Tech II. On this particular budget request, the review comment from the Vice Chancellor for Administrative Services (VCAS) was "Difficult to comment on without Academic side comment. Also,
purchases such as this were determined to go through TUAG. TUAG has not provided feedback on process, criteria, etc. to determine pc acquisition."

This comment is a problem because the TUAG does not currently exist, the TUAG was not a governance committee with this kind of review authority, and the Proposed Workstation Replacement Policy the TUAG developed specifically noted that not all computers would be part of the proposed replacement pool and some programs, such as CENT, would conceivably continue to procure and install their own computers. The TUAG proposed policy does reference a central IT management authority, presumably ITC. There is nothing in the Proposed Workstation Replacement Policy that relates to the process for budget requests and ranking such requests for allocation of budget funds. [TUAG Proposed Workstation Replacement Policy]

What also remains unclear, is how systematically the College assesses the effectiveness of the use of its technology resources, and how effective the integrated planning process is with respect to providing support to those instructional programs and academic support units that have identified technology resources related needs. Some programs report in their annual reviews that they have received funding for resources and whether they have carryover items from previous years, but not all programs appear to be consistently reporting regarding their success in obtaining the funding requested from the previous year.

A possible way to assess the effectiveness of the use of technology resources could be (ITC) establishing a comprehensive inventory of the technology resources on campus, and performing surveys to determine to what extent various resources are being used. For resources that are used infrequently, or not used at all, determine the reasons for infrequent use. Possible reasons for infrequent use might be that faculty do not know how to use the resource, faculty don't know how the resource might be useful in their courses, or even that the resource has fallen into disuse because it no longer fits the curriculum. The data collected by such a survey could also be used to establish benchmarks to be used for identifying resource utilization levels as high, moderate, or low. The benchmarks and utilization levels could be used for long term tracking and evaluation of the effectiveness of resource utilization.

A possible way to assess how effectively the planning process is providing support to programs or units that have identified technology resource related needs would be to perform an audit of program reviews and budget requests each year to determine what percentage of items identified through program reviews, and subsequently submitted as budget requests, were funded. For items that were funded, check with the programs to verify they received the funds and were able to procure the requested technology. For items that were not funded, examine the program reviews and budget requests for following years to determine whether the needs were still being reported by the program as a continuing need and whether new budget requests were submitted, or whether the previous year's budget requests were carried over. Additionally, surveying programs to find out whether they were successful in getting their highest priority items funded would provide feedback regarding the satisfaction of the programs with the funding process.
**Actionable Improvement Plans**

All support units should perform annual reviews and provide annual reports that include Action Plans and discussion of areas or plans for improvement, including technology needs when appropriate.

Annual program review reports for instructional units should report on success in obtaining funding for procurement items identified on the previous year's review report, so it is possible to clearly identify which needs have been fulfilled and which have not. The HCC Intranet website, as a minimum, should provide a single location that provides links to ALL program review reports, including the reports posted on the Intranet, the reports posted on the UHCC System ARPD website, and reports for any units that might also post their reports at separate locations. Access to these reports is currently fragmented and not particularly helpful.

The ITC should provide a comprehensive annual report on the status of Information Technology support at the College, including technology upgrades and improvements accomplished as well as continuing plans for technology upgrades and improvements. These reports should include a status report on the identification and fulfillment of technology needs of instructional programs and academic support units, if appropriate.

The budget request form should include an indication of the originating program's priority ranking (high, medium or low or a relative ranking number) for each request, as a means of ensuring that the governing bodies know how the programs internally rank their own requests.

Budget requests should be initiated by the originating program or organizational unit, so that each program is able to indicate its own priority (high, medium, low or a relative ranking number) for each request. Once the program has initiated the budget request, the divisional dean may assist in completing any additional information that might be needed, such as identification of other programs affected.

The review process for budget requests needs to provide sufficient information to governance bodies, such as the FSEC, SSEC, Kupa Ku Wai (KKW), ASUH, and the Planning Council, so they are able to understand and evaluate the requests being reviewed and ranked for distribution of funds. The information that should be available to the governing bodies include the program or unit annual program review and the budget request forms, including the originator's own ranking for the priority of the item.

Governing bodies should NOT rank budget requests for which they have not received sufficient information for the purposes of ranking. They should indicate the item was not ranked because insufficient supporting information was provided.
Administration should provide annual reports detailing actual distribution of funds in response to the annual program review and budget review process, so it's easy to determine which budget requests were funded and which were not.

Administration should assess the effectiveness of the budget process in meeting the needs of programs through the use of surveys to determine the degree to which programs and organizational units are satisfied that they were able to obtain funding for their most important requests through the annual budget process. As an additional measure of effectiveness, administration could audit and report on the outcomes of the budget process with regard to reporting the percentage of items that were funded according to organizational unit.

ITC and responsible programs should develop a comprehensive inventory of technology resources. Such an inventory might be initiated by using a survey of programs and organizational units to identify where the resources are located.

ITC should assess the usage of technology resources to determine how frequently such resources are being used. This might be included as part of an initial survey, as suggested above, to identify the resources and their location. Another option might be to perform usage assessment surveys incrementally based by location and the expected users based on the location of the resources.
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**III.D: Financial Resources**

**III.D. Financial resources are sufficient to support student learning programs and services and to improve institutional effectiveness. The distribution of resources supports the development, maintenance, and enhancement of programs and services. The institution plans and manages its financial affairs with integrity and in a manner that ensures financial stability. The level of financial resources provides a reasonable expectation of both short-term and long-term financial solvency. Financial resources planning are integrated with institutional planning.**

**Descriptive Summary**

The University of Hawai’i’s annual operating budget cycle is based on the State of Hawai’i fiscal year, which is July 1, 20XX to June 30, 20XX. The University of Hawaii including Honolulu Community College is able to augment its general funds on an annual basis. This budgeting process is accomplished by either requesting funds from the State of Hawaii Legislature on a Biennium period (two fiscal years) or on a Supplemental period (2nd fiscal year of the Biennium period). The Biennium Budget Request is considered to be the primary method of augmenting each unit’s general funds base.

The annual operating budget of the College primarily consists of general funds, and tuition and fees collected from students for classes. The general funds are static year to year unless reduced by legislative action. Generally, general funds account for approximately 80% of our annual operating budget. Tuition and fees account for the other 20% of the budget. During the period, July 1, 2008 to June 30, 2010, the general funds budget decreased from $22,199,957 (319.00 FTE) to $20,447,581 (323.00 FTE). This decrease is due to the economic condition of our State and Nation. However, during the same period, tuition and fees collection increased from $4.3 million to $6.4 million. This increase is attributable to increased student enrollment and increase in the per credit rate. The College received Enrollment Growth Funds (EGF) from the Vice President for Community Colleges to address its increasing enrollment. The College received $105,375, net in FY 2010 and allocated $175,260, net in FY 2011 in EGF. Furthermore, to offset the FY 2010 general funds Executive restriction of $2.5 million, the College received temporary American Recovery and Reinvestment Act (ARRA) funding of $ 1.3 million (FY 2010) and $ 1.1 million (FY2011). The ARRA funds were used to augment lectureship costs and support the implementation of the College’s Strategic Initiatives, such as enrollment growth, equipment replacement, expanding Financial Aid, Improving Developmental Education, and Achieving the Dream. The total amount allocated in FY 2011 was $397,016(FY 2011 General Fund and Tuition and Fees Special Funds Allocation-Final). The ARRA funds lapsed at the end of FY 2011, however, the University and the Community Colleges were successful in obtaining general funds in the FB 2011-13 Budget Requests from the 2011 Legislature to replace the ARRA funds. These replacement funds were allocated to the Vice President for Community Colleges. It was agreed by the Community College Chancellors that these funds would be allocated to the campuses based on meeting performance based goals and funding implementation plans which would address the College’s Strategic Initiatives.
For FY 2012, the College was allocated $418,530 ($516,704 maximum) based on meeting performance-based goals in FY 2011. The College received $397,016 in FY 2011 to meet its Strategic Initiatives and expects to equal or exceed this amount in FY 2012. Moreover, the College is receiving Carl Perkins funding on an annual basis to improve its Career and Technical Education Programs. During the periods FY 2010 to FY 2011, the College was able to maintain its existing programs and also reallocate funds to start up a new program Music and Entertainment Learning Experience (MELE) with funds it generated and/or was appropriated. Furthermore, the College was able to fund (approximately $250,000) the redesign of its remedial English and Math Programs. The College also has the financial resources to address emergency situations such as budget shortfalls, equipment replacement and facilities repairs. These resources are due to the prudent management of the College assets as demonstrated by its excess reserve funds. Excess reserve funds are funds in excess of the Community College’s Reserve Policy. The College had $398,000 in FY 2009, $1.2 million in FY 2010 and $2.0 million (UHCC Reserve Status Report-Unrestricted Funds {General, Special Revolving} Excluding Dormitory/Student Activities) in FY 2011. Furthermore, the Community College’s tuition rates were increased for periods FY 2013 to FY 2017 to address the issues of increased costs to delivery education. These tuition rates were approved by the UH BOR on October 26, 2011 [UH Systemwide Administrative Procedures E6.201 Tuition Schedules, 2012–2013 through 2016–2017].

The College’s budgeting process focuses on Long Range Strategic Planning Goals, the development of implementation strategies to achieve the strategic goals, the development of resource requirements to fund the implementation strategies and the annual assessment of the implementation strategies to determine validity of the implementation strategy and make the necessary adjustments. The College’s Annual Operating Budget consists of:

1. Achievement of Strategic Plan outcomes based on implementation strategies.
2. Program improvement activities based on annual program review/assessment.
3. Additional operating requirements, such as health and safety, enrollment growth, need for additional space, emergency repairs and maintenance, etc.
4. The Current Service budget to maintain the College’s existing programs and services.

The College annually reviews its budgetary needs to support its current instructional and non-instructional programs and support services. This review process is based on reviews among the various Vice Chancellors, Deans and Directors, Division Chairs, Program Coordinators, and the Campus Leadership Team.

The College is continuously reviewing and adjusting its 5-year budgetary plan that ends FY 2015 to meet strategic goals and ensure financial stability. This review process insures that the College has sufficient funds to implement both short-term and long-range institutional plans. The College also relies on the State’s BJ [Budget Journal] Tables, which provides both historical and long range planning by position numbers, other operating costs and equipment. Furthermore, the Community College’s System Office provides managerial financial information (Budget Level Summary) which allows the College’s administrators to make sound financial decisions based on overall amounts. Moreover, College utilizes its Long Range Development Plan (LRDP) to guide the
development and expansion of its facilities to meet programmatic requirements. This 30-year plan is approved by the BOR and is required for all Capital Improvement Projects (CIP) submitted to the Legislature. Furthermore, this plan provides budgetary information to plan long range funding needs for CIP projects. [Minutes, Board of Regents Meeting, March 17, 2011]

III.D.1. The institution relies upon its mission and goals as the foundation for financial planning.

III.D.1.a. Financial planning is integrated with and supports all institutional planning.

Descriptive Summary

The three primary components of the yearlong fiscal planning process include a review of the Strategic Plan, including mission and goals, a review of program effectiveness (formerly using Program Performance Health Indicators, or PHI), and ultimately finalizing the budget request for submission. The annual review of program effectiveness is currently being modified to change the indicators and assessments recorded during the review process. The new review process is identified as an Annual Assessment of program effectiveness. Honolulu Community College uses the Annual Assessment process to set goals for program improvement and identify changes necessary to accomplish those goals. The goals for achievement identified through the annual review processes are incorporated into the budget planning process.

Approximately 77% of the College budget request is for personnel costs. The remainder of the budget covers operating costs of the College. The College establishes budget priorities for new initiatives based on the strategic plans for the College, the University of Hawai‘i Community College System, and the University of Hawai‘i System; initiatives and priorities identified within the local community; and through the Program Review and Annual Assessment process. Additionally, the governing bodies of the Planning Council (PC), the Faculty Senate Executive Committee (FSEC), the Staff Senate Executive Committee (SSEC), the Kupa Ka Wai Council (KKW) and the Associated Students of University of Hawaii – Honolulu Community College (ASUH-HCC) are tasked to make recommendations regarding campus priorities for new initiatives. Based on the recommendations submitted by these governing bodies, the Chancellor and his Administrative Staff determine the final campus prioritization. After the local campus priorities have been determined, the budget is submitted to the University of Hawai‘i Community College System. The Chancellors of the Community Colleges then determine relative priorities for the entire budget initiatives submitted from the seven Community Colleges.

The financial planning process is based on the institutional planning documents, including the Strategic Plans for the University of Hawai‘i System, the University of Hawai‘i Community Colleges, and Honolulu Community College, the Long Range Development Plan (LRDP), Program Review and Annual Assessment. All CIP budget requests submitted to the University of Hawai‘i Board of Regents must be supported by
the LRDP, otherwise the request will not be approved by the Board. The financial planning process for existing programs also incorporates results of Annual Assessments of program effectiveness to determine budget priorities.

At times external factors may dictate the College not following the prescribed planning process. These short notice requirements may affect annual budget priorities. The College leadership consistently receives up-to-date information about fiscal planning and is directly involved in both institutional planning and fiscal planning and is well aware of the links between fiscal planning and institutional planning. [Integrated Planning, Resource Allocation, and Assessment - HCCP # 4.101]

**Self Evaluation**

The College meets the standard.

Honolulu Community College uses the Annual Assessment and Program Review processes to set goals for program improvement and identify changes necessary to accomplish those goals. On March 3, 2009 the Planning Council approved a set of criteria for all budget requests. These criteria require all Divisions/Departments/Units to demonstrate the need for all budget requests through their respective Program Reviews or current accreditation standards. In addition, these requests must be clearly aligned with the college’s Strategic Plan and Mission. [Criteria for Budget Requests & Proposals]

In March of 2010 the Chancellor informed the College that setting priorities for the budget items shall be the joint responsibility of the Planning Council, the Faculty Senate Executive Committee (FSEC), the Staff Senate Executive Committee (SSEC), the Kupu Ka Wai Council (KKW) and the Associated Students of University of Hawaii-Honolulu Community College (ASUH-HCC). These priorities are set into the college’s Biennium Budget, which is then presented to the Vice President of Community Colleges, the President of the University, and the Board of Regents.

The process, however, was not strictly followed. Most, if not all 2012-13 budget items did not have the initial proposal forms linking them to the College’s and the System’s Strategic Goals. The Interim Vice-Chancellor of Administrative Services has stated that the list of budget items was created by the Administration and presented to the governance bodies for review and prioritization. However, for the 2013-14 budget, the process is being followed with all items being linked to the College’s Strategic Goals.

**Actionable Improvement Plans**

The Chancellor and Vice-Chancellors of the College must strictly enforce the planning and budget guidelines that have been established.

*III.D.1.b. Institutional planning reflects realistic assessment of financial resource availability, development of financial resources, partnerships, and expenditure requirements.*
Descriptive Summary

The Vice-Chancellor of Administrative Services (VCAS) provides up-to-date information about funding and budgets to the Governing Bodies, who work together to determine the priorities and allocations for budget resources. Additionally, the University of Hawai`i Financial Management Information System (FMIS) provides electronic access to up-to-date information about available funds which is readily available to the respective bodies. Funding needs are identified by programs in their Program Review submittals and/or Implementation Plans to meet the College’s Strategic Goals. Alternate funding avenues are also taken into consideration prior to identifying and prioritizing funding for program needs, which would allow the reallocation of budgeted funds to other areas of need. An example of this would be the MELE programs funding donation from Mike Curb. After funding requests are prioritized by the Governing Bodies, the Budget Planning Committee of the Planning Council collectively review the priorities and make funding allocations based on the budget amounts provided by the VCAS and the relative needs justified by the respective programs. All priorities for funding are based on impact of student learning and/or institutional needs for non-academic units. Funding priorities are described by the LRDP, Strategic Plans, and Implementation Plan to meet Strategic Goals, Annual Assessment and Program Review. The Planning Council (PC) annually reviews these budgetary and programmatic requests based on a five year budgetary plan that ends FY 2015 in order to assess financial resource availability to meet both short term and long term academic goals. This five year plan shows both resource and expenditure requirements. PC recommends the budget to the Chancellor. The Chancellor approves the budget.

Self- Evaluation

The College meets the standard.

The College continues the implementation of Annual Assessment Program Review processes to set goals for program improvement and to identify changes needed to achieve these goals. Furthermore, the College is continuously reviewing and assessing the Implementation Plan to meet Strategic Goals in order to meet academic goals of the University. The PC approved a set of criteria for all budget requests. These criteria require that all Divisions/Departments/Units demonstrate the need for all budget requests through their respective Program Review or current accreditation standards. Additionally, requests must be clearly aligned with the College’s Strategic Plan and Mission. Priorities for budget items are the joint responsibility of the Planning Council (PC), the Faculty Senate Executive Committee (FSEC), the Staff Senate Executive Committee (SSEC), the Kupu Ka Wai Council (KKW), and the Associated Students of University of Hawaii-Honolulu Community College (ASUH-HCC). These priorities are set into the College’s Biennium or Supplemental Budget, which is recommended by the Vice President of Community Colleges and the President of the University, and then approved by the Board of Regents.
Actionable Improvement Plans

No action is required.

III.D.1.c. When making short-range financial plans, the institution considers its long-range financial priorities to assure financial stability. The institution clearly identifies and plans for payment of liabilities and future obligations.

Descriptive Summary

Biennial budget requests and annual supplemental requests clearly reflect the priorities established by the system’s Strategic Plans, Long Range Development Plan (LRDP) and Program Reviews and Annual Assessments. The continued prioritization of the Annual Budget and Capital Improvements reflect this. Furthermore, the College utilizes a five year resource and expenditure plan to determine whether or not funding should be allocated.

An example of planning was the execution of a long term facilities lease for the College’s AERO program was not initiated until funds were allocated by the State of Hawaii Legislature in 2007. This long term lease is for the period July 1, 1998 to June 30, 2030 at an annual cost of approximately $52,000. All costs are paid when incurred, or existing funds are reallocated to reconcile the debt. Employee benefits, such as long-term retirement benefits, are funded by the State of Hawaii.

The Community College System has a Cash Reserve Policy, which requires all its Colleges’ to maintain a cash reserve that meets ACCJC requirements for financial stability. Honolulu Community College has cash reserves in excess of the 5% requirement of ACCJC.

Self-Evaluation

The College meets the standard.

The college pays all obligations when due or will request for general funds from the Hawaii State Legislature. Funding for authorized positions is approved by the State Legislature; unfilled positions cannot be filled without sufficient funding and programmatic needs. Additionally, funding for authorized salaries and wages are provided by the State’s legislatively appropriated budgets including long-term retirement benefits for general funded employees which are paid for by the State of Hawaii. The UH system is self-insured and the UH Community College System maintains adequate cash reserves for emergency situations.

Actionable Improvement Plans

No action is required.
III.D.1.d. The institution clearly defines and follows its guidelines and processes for financial planning and budget.

**Descriptive Summary**

The College has established procedures for financial planning and budget development. The members of the College have the opportunity to participate in the process through their departments and division representatives on the leadership councils. There is continuous assessment throughout the process. The process for financial planning and budget are communicated to the college from the administration to the college leadership groups including the Planning Council (PC), the Faculty Senate Executive Council (FSEC), the Staff Senate Executive Council (SSEC), the Kupu Ka Wai Council (KKW) and the Associated Students of University of Hawaii – Honolulu Community College (ASUH-HCC) Meetings are held by these groups with their respective constituencies to share this information and obtain feedback. Information of this process is posted on the College’s Intranet.

There is an established process and timeline for developing the college’s annual and long range budget planning. In 2011 the college adopted an operational model that integrates strategic planning, implementation strategies, resource requirements and assessment.

**Self Evaluation**

The College meets the Standard.

The results of the HCC Accreditation Self-Study Spring 2012 found that over 50% of the respondents agreed with the statement “I understand how budget and resource allocations are made at this campus.” Additionally, 46% of those surveyed agreed with the statement “I have the opportunity to provide input to budget and resource allocation processes at this campus.”  [Accreditation Self-Study Spring 2012 Executive Summary]

**Actionable Improvement Plans**

The College should continue to improve communication with the campus community regarding the budget and financial planning process.

**III.D.2. to assure the financial integrity of the institution and responsible use of financial resources, the financial management system has appropriate control mechanisms and widely disseminates dependable and timely information for sound financial decision-making.**

**III.D.2.a. Financial documents, including the budget and independent audits, reflect appropriate allocation and use of financial resources to support student learning programs and services. Institutional responses to external audit findings are comprehensive, timely, and communicated appropriately.**
Descriptive Summary

The budget shows that funds are allocated in a manner intended to realistically achieve the institution’s stated goals for student learning. Audits of financial statements within the University of Hawai`i System have traditionally been done on a system-wide basis. Consequently, there have previously been no audits of the financial statements for the individual campuses. As of July 21, 2005, ACCJC/WASC has agreed to accept, for a period of two years, a modified audit method that will append the consolidated financial statements for the community college system to the University of Hawaii consolidated financial statements in the annual audits. The ACCJC/WASC has continued to accept this modified audit. The A133 Financial and Compliance audits of Federal funds, also performed on a system-wide basis, include findings for individual campuses. The College has received findings in these audits and has responded to all audit findings.

Self Evaluation

The College meets the Standard.

Actionable Improvement Plans

No action is required.

III.D.2.b. Appropriate financial information is provided throughout the institution.

Descriptive Summary

A cycle of planning has been established and consists of an integration of the strategic planning, implementation strategies, resource requirements, and assessment. [The Operational Model]

Various key committees which include the Planning Council (PC), Faculty Senate Executive Committee (FSEC), Staff Senate Executive Committee (SSEC), Kupu Ka Wai (KKW), and The Associated Students of University of Hawaii-HCC (ASUH-HCC) disseminate the plans to their constituencies for input. Through this review process, an implementation plan is developed which includes budget requests. A flowchart and timeline was created to outline the planning process.

Annual Budget Development Flow Chart

Annual Budget Development Cycle and Timeline

Fiscal conditions of the college are provided by monthly statements from the deans which are then disseminated to the department heads. In addition, clerks have access to the computerized fiscal status of budget and expenditures. The procedure for service budgets is initiated by a meeting with individual department heads and the VCAA and VCAS. In
the recent years, the requested budgets were approved without significant changes.

The UH system performs a yearly audit which satisfies the federal government requirements.

**Self Evaluation**

The College meets the standard.

The College has established a strategic planning cycle. However, the timelines are not being adhered to. Documents relevant to long-range planning are available on the College’s Intranet. The UH System Financial Statements are available on the UH Vice President for Budget & Finance / CFO website.

Up-to-date reports on status of accounts are available to the representatives for the Deans, academic divisions and administrative programs.

**Actionable Improvement Plans**

In the past two years, the College has reexamined and adopted new guidelines and timelines on the strategic planning process. These documents should be communicated regularly to the College constituency. In addition, the timeline for the process should be followed.

*III.D.2.c. The institution has sufficient cash flow and reserves to maintain stability, strategies for appropriate risk management, and realistic plans to meet financial emergencies and unforeseen occurrences.*

**Descriptive Summary**

The UH community colleges’ Unrestricted Fund Policy document includes a Reserve Status Report of Unrestricted Funds, which shows the adjusted unrestricted funds balances for each campus for Fiscal Years 2009-2011. For this College, the unrestricted funds for each of the prior fiscal years are reported as follows: FY 2009 ($398,637), FY 2010 ($1,275,312), FY 2011 ($2,008,486). The College has established consistent reserves of 5% that meets the policy.

Based on agreement among the community colleges, each community college will establish and maintain a reserve of 3-4% of unrestricted funds. Our College’s cash reserve is well above the recommended level. The community college system maintains an additional reserve to meet the ACCJC recommended requirement for a 5% reserve. The College can obtain additional funds from the community college system and from the UH system financial resources if the need arises.

The College receives funds from a variety of sources, including general funded allocations from the State; special funds from tuition and fees for credit and non-credit
class offerings, testing, hands-on services; revolving funds such as financial aid reimbursements; federal funds from grants; financial aid; and foundation funds.

The receipt of revenues does not create a cash flow problem for the College. Individual revolving fund accounts can have a negative balance as long as the total balance for all special and revolving funds remain positive. Since tuition and fees are received at the beginning of each semester, this provides a large positive balance in the special funds category and offsets occasional or periodic negative balances in individual revolving accounts.

The UH community college system is self-insured and maintains reserve funds to cover system-wide needs for the community colleges. The College follows the UH system’s guidelines and procedures for risk management. An agreement has been established among the community colleges such that the individual campuses will maintain a 3% reserve balance from Non-restricted Funds carried over between fiscal years, and the community college system will maintain additional reserves in Repair and Maintenance funds to meet the ACCJC recommended 5% reserve standard. The UH system maintains sufficient reserves to handle financial emergencies. In the event that a catastrophic emergency occurs (eg. the flooding at Hamilton Library at the UH Manoa campus), external funding from the State or federal levels would be sought to supplement the emergency reserves within the UH system and to avoid completely depleting the emergency reserves of the UH system.

Self Evaluation

The College meets the Standard.

Actionable Improvement Plans

No action is required. The College maintains a reserve of at least 5%, which is above the 3% amount established for the individual campuses and the amount established by the ACCJC.

III.D.2.d. The institution practices effective oversight of finances, including management of financial aid, grants, externally funded programs, contractual relationships, auxiliary organizations or foundations, and institutional investments and assets.

Descriptive Summary

The University of Hawai‘i System fiscal management procedures govern fiscal management and review procedures at Honolulu Community College. All fiscal transactions are reviewed as they occur to ensure that they conform to the University’s requirements and procedures. All contracts are executed through the University of Hawai‘i Procurement Office, which ensures they conform to the contracting requirements and procedures. Audits of financial statements have previously reviewed only the system-wide consolidated financial statement, instead of reviewing financial statements
for individual community colleges. Other audits, such as the Financial and Compliance A133 audit of Federal funds, have included findings relevant to specific campuses including Honolulu Community College. Financial program reviews within the University of Hawai`i System are performed on an ongoing, continuous basis as procurements are made.

Self Evaluation

The College meets the Standard.

Honolulu Community College continues to comply with the University of Hawai`i fiscal management procedures and is subject to University of Hawai`i System audit procedures.

Actionable Improvement Plans

No action is required.

III.D.2.e. All financial resources, including those from auxiliary activities, fund-raising efforts, and grants are used with integrity in a manner consistent with the mission and goals of the institution.

Descriptive Summary

All financial resources are reviewed on a regular basis to ensure that all resources and expenditures are consistent with the mission and goals of the institution. The Chancellor and Deans of the institution first ensures that all of the resources and expenditures meet the institution’s mission and goals. The State of Hawaii Auditor and the UH Internal Audit Office audits special funds on a regular basis. The institution; along with the UH Office of Research Services and UH General Accounting Office, are part of the annual UH A-133 Audit for all grant funds; including financial aid. The UH Foundation Office assists the institution with fund-raising and monitoring fund usage and audited separately from the University. There have not been any material findings in the last five years. Immaterial findings have been responded to by the institution and implemented corrective actions to demonstrate the integrity of financial management practices.

Self Evaluation

The College meets the Standard.

All expenditures and revenues are reviewed to ensure that they are used with integrity in a manner consistent with the mission and goals of the institution through regular audits.

Actionable Improvement Plans

No action is required.
III.D.2.f. Contractual agreements with external entities are consistent with the mission and goals of the institution, governed by institutional policies, and contain appropriate provisions to maintain the integrity of the institution.

**Descriptive Summary**

Current information on contractual agreements and obligations are located at the Business Office. All contractual agreements are made in accordance with UH system policies. The purchase of goods and services are covered under UH policy A8.270 (Procurement-Types of Contracts.) Extramurally funded grants and contracts are under UH Policy A8.900 (Accounting for Research & Training Contracts & Grants.) [UH Systemwide Administrative Procedures A8.270 Types of Contracts; UH Systemwide Administrative Procedures A8.910 Procedures for the Preparation and Submission of Proposals to External Sponsors and the Review/Approval Requirements for Sponsored Agreements]

All policies are developed by the UH system. These guidelines provide a clear framework to ensure that external funding opportunities meet our institutional goals and are clearly aligned with the College’s mission statement. Contractual agreements that exceed $25,000 are reviewed and coordinated by the UH System Procurement Office. Policies governing contracting processes include section A8.200 of the University System Administrative Procedures available as part of the Administrative Procedures Information System, Chapter 8 of the Board of Regent Policies and Bylaws and Chancellor for Community Colleges Memorandums (CCMS) relevant to community college Special Funds, Revolving Funds, and Service Contracts.

**Self Evaluation**

The College meets the Standard.

All contractual agreements that are awarded and managed comply with UH policies, demonstrating that all contracts are accurately established, monitored, and managed.

**Actionable Improvement Plans**

No Action Required.

III.D.2.g. The institution regularly evaluates its financial management processes and the results of the evaluation are used to improve financial management systems.

**Descriptive Summary**

The UH system performs annual external audits on a system-wide basis. The University of Hawaii Community Colleges (UHCC) gained initial approval in July 2005 to provide consolidated UHCC financial statements that meet the needs and standards of the ACCJC. The College performs Annual Assessments of programs that are based on
achievement of strategic planning goals and program improvement activities based on annual program review.

**Self Evaluation**

The College meets the standard but needs improvement.

The UH system will be transitioning to a newly developed financial management system that will increase the College’s overall ability to efficiently manages its fiscal processes. The current Financial Management Information Systems (FMIS) will be transitioning to the Kuali Financial Systems (KFS) starting July 1, 2012. The improved system will allow for increased electronic workflow, modular architecture, and reduced implementation costs.

The College has made improvements to the current operational budgeting model. The budgeting process is centered around long-range strategic planning goals and program improvement activities based on annual assessment of programs. Results from this process are evidenced by the five-year budget that started in 2009-2015. In addition, the college annually reviews its current service budget to maintain existing programs and services.

**Actionable Improvement Plans**

The College must continue to improve the newly adopted operational budgeting model and ensure timely implementation during the academic school year.

III.D.3. The institution systematically assesses the effective use of financial resources and uses the results of the evaluation as the basis for improvement.

**Descriptive Summary**

The Planning Council has the responsibility to periodically review of the College Mission and Goals, coordinate the Strategic Action Plan and Budgeting Process, and monitor the processes related to institutional research and effectiveness. As clearly indicated in its Charter, the duty of the Planning Council is to provide input into the processes of strategic planning and budget prioritization. The Council has undertaken several steps to ensure more transparent, inclusive and efficient processes in these areas.

The Annual Budget Implementation Plan is a yearly-updated list of specific action steps identified by different campus constituencies as those needed to achieve strategic goals and objectives. The College annually reviews, updates and prioritizes this list of specific tasks and needs. The Planning Council has the primary responsibility for carrying out this review and updating process.

**Self-Evaluation**
The College meets the standard.

Planning Council members have been consistently effective in communicating with the campus community at large regarding revisions in planning processes and document names, as well as the ongoing revision of the Strategic Plan and the creation of performance measures. Communication methods include frequent email announcements from the Planning Council Chair and administration, an extensive website with several relevant links, and campus wide Town Hall meetings dedicated to the topics of strategic plan and annual budget implementation plan activities.

One of the primary achievements of the Planning Council has been refining the process of updating the Annual Budget Implementation Plan (formerly called the Strategic Plan). Through policy documents, the Planning Council explicitly links the ongoing program and departmental assessment with the essential and required use of these results in planning and budgeting decisions. The Planning Council approved two key documents codifying this link: an explicit statement asserting the relationship between strategic planning and assessment activities, and an Assessment and Planning Guide. These documents were disseminated to the College through email announcements and posted on the intranet. The emphasis in both documents is to increase the transparency of the planning process and facilitate increasingly effective and systematic use of assessment data in planning and budgeting decisions. In all communications with the campus, via email, posted information or Town Hall meetings, the emphasis is on the need to use assessment and program review findings to justify and thereby strengthen the prioritization of annual budget implementation task proposals.

In Spring 2008, the Planning Council conducted a survey of the campus to solicit input regarding the strategic planning process. Survey questions evaluated the clarity, effectiveness and inclusivity of the ‘strategic planning’ (annual budget implementation plan) process. Results from these surveys were used to revise the process. The results from this survey were discussed at a Fall 2008 Town Hall Meeting. The results also were an important component in the Planning Council Chair’s report to the Council on recommended changes.

A Town Hall Meeting in October 2008 was facilitated by the Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs and the Planning Council Chair. It focused on sharing with campus members the requirements for submitting strongly supported items to the Annual Budget Implementation Plan (at that time called the Strategic Plan). The process of submission and the manner by which the Planning Council prioritized these proposals for potential funding was explained. Examples of effective use of data in support of budgeted action step requests were shared. The Planning Council Chair also outlined goals for improving the Strategic Plan (Annual Implementation Plan) process, including discussion of campus survey results. Attendees asked questions and offered input, as well as writing out further suggestions for improvement or needed clarification. The PowerPoint presentation for this session was posted on the intranet for those who could not attend. This information was incorporated in the revision of the Assessment and Planning Guide and many of the planning actions for improvement have been carried out.
A Town Hall Meeting in March 2009 provided an overview of fiscal and budgeting challenges faced by the state, and implications for the College. The Vice Chancellor for Administrative Services provided a review of federal stimulus money and rules for use of these funds. The Planning Council Chair provided an overview of the current cycle and process of updating the Annual Implementation Plan. This included presenting samples of submissions from past years which received high priority and which demonstrated effective use of supporting assessment and/or program review data.

At a Town Hall Meeting in April 2009, the Vice Chancellor for Administrative Services outlined the new detailed fiscal report that will be conducted annually and posted for the campus community. This report includes a breakdown of all program, department, and/or unit expenditures including: personnel, equipment, operations and resources from general funds, tuition and revenues and special funding.

Some of the significant improvements in annual implementation planning and budgeting processes enacted by the Planning Council as a result of these discussions, reports and surveys. For example, explicit and clear criteria to be used in evaluating budget priorities from the annual implementation plan were articulated and published. Comprehensive flow charts outlining the flow of decision making, and opportunities for input into the Strategic Plan Annual Budget Implementation Plan were created and shared with the campus via email announcement and posting on the intranet. These flow charts map the process within the College for submitting and prioritizing budget items, as well as the process for inclusion of proposed items in the UHCC and UH system budgets and submission to Hawaii State Legislature. Also drafted and shared with the campus was a flow chart outlining the process of creating and submitting the biennium budget to the legislature. These charts enhance understanding and awareness of the processes, timelines, and means by which College campus members can participate in or track decisions.

**Actionable Improvement Plans**

The Planning Council has undertaken many actions to improve the planning process, in response to campus concerns and input. The Planning Council will continue to actively seek input from the campus in its efforts to revise and refine the annual implementation planning process including surveying the campus community and targeted town meeting sessions. Town Hall meetings are also valuable in imparting information to the campus, helping inform those attending and sharing what was presented to the rest of the College community through posted information from these sessions.

To ensure implementation of actions necessary to achieve strategic plan objectives, an implementation framework has been created by administrators, which explicitly indicates parties, offices and/or committees responsible for achieving stated outcomes. This implementation framework directly links accountability to specific administrative positions. This will help to ensure follow-through on the strategic plan, as well as providing the basis for more transparent outcomes based assessment of administration.
III.D. EVIDENCE
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Standard IV: Leadership and Governance

The Institution recognizes and utilizes the contributions of leadership throughout the organization for continuous improvement of the Institution. Governance roles are designed to facilitate decisions that support student learning programs and services and improve institutional effectiveness, while acknowledging the designated responsibilities of the Governing Board and the Chief Administrator.

IV.A. The Institution recognizes that ethical and effective leadership throughout the organization enables the Institution to identify institutional values, set and achieve goals, learn, and improve.

IV.A.1. Institutional leaders create an environment for empowerment, innovation, and institutional excellence. They encourage staff, faculty, administrators, and students, no matter what their official titles, to take initiative in improving the practices, programs, and services in which they are involved. When ideas for improvement have policy or significant institution-wide implications, systematic participative processes are used to assure effective discussion, planning, and implementation.

Descriptive Summary

Institutional leaders at Honolulu Community College provide opportunities for administration and representative faculty, staff, and students to engage in decision-making processes. Governance at the College is the joint responsibility of these institutional leaders. Discussions and planning for improvements in the practices, programs, and services of the College occur in standing committees, ad hoc committees, academic division forums, campus-wide forums and between individuals. The Standard IV Team identified the following individuals and committees as crucial participants in discussions and decision-making activities related to governance:

- Chancellor
- Vice Chancellor of Academic Affairs (VCAA)
- Vice Chancellor of Administrative Services (VCAS)
- Program Deans and Directors
- Dean of Student Services
- Division Chairs
- Planning Council (PC)
- Campus Leadership Team (CLT)
- Kupu Ka Wai Council (KKW)
- Faculty Senate Executive Committee (FSEC)
- Staff Senate Executive Committee (SSEC)
- Associated Students of the University of Hawai‘i – Honolulu Community College (ASUH-HCC)

The College involves representatives of all major campus constituencies in campus decision-making and prioritization processes. The FSEC, SSEC, KKW, ASUH-HCC and PC are made up of elected and/or appointed representatives; these bodies carry out activities related to
governance decisions including review and approval of policies and providing input into planning and budgeting formulation and prioritization.

The Planning Council was formed in 2006 and is charged with carrying out long-range institutional planning and budget prioritization based on College and UHCC System strategic plans. The Faculty Senate Executive Committee (FSEC) is the faculty governance committee on campus and oversees numerous subcommittees dealing with issues or procedures affecting faculty and students. The Staff Senate Executive Committee (SSEC), made up of representatives from APT and civil service staff, reviews governance decisions and provides input regarding institutional discussions and decisions. The Associated Students of the University of Hawai‘i - Honolulu Community College (ASUH-HCC) is the student senate, charged with representing students and their concerns. Most governance committees and major subcommittees include a committee seat for student representatives from the ASUH-HCC, including the Committee of Programs and Curricula, the Committee on Student Affairs, and the FSEC.

The focus of serving the indigenous people of Hawai‘i has led to changes in the system and College missions, as well as the governance at both the system and College level. The University of Hawai‘i recognizes the unique political status Native Hawaiians have with the United States and Hawaii State governments, respectively. The University also recognizes the important role it plays as a State institution of higher education in addressing societal and educational challenges facing Native Hawaiians as a political entity. At the system level of operations, a governance group comprised of Native Hawaiian representatives across all ten campuses, named the Pukoa Council, provides direct consultation to the President of the system. In 2011, Honolulu Community College replicated that structure with the formalization of the campus Kupu Ka Wai council, which provides recommendations directly to the chancellor of the college. With the approval of that governance group, the Kupu Ka Wai council has become one of the major governance groups that works on policy development, planning, and budgeting, similar to the planning council, FSEC, SSEC, and ASUH-HCC.

Additionally, the Vice Chancellor of Academic Affairs (VCAA) convenes a group titled the Campus Leadership Team (CLT). This broad-based group is comprised of all administrative / leadership representatives including Vice-Chancellors, Deans, Divisions Chairs, and a representative from every campus division or unit. This committee addresses issues related to day-to-day operational issues of the campus, which vary from notification of construction, to changes in enrollment policies, to announcements of student government events. The group makes operational decisions regarding instructional issues such as scheduling, student information systems, and records procedures. The committee invites others as needed to address specific topics; for example, the financial aid officer provides updates on laws and federal policies impacting students. The group meets frequently to resolve and improve campus operations.

Beginning in Fall 2011, the VCAA began convening a group of all the Deans and Division Chairs titled the Deans and Division Chairs working group (DDC). The purpose of this group is to coordinate leadership regarding instructional issues. Examples of issues dealt with include clarifying program review schedule, submission, and review process; and lecturer and new-hire
materials. Current work includes the assessment and alignment of student learning outcomes and program outcome mapping and assessment.

Governance decisions are based on meeting institutional goals of the College, which are clearly outlined and available to the campus. College goals reflect a focus on student learning and improvement. These strategic goals are posted on the college intranet and are periodically reviewed and discussed at General College Meetings or Town Hall meetings. The UHCC VCAA also makes annual visits to the College to provide updates on College performance related to institutional goals and outcomes.

To reinforce the need for decision-making to be aligned with institutional goals, the College adopted policy HCCP #4.101, “Integrated Planning, Resource Allocation, and Assessment.” This policy clarifies responsibilities and processes by which the College integrates assessment, planning activities, and budget allocation decisions. This policy identifies responsible parties and makes explicit the links between UHCC system and College strategic goals, and College planning activities; the policy reinforces the imperative that planning is to be informed by assessment results. The policy is intended to ensure a “transparent planning, resource allocation, and assessment process that has established tasks and milestones to ensure systematic participation from among the established college governing bodies as well as program faculty, staff, and administrators; and is able to be completed in time to meet established University system budget making deadlines” (HCCP #4.101, Purpose # 2). Campus members have the opportunity to link requests for divisional and department funding to fulfillment of institutional goals through the budget prioritization process. The budget proposal form explicitly requires that budget requests indicate how funding will help better meet the College’s mission, the University of Hawai‘i’s mission and facilitating implementation of institutional strategic plan goals.

Campus members have the chance to learn about planning and policy topics at bi-annual General College Meetings where information about current and future initiatives are announced. Email updates are periodically used to inform the College community, as are minutes from College committees. Campus members have the chance to provide input for planning and implementation of changes through standing committees with regularly scheduled meetings and through Town Hall Meetings.

**Self Evaluation**

The College meets the Standard.

The College has addressed many concerns indicated in the 2006 report. Actions taken to improve representation include revision of membership on committees, for example charter revisions clarifying membership and functioning of the Planning Council and Faculty Senate. The current reorganization is intended in part to further improve representation in governance functioning.

There have been several significant initiatives undertaken by the campus over the past six years, including restructuring of developmental education curriculum and delivery, integration of
campus goals with UHCC system strategic planning outcomes, Achieving the Dream innovations, revision of the College’s General Education program for CTE divisions, and significant structural reorganization. In most cases, campus members were provided opportunities to be informed and/or give feedback regarding the goals, activities, and implications of these initiatives and organizational changes through campus-wide meetings and periodic email updates. Alternative plans, as well as implications of final decisions, were also discussed in relevant standing committees.

In terms of establishing budget priorities as related to implementation of the campus strategic plan, there is consensus among administrators, and faculty and staff leaders, that this process has greatly improved in that it is more inclusive, transparent, and participatory. The three major faculty/staff governance groups (FSEC, SSEC, KKW) have a major role in creating the priority list for budgeting. Each committee has a representative on the Budget Committee, which establishes preliminary ranking of budget proposals. Then, the ranking list goes to individual governance bodies for further discussion and prioritization. The Planning Council summarizes and finalizes findings of the governance bodies. In implementing this process last year, some problems were identified and improvements made in the 2011-2012 implementation, including more reasonable timelines, more complete information provided regarding budget proposals, and clarification of ranking criteria. Because this process is more inclusive and entails substantive review of proposals, it does require substantial time and level of responsibility on the part of governance representatives; evidence gathered also indicates there needs to be improved communication between representatives and constituents to enable their input into decisions made.

Administrators indicate that standing committees are important venues through which campus members can raise questions, assist in clarification of disseminated information, and make suggestions. These committees are valuable forums for representatives to raise concerns that can and have led to visible responses and improvements. Representatives on committees share agendas and minutes with the campus community although there needs to be more consistent and timely sharing of information to maximize awareness and inclusion. Feedback from present and past faculty and staff leaders indicates that there is a need for better orientation for all faculty and staff, in particular new hires and lecturers, so that they are completely aware of opportunities for input. Furthermore, Committee Chairs should be more fully trained to ensure that the committees’ representation duties are fulfilled. These duties include sharing information, soliciting topics for discussion, and providing meaningful opportunities for input from the campus community.

The HCC Accreditation Self-Study conducted in Spring 2012 indicated that the greatest degree of satisfaction regarding opportunity to participate is at the level of divisional/unit decision-making. More than half of respondents believe there is sufficient opportunity to participate in campus-wide decision-making, and a little over half believe campus-wide decision-making is fair. The results are generally positive although they reflect room for improvement. Positive results from the Governance and Leadership survey conducted by Standard Four also reflected the perception that at the more immediate level (e.g. the Dean or supervisor), leaders do provide necessary opportunities for input.
Campus responses to the more narrowly focused Governance and Leadership survey, conducted in Fall 2011 by the Standard Four committee regarding opportunities for input, communication, and efficacy of existing governance structure and processes, helped clarify areas in need of improvement. Concerns were also made clear via spoken and written comments solicited from faculty and staff leaders, and student senate representatives. In terms of how well institutional leaders create an environment for empowerment, innovation, and institutional excellence, the lowest scoring areas in this survey were related to communication, specifically, over institutional reorganization and recent initiatives for creating new policies. These results indicate that Institution leaders should better provide meaningful opportunities for dialogue and input related to major campus initiatives. Content analysis of the survey’s written comments further clarified areas in need of improvement. Several comments related to lack of timeliness of information provided to campus. Another concern was the lack of explanations to the campus once decisions were made.

Staff respondents ranked their degree of inclusion consistently lower than that of faculty. Staff results were notably less positive for all but one of the questions on the survey, indicating that staff members feel less informed and view their input as less valued. A staff survey conducted in Summer 2011 reinforced these findings; written comments point to lack of effective dissemination of information and to inadequate institutional support for being more fully engaged in campus discussions and committees. Ensuring meaningful staff participation in governance has been a long-standing issue on this campus as staff find it difficult to secure coverage and time to participate, and there are fewer structural professional incentives or rewards for participation. These issues need to be addressed by the campus leadership.

The evident need to improve communication between campus leaders and campus constituencies requires addressing Administrative communication strategies as well as campus members’ disinterest and lack of effort to stay informed and be involved. Creating strategies to improve sharing of and access to necessary information to build empowerment and involvement requires more timely communication from leaders and directly addressing the obstacles to faculty and staff engagement.

To evaluate the involvement and efficacy of student governance representatives, there was a focus group meeting with Student Senate and club representatives as well as the soliciting of their written feedback. Student Senate and club representatives indicated the need for better and more direct communication between institutional leaders and all student leaders. The consensus was that structures for necessary inclusion in decisions and discussions are in place; specifically, a Student Senate representative has an established seat on major campus committees, and through this membership, students learn about campus issues and are the given the opportunity for input. For example, in recent discussions regarding revising the College mission, the ASUH-HCC President took an active role in revising the language to be more inclusive. Minutes also indicate that the Student Body President has been a participating member of the Planning Council. However, recruiting students who will be able to responsibly and consistently participate as members of major committees has proven challenging. Thus, the intended dissemination of information and the inclusion of the student voice and perspective does not occur consistently. Students consulted suggested that expanded, regular use of communication
technologies (e.g. emails updates) to all student leaders would help improve student awareness of campus issues and initiatives.

Standard Four members also conducted a survey of the general student body regarding the effectiveness of the ASUH-HCC members. The survey of students revealed that, while the Student Senate is perceived as effective in representing student interests, the senate needs to better share information with students about changes in College policies that directly affect them. The Senate has already taken steps to improve its website as a primary communication venue; student leaders are also increasing their use of the campus newspaper as a way to get information out to fellow students. An additional suggestion was for the campus to provide accurate and accessible information about the College’s bureaucratic structure, indicating the individuals in key positions so that students know who to go to with their concerns and input.

**Actionable Improvement Plans**

There should be orientation materials and established guidelines for all institutional leaders—Administrators, and members of major campus committees—to ensure consistent levels of communication that inform constituents of discussions; represent necessary efforts to solicit input prior to decision-making; delineate resulting decisions; and create clear avenues for response to decisions.

IV.A.2. *The Institution establishes and implements a written policy providing for faculty, staff, administrator, and student participation in decision-making processes.* The policy specifies the manner in which individuals bring forward ideas from their constituencies and work together on appropriate policy, planning, and special-purpose bodies.

IV.A.2.a. *Faculty and administrators have a substantive and clearly defined role in institutional governance and exercise a substantial voice in institutional policies, planning, and budget that relate to their areas of responsibility and expertise.* Students and staff also have established mechanisms or organizations for providing input into institutional decisions.

**Descriptive summary**

Board of Regents’ policies have shifted a significant degree of control to the Vice President of Community Colleges or Chancellors of specific campuses. While faculty retain responsibility over curricular matters, and governance committees provide a faculty, staff, and student voice on issues, the Chancellor has final decision-making authority. As stated in BOR policies, the faculty and Chancellor must work together to create a governance structure in which all issues affecting the Institution’s ability to achieve its mission can be discussed. Campus leadership is to have a major advisory voice in all decisions about those issues.

The Faculty Senate Executive Committee (FSEC) is the body established to represent all faculty members on matters of academic decisions and academic policy making. This authority is made explicit in BOR policy general provisions, which states explicitly that through the established College faculty senate, the faculty “…has primary responsibility for such fundamental academic areas as curriculum content, subject matter, and methods of instruction and research.”
Governance processes and responsibilities have been explicitly articulated in several recent College policies. Beginning in April 2011, policies that make more explicit the roles, responsibilities, and rights to participate have been adopted, as have policies that outline linkages between planning, assessment, and budgeting activities. These include 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.” These policies were reviewed and formally approved by the College’s governance bodies.

HCCP #1.101, “Participation in College Decision-Making Processes” makes explicit both the representative bodies included in campus governance processes and their responsibilities. As stated in the policy, the intent is to 1) facilitate discussion of ideas and assure effective communication among the administration, faculty, staff, and students for the good of the College; and 2) assure that faculty, staff, and students have a substantive and clearly-defined role in institutional governance and the opportunity to exercise a substantial voice in College policies, planning, and budget decisions that relate to their areas of responsibility and expertise. The policy establishes guidelines to ensure transparency in committee representation and functioning, including mandated charters to include definition of membership, mission, scope of authority, and operating processes. The policy makes explicit the need for posted minutes. The policy also includes the requirement that program administrators and supervisors provide individuals under their supervision sufficient time away from primary work assignments to participate as members of decision-making bodies. Making clear what is expected of governance bodies is an important step accomplished by the College; further work is needed to increase awareness of and to ensure compliance with these stated policy expectations.

The College’s Strategic Plan is the primary document guiding institutional planning and budget formulation. While the ultimate decision in matters of budgeting priorities rests with the Chancellor, governance committees have a strong voice related to specific areas of responsibility and expertise. These committees are the primary means by which faculty, staff, and students participate in decision-making and provide leadership within the College community. Policy HCCP: #4.101, “Integrated Planning, Resource Allocation, and Assessment,” is the comprehensive policy that mandates links between program review and assessment, and planning and resource allocation. The policy includes a timeline for assessment activities and requests for resources, and other important milestones to be carried out each year. It explicitly states the role of established governing bodies in this process. HCC #5.202, “Review of Established Programs,” states the role of governing bodies in utilizing program review results to prioritize budget proposals so they are in alignment with the College’s strategic goals.

**Self Evaluation**

The College meets the Standard.

Policies that articulate the role and responsibilities of campus governance bodies are in place. The College has established committees to ensure that faculty, staff, and students have a clearly defined role in governance; committees also address critical areas such as curriculum, use of technologies, student affairs, accommodating students with special needs, student academic honors, faculty development, and social equity. Committees review their charters on a periodic
basis to assess whether the mission or membership needs revision. Minutes and agendas are posted and/or shared via email with the campus at large. The Planning Council has improved the process by which campus representatives participate in discussions related to setting campus budgeting and strategic planning priorities. The College is now in its second year of utilizing the Planning Council to handle the final recommendations to Administration. A budget prioritization list of all items identified through the program review process, or new items needing funding which are tied to the strategic outcomes, is provided to all the governance groups and they are asked to prioritize those items. A final list of priorities is compiled and rated. The Budget Planning subcommittee, made up of members of the Planning Council, then reviews the prioritization items and are provided with detailed information about the current budget and the five-year financial plan. This process is providing a great deal of transparency among the groups represented by subcommittee members.

Despite progress made in transparency and formalization of participatory processes, Governance and Leadership survey results as well as written and spoken feedback from campus leaders indicate areas needing improvements, for example lack of adequate time and opportunity for representatives to solicit informed input from constituents prior to finalization of decisions. It is important to note that these comments are the results of the first-year roll-out of this process implementing HCCP #4.101, resulting in a learning curve for the campus. Now in the second year of the budgeting and planning process, the Administration has developed a timeline and is on track and addressing the concerns of the previous year.

The surveys carried out by Standard Four and by staff leaders also clearly indicate that staff do not feel that they have a substantive and supported role in governance. Written comments reflected staff concerns that they are unable to readily participate in committees and that the role of the SSEC is less significant in governance as a result. Although policy HCCP #1.101, "Participation in College Decision-Making Processes," was adopted by the College, much more needs to be done to change this sentiment felt by staff. Adoption of policies is a significant starting point. However, it will take the work of administrators, immediate supervisors, staff, and faculty as a whole to change this cultural mindset.

**Actionable Improvement Plans**

The campus must address the structural and attitudinal barriers to ensuring campus-wide representation of staff of the SSEC. SSEC will work with key administrators to create and implement a plan to address this issue, and a major factor will be getting the supervisors and staff to play an integral part of making the plan work.

IV.A.2.b. *The Institution relies on faculty, its academic senate or other appropriate faculty structures, the curriculum committee, and academic administrators for recommendations about student learning programs and services.*

**Descriptive summary**

The Board of Regents grants primary responsibility regarding curriculum matters to the faculty. Faculty retain primary responsibility for overseeing curricula matters. Faculty, via the FSEC,
have delegated that responsibility to the Committee on Programs and Curricula (CPC). The CPC acts on recommendations from specific divisional curriculum committees. Three Division Curriculum Committees (DCC) exist for Trades and Transportation (Tech 1), Communications and Services Division (Tech 2), and the University College (UC). Elections are held by divisions to determine membership, which is staggered to ensure continuity on the committee. Courses requiring additional review and certification (e.g. distance courses, those fulfilling General Education designations) undergo additional review processes. Following DCC review and comments, a proposal is submitted to the Committee on Programs and Curricula (CPC) for review. The CPC is made up of administrators, faculty, and students across the campus and includes representatives from the DCC’s.

The General Education Board is a subcommittee of the Committee on Programs and Curricula (CPC) and consists of six sub-boards: four Focus Boards (Contemporary Ethical Issues, Writing Intensive, Hawaiian/Asian/Pacific Issues, Speech), a Foundations Board (Global/Multicultural, Symbolic Reasoning, Written Communication), and a Diversifications Board (Arts, Literature, Humanities, Social Sciences, Biological Science, Physical Science, Laboratory). The General Education Board acts as a clearinghouse for information on courses that have been articulated, and for publishing course articulation procedures and system-wide articulation requirements and status.

The Distance Education Review Board was revised in Fall 2011 to ensure involvement of those directly charged with the integrity of the curriculum and those with knowledge of DE issues: Division Chairs, Deans, the Distance Education coordinator, and experienced DE faculty. All courses being offered in DE format have been reviewed and certified by the DERB.

**Self Evaluation**

The College meets the Standard.

The major faculty-based curriculum committees are carrying out their responsibilities effectively. An updated and expanded Curriculum Reference Manual has been created to clarify process and procedures and to enhance faculty knowledge of standards, procedures, precedents, and expectations for curriculum actions. The bodies responsible for providing specific curricular review (e.g. to evaluate meeting of General Education hallmarks) have clear and explicit policies, criteria, and cycles for review and certification. The College structures reflect the belief that successful student learning is a campus-wide responsibility.

**Actionable Improvement Plans**

No action is required.

IV.A.3. *Through established governance structures, processes, and practices, the governing board, administrators, faculty, staff, and students work together for the good of the Institution. These processes facilitate discussion of ideas and effective communication among the Institution’s constituencies.*
Descriptive Summary

The established governance structures at the College include the Planning Council, CLT, FSEC, SSEC, Kupu Ka Wai Council, ASUH-HCC, and other campus committees. These committees regularly meet, discuss, vote, and take actions on matters that concern the College. Charters for these committees require that impacted divisions on campus are represented on these committees either by election, assignment, or as guest participants. Minutes of meetings are posted on the Intranet website. Town meetings are held to discuss campus issues as needed. Communication with members of the College community is frequently conducted via email and the Intranet website. Some policies and procedures are available through this internal website. In an effort to reduce usage of paper, many forms are also available via the website.

Over the past year, the campus has undertaken a substantive reorganization, which impacts governance representation at the College. The proposed reorganization proposal affects Academic Affairs, the Pacific Center for Advanced Technology Training, and the Administrative Services units. The proposal calls for abolishment of the Pacific Aerospace Training Center; related academic units will be subsumed under Academic Affairs. The reorganization is intended to create a structure that enhances efficient and effective management, alignment of campus resources, greater ability to address operational issues impacting student performance, and meeting strategic outcomes set as campus performance measures. The proposed reorganization is also specifically intended to improve communication within and between other units.

The process of organizing, communicating, and soliciting feedback and advice of campus faculty and staff regarding reorganization has been an ongoing process. Beginning in Fall 2010, there were re-organization meetings with all parties involved invited. All meetings were open and meeting minutes posted on the campus Intranet. All of those directly impacted by the proposed changes were provided opportunities to be directly involved in the development of the organizational structure needed to ensure the College can meet its mission, strategic goals, and outcomes. In most cases the groups affected by the changes were asked to design their own departmental structures that would allow for better service or better overall organization. Examples of this include the consolidation of IT services. Their task was to design their reporting structure to allow for better operations. Another example was the suggestion that came from the Native Hawaiian center on the creation of a Native Hawaiian Studies division within the University College.

Implementation of proposed reorganization changes is anticipated to be completed by Spring 2012 and in place by the start of the Fall 2012 semester. The College Administration will continue to provide opportunities for members of the campus community to give feedback on the impact and effectiveness of the reorganized leadership structure through town meetings and formal assessment.

Self Evaluation

The College meets the Standard.
The established governance structure at the College provides opportunities for input from faculty, staff, and administrators. Major campus committees meet regularly. The issues these committees discuss in their meetings are critical to campus decision-making; these committees make recommendations to the Chancellor and Vice Chancellors regarding budget and organizational issues as well as curriculum.

The Standard IV Accreditation Committee met with campus governance committee members, past and present, to solicit feedback on progress made and areas needing improvements. The feedback reinforced what was indicated on survey results. Communication emerged as a dominant theme. There is a clear need for improvement in governance committees communicating with each other. Their roles and functions touch upon common concerns; this heightens the importance of better communication to avoid duplication of effort and the confusion of mixed or confusing messages to the campus. The number of governance committees and the volume of deliberations and decisions are sufficiently complex that simple posting of minutes is inadequate and it is unrealistic to expect faculty and staff to extract information relevant to their individual needs and interests.

There is evident need for improvement in communication between committee members and constituents they represent. Campus survey results reveal that some governance bodies are perceived as more communicative than others; information for some governance committees is incompletely posted on the web or shared via email. In recognition of the fact that sharing agendas and minutes by major committees has been inconsistently carried out, the Standard Four committee issued a template for reporting committee minutes to standardize such record-keeping. Campus leaders must ensure this best practice is maintained regardless of committee turnover.

Also discussed was the need to ensure consistent end-of-the-year reporting by all committees, to facilitate a smooth transition to the next year and avoid redundancies and dropped initiatives. There needs to be training of committee members regarding important expectations such as the necessity of including key decisions and pending issues in committee minutes and end-of-year reports. These recommendations were passed on to all concerned committees for follow up.

**Actionable Improvement Plans**

No action is required.

IV.A.4. *The Institution advocates and demonstrates honesty and integrity in its relationships with external agencies. It agrees to comply with Accrediting Commission standards, policies, and guidelines, and Commission requirements for public disclosure, self-study and other reports, team visits, and prior approval of substantive changes. The Institution moves expeditiously to respond to recommendations made by the Commission.*

**Descriptive summary**

The College engages in requisite and expected public disclosure of accreditation standing and relations. The College has moved to respond to major recommendations from the 2006 report in
several areas including formalizing processes and leadership of its distance education program and clarifying duties of key governance bodies. The College’s Accreditation Oversight Committee, the Planning Council, College committees, and those in leadership positions have been working to address recommendations compiled in the Planning Agenda from the 2006 self-study. Several recommendations have been met; others are in process, for example review CTE General Education requirements. In 2009, the College’s Midterm Report was fully accepted with no additional requirements for follow-up reporting.

The College successfully achieved ACCJC-WASC approval for Substantive Changes in three programs since the last self-study: a new degree program in MELE, a degree in Construction Management, and approval for students to receive degree completed with a majority of distance education courses in the FIRE program and for the Associate of Arts degree. The College acted directly to address recommendations accompanying those approvals, in particular strengthening student support services for distance education students.

As for public disclosure, information is available and disseminated through printed publications, and online documents and websites. The HCC website accessible to the public provides the most current accreditation report.

In addition, there are several CTE programs that are accountable to external licensing bodies. These include Aeronautics Maintenance Technology (AERO), Auto Body Repair & Painting Technology (ABRP), Automotive Technology (AMT), Commercial Aviation (AVIT), Computing Electronics and Network Technology (CENT), Cosmetology (COSM), and Early Childhood Education (ECE). All of these programs conscientiously and successful maintain their accredited status.

The College’s ABRP and AMT programs are certified by NATEF (National Automotive Technicians Education Foundation, Inc.) and recertified every five years. ABRP was recently recertified this semester (Spring 2012), and AMT was last recertified in 2008. Documentation is filed with the program. The Federal Aviation Administration (FAA) is the external certifying agency for the AERO program, which is certified under the Title 14 Part 147 of the Code of Federal Regulations and is inspected and reviewed annually. The AVIT program is also certified by the FAA as an approved Part 141 flight school. This certification is valid for twenty-four months. The academic instruction provided by HCC professors and lecturers in some courses was also approved as certified Part 141 ground instruction. The CENT program, in partnership with the Pacific Center for Advanced Technology Training, is part of the Cisco Network Academy, Microsoft IT Academy, VMware IT Academy and the CompTia Academy. Students can take certification exams to become certified as Cisco Certified Network Associate, Cisco Certified Network Professional, Microsoft Certified Professional, VMware Certified Professional, A+ Computer Technician, and Security +. AutoDesk requires an online evaluation of the teacher and the training itself after each course. The COSM program is part of Pivot Point International; maintaining this contract requires annual continuing education for instructors. Program instructors are also part of the International Dermal Institute, which mandates training requirements. In the ECE program, the Children’s Center is accredited by the National Association for the Education of Young Children (NAEYC). Recertification occurs every five years. An NAEYC assessor makes a site visit to look such requirements as safety, compliance of
the Department of Human Services, the required State child/teacher ratios, and developmentally appropriate interaction with the children. The ECE instructional program is currently undergoing a self-study for the Early Childhood Associate Degree Accreditation also offered by NAEYC.

**Self Evaluation**

The College meets the Standard.

Actions have been taken in a timely manner to address major concerns from past Accreditation reviews and reports. The processes in place to ensure continued attention to accreditation recommendations include communication from the Accreditation Liaison Officer, who publishes periodic bulletins in the form of a newsletter. Additionally, committees are informed of the planning agenda items related to their body and areas needing follow-up. Campus survey results did not reveal any major concerns about how the leadership of the College demonstrates integrity in relationship to accrediting agencies.

The College also relies on the Accreditation Oversight Committee (AOC). The AOC was active in creating the Self-Study committees for the 2012 report, at which point oversight was primarily carried out by the accreditation steering committee. The intention is to have the AOC take on the direct role for oversight after this Self-Study is submitted. The AOC serves as the oversight group, ensuring campus awareness of and attention to accreditation recommendations during years when there are no active accreditation committees. When accreditation committees are formed for the next Self-Study, these groups and the steering committee take on that more active role. The campus will continue to use a planning agenda generated from each Self-Study report to keep the campus on task in dealing with recommended changes. This will be done with the new planning agenda emerging out of the 2012 Self-Study.

Areas for improvement include the recognized need to ensure adequate time be given when planning for and implementing recommended changes that require inclusion, review, and input from many constituents. Also, with shifting membership in committees, there needs to be a systematized method for ensuring that institutional memory is preserved and that initiatives are carried on by new committee members. The annual review and publication of planning agenda items will be useful in this regard. Those programs, which must be externally evaluated and certified, have attained and maintained industry certifications and accreditations.

**Actionable Improvement Plans**

No action is required.

IV.A.5. The role of leadership and the Institution’s governance and decision-making structures and processes are regularly evaluated to assure their integrity and effectiveness. The institution widely communicates the results of these evaluations and uses them as the basis for improvement.

**Descriptive Summary**
Administrators are currently evaluated internally by “360” surveys. Constituents, peers, subordinates, and partners of administrators are selected at random from a list reviewed by the supervisor; those selected carry out anonymous reviews. The results of these surveys are the basis for discussion between Administrator and Supervisor. If called for, a plan of action is devised to respond to concerns reflected in these survey results.

In Fall 2009, the Chancellor requested that a faculty committee create an assessment tool to measure administrative leadership. The "Proposal for Administration Self-Assessment Based on the Program Review Model and a Non-Quantitative Measurement of Leadership" was completed in Spring 2010. This comprehensive outline proposes that the administration focus on College Leadership Outcomes, institutional objectives, services, administration support, analysis, planning, and leadership. Implementation is scheduled for Fall 2011-Spring 2012.

In carrying out this assessment, the administration created a Mission Statement and identified Campus Leadership Outcomes (CLOs) which will be the standard against which administrative leadership and performance is measured. After completing its self-assessment, the Administration submitted its evaluation findings to a committee composed of the chairs of seven campus governance committees who evaluated the Administration's self-assessment. By the end of the spring semester, this committee will begin reviewing the assessment and the Administration will have the option of responding to the Committee of Seven's evaluation, but without altering its content. This process will enable identification of ways administration can improve its performance and be more effective in supporting the campus.

In implementing this process for the first time, areas of improvement were identified including realigning the timing of this process and further delegating steps of the process throughout the administrative structure. This self-assessment will be conducted annually.

All governance bodies report to the campus via minutes and periodically through end of the year reports. There have also been specifically targeted surveys conducted, for example by the Student Senate. These governance bodies are also evaluated as part of cyclical surveys conducted primarily for accreditation purposes. However there have not been standardized cycles and processes for evaluating the effectiveness of decision-making structures and processes for FSEC, SSEC, KKW, PC, or ASUH-HCC.

**Self Evaluation**

The College partially meets the standard.

Progress has been made in that a defined process for evaluating Administration has been established and is under way. The College needs to complete this cycle of evaluating administrative meeting of established CLOs, identifying improvement steps, implementing these steps, and then conducting another evaluation for a comprehensive report on this process. Standardized assessment processes have not been established for all decision-making bodies and processes.
Governance and Leadership survey results reveal there is work to be done in systematizing and publicizing results of assessment of Administrative functions and outcomes. The critical comments related to lack of accountability of Administration will be addressed by the implementation of the new transparent method of Administrative assessment.

Comparable efforts to evaluate the efficacy of governance and other major campus committees will need to be systematized and carried out on a consistent cycle, with results shared with the campus. In discussions with campus leaders, it was suggested that required end-of-year reports explicitly include self-assessment by committee members. This would require establishing a template to make clear expectations of the end-of-year reports, thereby explicitly merging end-of-year reports with self-assessment of the committee.

**Actionable Improvement Plans**

Governance bodies should establish systematic processes and cycles for carrying out assessment activities.

The College will carry out follow-up assessment activities to evaluate effectiveness of the new organizational structure.
IV.A: EVIDENCE

Accreditation Steering Committee Documents:

Accreditation Oversight Committee
Accreditation Bulletin Newsletters
Administration Assessment Process

ASUH-HCC Website

Board of Regents Policies and Bylaws - General Provisions (see Section 1-10)

Annual Budget Development Flow Chart

Planning Council Budget Information

Campus Reorganization Proposal - November 15, 2011

Campus Communication

[Committee of Seven Results (review by governance bodies)]

Curriculum Reference Manual

Distance Education (see under DE Curriculum Review):

Accreditation Self-Study Spring 2012 Executive Summary (broader survey carried out by Accreditation Steering Committee)

Approved Re-Organization Charts - Fall 2012

[FSEC Survey Instrument]

FY 2012 Budget Plan

FSEC Budget Rankings – February 24, 2012

General Education

Participation in College Decision-Making Processes - HCCP # 1.101

Integrated Planning, Resource Allocation, and Assessment - HCCP # 4.101
Strategic Plan 2008-2015

Strategic Planning

HCC Policies and Procedures

Links to Campus Committee minutes:

Minutes, Planning Council Budget Subcommittee Meeting - September 2, 2011

Summary of Responses - Questions Asked of Faculty and Staff Leaders

Summary Notes, Standard Four Meeting with ASUH-HCC Members - November 2011

[Notes from meetings with the Chancellor]

Committee on Programs and Curriculum Minutes

Faculty Senate Executive Committee Minutes

Kupu Ka Wai Minutes

Planning Council Minutes

Staff Senate Executive Committee Minutes

VPCC Campus Visits

Content Analysis of Comments from Standard IV Governance Survey

Fall 2011 Governance and Leadership Survey Results

Spring 2012 Student Engagement Survey Results

Annual Budget Development Cycle and Timeline

Town Hall Meetings

UHCC Strategic Planning/Budget Documents
IV.B: Board and Administrative Organization

In addition to the leadership of individuals and constituencies, institutions recognize the designated responsibilities of the governing board for setting policies and of the Chief Administrator for the effective operation of the Institution. Multi-college districts/systems clearly define the organizational roles of the district/system and the colleges.

In 1907, the University of Hawai‘i was established on the model of the American system of land-grant universities created initially by the Morrill Act of 1862. In the 1960s and 1970s, the University was developed into a system of accessible and affordable campuses.

These institutions currently include:

- A research university at Manoa offering a comprehensive array of undergraduate, graduate, and professional degrees through the doctoral level, including law and medicine.

- A comprehensive, primarily baccalaureate institution at Hilo, offering professional programs based on a liberal arts foundation and selected graduate degrees.

- A baccalaureate institution at West O‘ahu offering liberal arts and selected professional studies.

- A system of seven open-door community colleges spread across the islands of Kaua‘i, O‘ahu, Maui, and Hawai‘i, offering quality liberal arts and workforce programs. In addition to the seven colleges, outreach centers are located on the islands of Molokai and Lanai (administered by UH Maui College), on the island of Hawai‘i in Kealakekua (administered by Hawai‘i CC), and in the Waianae/Nanakuli area of O‘ahu (administered by Leeward CC).

The University of Hawai‘i Community College system, led by the Vice President for Community Colleges, is located on the UH Manoa campus on O‘ahu.

University System:

The current UH System organization is a result of the June 2005 BOR approved reorganization of the community colleges which included the creation of a Vice President for Community Colleges, responsible for executive leadership, policy decision-making, resource allocation, development of appropriate support services for the seven community colleges, and re-consolidated the academic and administrative support units for the community colleges. A dual reporting relationship was created whereby the Community College Chancellors report to the Vice President for Community Colleges for leadership and coordination of community college matters, and concurrently report to the President for University system-wide policymaking and decisions impacting the campuses. The dual reporting relationship preserves previous BOR action that promoted and facilitated campus autonomy in balance with system-wide academic and administrative functions and operations. College chancellors retain responsibility and control over campus operations, administration, and management. [President's System Level Reorganization - Community Colleges - June 2005]
All ten chancellors continue to report to the President and collectively meet as the Council of Chancellors to advise the President on strategic planning, program development, and other matters of concern. The Community College Chancellors meet as the Council of Community College Chancellors to provide advice to the President and Vice President for Community Colleges on community college policy issues and other matters of community college interest.

The Regents Candidate Advisory Council of the University of Hawai‘i – 2007:

The advisory council was created by Act 56, 2007 Hawai‘i Legislature, in conformity with the amendment to Article X, Section 6 of the Hawai‘i State Constitution ratified by the voters on Nov. 7, 2006. The council is tied to the University of Hawai‘i for administrative purposes. The Council identifies candidates for the University System’s governing Board of Regents. The council presents to the Governor of Hawai‘i pools of qualified candidates from which candidates are nominated and, with the consent of the State Senate, appointed by the Governor. [Office of the Board of Regents]

The Regents Candidate Advisory Council of the University of Hawai‘i Amended 2008, 2010:

Seven members comprise the Advisory Council. They establish the criteria for qualifying, screening, and forwarding candidates for membership on the UH Board of Regents. The council advertises pending vacancies and solicits and accepts applications from potential candidates. [UH Regents Candidate Advisory Council]

Act 56 was amended by Act 9 in 2008 which, in part, established residency within the county. In 2010, Act 9 was amended by Act 58 which, in part, ensured student involvement by the creation a student advisory group. [Act 9; Act 58]

Change in Board of Regents Structure:

As a result of changes in State law, the BOR was increased to fifteen members with all Regents nominated by a Regents Selection Advisory Committee, selected from this nominee list by the Governor, and confirmed by the State Senate.

While the Community College Committee of the BOR continues in existence, Community College actions requiring Board approval are discussed and acted upon by the full Board through the regular Board meetings. There have been no difficulties in moving items to the Board or in getting timely approval of action items. The VPCC remains the principal liaison with the full BOR and the standing Community Colleges Committee on all Community College matters. The standing committee met as a separate committee in March, April, and November 2010 and January 18, 2012. A report from the standing committee chair to the full BOR is included in the November 19, 2010, meeting. The BOR intentionally holds meetings on all campuses within the UH system. [Board of Regents Committee on Community Colleges; Board of Regents Meeting Minutes and Agendas]

The main agenda items for the standing committee meetings were listed as “Campus Issues and Concerns – Information Only and Campus Tour.” Within “Issues and Concerns,” the standing
committee’s schedule is structured to include an open comment period for the community, and meetings with student leaders, faculty leaders, and administration.

Achieving the Dream – 2006:

In Fall 2006, the then-interim Vice President for Community Colleges (VPCC), on behalf of the UHCCs, filed a letter of intent to join the national initiative, Achieving the Dream (AtD.) Implementation began in July 2006 and will continue through June 2012. A Core Team and a Data Team were set up under the VPCC. Members include an Initiative Director representative from each of the community colleges, and staff from the OVPCC. The five AtD Goals for Student Success were adopted with particular focus on the success gaps for Native Hawaiian students. Although the UHCC focus is on increasing Native Hawaiian student success and achievement, because of the evidence-based strategies implemented, all students benefit from the initiative. The commitment to the initiative is evidenced by the inclusion of many AtD goals within the UHCC Strategic Plan, thus ensuring a life beyond the time frame of AtD. [Achieving the Dream Goals]

Act 188 Task Force (2008):

Act 188 was adopted by the 2008 State Legislature to establish a task force that would make recommendations on a budgetary system that “includes an equitable, consistent, and responsive funding formula for the distribution of fiscal resources to the various University of Hawai’i campuses.”

UHCC Strategic Planning Council (2008):

In Spring 2008, the Planning Council began to evaluate and report performance data that contributes to UHCC Strategic Outcomes and Performance Measures 2008-2015 Appendix B. The Vice President for Community Colleges visited each college to review benchmarks, baseline data, and suggested targets. The colleges were asked to review the proposal and agree to the proposals or suggest new targets. Each college was starting from a different point and had different capacity – all of which were taken into account in establishing UHCC System Strategic Outcomes and Performance Measures, 2008-2015. Underlying the system goals and outcomes are college-level goals and outcomes. In Fall 2008, the Planning Council finalized the strategic outcomes, performance measures (definitions and sources), and expected levels of performance and made public the results of their work. The Office of the Vice President for Community Colleges (OVPCC) distributes updated annual performance data in the spring of each year and the VPCC holds forums at each college to discuss the UHCC system and college-level performance. [UHCC Strategic Outcomes and Performance Measures 2008-2015 Appendix B; UHCC System Strategic Outcomes and Performance Measures, 2008-2015; Strategic Planning Annual Performance Data]

Assessment of the strategic planning process is conducted regularly using the Community College Inventory survey. Survey data are used for determining progress for Goal E performance measures in the Strategic Plan: “Develop and sustain an institutional environment
that promotes transparency, and a culture of evidence that links institutional assessment, planning, resource acquisition, and resource allocation.’

**UH Community College Enrollment Growth Funding (2008):**

Beginning with the FB-2007-09, general funds have been appropriated by the Legislature to the University of Hawai‘i Community Colleges (UOH 800) to cover the differential cost (additional costs net of tuition revenue) for additional credit classes/credits required to meet student demands. These general funds are to be used only to defray the cost of additional credit classes/credits with any remaining funds not used for this specific purpose lapsing to the State general fund at the end of each fiscal year.

**Community College Enrollment Growth Cost Differential Funding - Final FY 2011 Allocations**

**Change in Accreditation Status and Name Maui Community College (2009):**

Effective August 2009, Maui Community College’s accreditation was transferred from the WASC Junior to the WASC Senior Commission and renamed the University of Hawai‘i Maui College. The college remains part of the University of Hawai‘i Community College System for administrative and organizational reporting and funding.

**Change in University of Hawaii System Presidency (2009):**

On August 1, 2009, Dr. M.R.C. Greenwood became the 14th President of the University of Hawai‘i. Dr. Greenwood previously served as Chancellor of the University of California Santa Cruz and Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs within the University of California System. During her tenure with the UC system, Dr. Greenwood had close working relationships with area community colleges and is very familiar with WASC and the accrediting requirements. Dr. Greenwood highlighted the work of the UH Community Colleges in her inaugural speeches, focusing on both the extraordinary enrollment increases and the emphasis that the community colleges have placed on student success through the Achieving the Dream (AtD) and National Association of System Heads (NASH) Access to Success initiatives. Dr. Greenwood is firmly committed to the establishment of measurable outcomes and effective planning and budgeting to reach those decisions. There are no immediate plans to change the current organizational structure as it relates to the Community Colleges.

**Hawaii Graduation Initiative and Complete College America (2010):**

Hawaii Graduation Initiative aimed at increasing the number of college degrees awarded by 25 percent by the year 2015. Hawai‘i, along with sixteen other states, form the Complete College Alliance of States, a select group of leading states committed to significantly increasing the number of students successfully completing college and closing attainment gaps for traditionally underserved populations. As part of the initiative, the University of Hawai‘i President will lead a team of leaders to advance the Complete College America policy agenda and to coordinate local initiatives within the Complete College America agenda. The Hawai‘i team members include the Vice President for Community Colleges, University of Hawai‘i; President, Chaminade
Section 304A-104 of the Hawaii Revised Statutes changed to read that Officers of the Board of Regents shall consist of a Chairperson and up to two Vice Chairpersons. The Chairperson and up to two Vice Chairpersons shall now be elected by the Board at a meeting preceding July 1 of each year. [Hawaii Revised Statutes 304a-104 (2010)]

IV.B.1. The Institution has a governing board that is responsible for establishing policies to assure the quality, integrity, and effectiveness of the student learning programs and services and the financial stability of the Institution. The governing board adheres to a clearly-defined policy for selecting and evaluating the Chief Administrator for the College or the district/system.

IV.B.1.a. The Governing Board is an independent policy-making body that reflects the public interest in Board activities and decisions. Once the Board reaches a decision, it acts as a whole. It advocates for and defends the Institution and protects it from undue influence or pressure.

Descriptive Summary

Governance of the University of Hawai‘i is vested in a fifteen-member Board of Regents nominated by a Regents Selection Advisory Committee, selected from this nominee list by the Governor, and confirmed by the State Senate. Membership of the BOR is controlled by State Law. That statute states that the “affairs of the university shall be under the general management and control of the Board of Regents.” That statute indicates the membership and size of the BOR, how the members are selected, their terms of office, when the BOR is expected to meet, and how they are compensated. [Hawaii Revised Statutes 304a-104 (2010)]

Board of Regents By-Laws and Policies define the duties and responsibilities of the Board and its officers and committees. The BOR is responsible for the internal organization and management of the University, including, but not limited to, establishing the general mission and goals of the system and approving any changes to them; adopting academic and facilities planning documents for the system and the campuses; adopting broad policy that guides all aspects of University governance; appointing and evaluating the President; establishing the Administrative structure and approving major Administrative appointments; approving all major contractual obligations of the University; approving new academic and other programs and major organizational changes; reviewing all fiscal audits of University operations; and approving the University budget, long-range financial plans, and budget requests for state funding.

The BOR appoints and evaluates the President of the University and approves other executive appointments, including Vice Presidents, Chancellors, and Deans. Evidence of the BOR as an independent policy-making body that reflects the public interest in board activities and decisions can be traced to a constitutional amendment that gave greater autonomy to the University of Hawai‘i.
Hawai‘i. Although the Constitution had previously granted the BOR of the University authority to manage the University, a clause “in accordance with law” had been interpreted to mean that the BOR could not take action unless legislation specifically permitted the action. The constitutional amendment removed that clause. The BOR and Administration are currently working with external and internal constituents to establish and carry out the principles that will guide the changed relationship the University seeks with the State. [Hawaii Revised Statutes 304a-105 (2010)]

The BOR elects its own officers and hires its own staff. Currently, the BOR has two professional staff members (the Executive Administrator and Secretary to the BOR and the Executive Assistant) and three secretaries. System administrative staff also provide support to the BOR as needed.

BOR Policy Chapter 9, Part III, addresses recruitment and appointment of Executive and Managerial personnel. BOR Policy Chapter 2 details the evaluation of the President. [Board of Regents Policies and Bylaws]

In accord with the State’s Sunshine Law, all meetings are public, except those involving discussion of personnel and legal matters. Board of Regents By-Laws and Policies—as well as agenda and minutes of meetings—are publicly available at the BOR website. [Hawaii Revised Statutes 92; Office of the Board of Regents]

Self Evaluation

The College meets the standard.

The College Administration works effectively with the BOR. Recent actions the College has requested and the BOR has approved include the recent update of the campus Long Range Development plan, approval of the Construction Management Associate of Science degree and the Associate of Science in Music and Entertainment Learning Experience as provisional programs.

The College has a strategic plan aligned with the system and CC system strategic plans. A number of initiatives the system and BOR have approved have helped the campus better focus on student success and measures the campus is accountable for meeting. Examples of these initiatives include the Achieving the Dream project and the Hawaii Graduation Initiative. Another example of system initiatives’ assisting the campus operations is the enrollment growth funding that began in 2008, which allows the campus to respond to student demand by adding courses in great need.

Actionable Improvement Plans

No action is required.
IV.B.1.b. *The Governing Board establishes policies consistent with the Mission Statement to ensure the quality, integrity, and improvement of student learning programs and services and the resources necessary to support them.*

**Descriptive Summary**

BOR policies are implemented through administrative policies and procedures and delegations of authority published and promulgated by means of the University of Hawai‘i System-Wide Executive Policies and the University of Hawai‘i System-Wide Administrative Procedures Manual. These documents are available on the Web at: [Systemwide Administrative Procedures](#).

The issues of the community colleges are being addressed appropriately by the Board of Regents. The BOR minutes show many agenda items focused on the needs and issues of the community colleges. The BOR practice of meeting at the colleges was designed to give Regents a better understanding of each college’s climate and culture. The Regents have had a long-standing practice of annually holding its meetings on each of the University’s campuses. [Board of Regents Meeting Minutes and Agendas](#)

The University of Hawai‘i Community Colleges Strategic Plan 2002-2010 was adopted by the BOR on November 22, 2002. UHCC Strategic Plan states that within the overall mission of the University of Hawai‘i, the Community Colleges have as their special mission: [Minutes, UH Board of Regents, November 22, 2002; UHCC Strategic Plan](#)

- **Access:** To broaden access to post-secondary education in Hawai‘i, regionally, and internationally by providing open-door opportunities for students to enter quality educational programs within their own communities.

- **Learning and Teaching:** To specialize in the effective teaching of remedial/developmental education, general education, and other introductory liberal arts, pre-professional, and selected baccalaureate courses and programs.

- **Work Force Development:** To provide the trained workforce needed in the state, the region, and internationally by offering occupational, technical, and professional courses and programs which prepare students for immediate employment and career advancement.

- **Personal Development:** To provide opportunities for personal enrichment, occupational upgrading, and career mobility through credit and non-credit courses and activities.

- **Community Development:** To contribute to and stimulate the cultural and intellectual life of the community by providing a forum for the discussion of ideas; by providing leadership, knowledge, problem-solving skills, and general informational services; and by providing opportunities for community members to develop their creativity and appreciate the creative endeavors of others.

- **Diversity:** By building upon Hawai‘i’s unique multi-cultural environment and geographic location, through efforts in curriculum development and productive relationships with
international counterparts in Asia and the Pacific, UHCC students’ learning experiences will prepare them for the global workplace.

In 2008, the UHCC System updated the Strategic Planning Context UHCC Strategic Planning Context Appendix A and developed Strategic Outcomes and Performance Measures 2008-2015 Appendix B that provide a more uniform method with which to evaluate progress. The plans and performance measures are in line with the University of Hawai‘i System Strategic Plan. UHCC Strategic Planning is overseen by the Community College Strategic Planning Council. The roles and responsibilities of the Strategic Planning Council are codified in UHCCP 4.101. The Council is made up of Chancellors, Faculty Senate Chairs, and Student Body Presidents from each college, and the Vice President and Associate Vice Presidents for the CC system. Each college has a college strategic plan that is integrated in the UHCC Strategic Plan. [UHCC Strategic Planning Context Appendix A; Strategic Outcomes and Performance Measures 2008-2015 Appendix B; Strategic Academic Planning - UHCCP # 4.101]

**Self Evaluation**

The College meets the standard.

The College has recently revised its mission statement to better align with the new system mission focused on success of Native Hawaiian students. The Strategic Planning Council includes members of the Honolulu CC campus and allows for input into the strategic planning process, development of strategic measures and outcomes, and overall vision and planning.

**Actionable Improvement Plans**

No action is required.

*IV.B.1.c. The governing board has ultimate responsibility for educational quality, legal matters, and financial integrity.*

**Descriptive Summary**

The descriptive summary for Standard IV.B.1.b above addressed the BOR’s responsibility for educational quality. Regarding legal matters and financial integrity, the BOR is responsible for the internal organization and management of the University. Increased autonomy granted to the University by the Legislature over the past decade guarantees that the University has the right to determine where budgets will be cut or reallocated when State appropriations are reduced. Implementation of BOR policies is the responsibility of the President and the Executive Managerial team.

The University of Hawai‘i System President prepares a budget that includes all elements of the University. When approved by the BOR, the budget is submitted to the State Legislature. Allocation of resources is system-wide after the appropriation from the legislature is known. The community college allocations are determined through a budget process overseen by the Strategic Planning Council and submitted to the President for inclusion in the larger University
The UHCC Strategic Plan set benchmarks and numeric goals. The Colleges set local goals, relying on program review data. In this way, the Colleges’ planning aligns with the overall goals set by the Strategic Planning Council. The President’s final budget recommendation is communicated to the Community College Chancellors.

Upon approval by the BOR, the University’s operating and Capital Improvement Projects (CIP) budget requests are submitted simultaneously to the Governor for review and incorporated into the executive budget request for the State and to the Legislature for informational purposes. The executive budget request for the State is submitted to the Legislature in December for consideration in the regular session of the Legislature in January. Appropriations by the Legislature (General or Supplemental Appropriations Act) are usually passed in May and transmitted to the Governor for approval. Upon approval by the Governor in June, allocation notices are transmitted to all state agencies, including any restrictions imposed on Legislative appropriations. The Governor can impose restrictions at any time of the year based on economic conditions.

Legislative appropriations for operating funds are specifically designated by fund type for major organizational units (UH-Mānoa, UH-Hilo, West O‘ahu, Community Colleges, System-Wide Programs, etc.). State law allows the Governor to withhold or restrict Legislative appropriations. General fund allocations are made to each major organizational unit less any restrictions imposed by the Governor. The President is authorized to determine distributions of general fund restrictions as well as reallocations between major organizational units. The Vice President for Community Colleges and the Community College Chancellors determine the general fund allocations to the individual Community Colleges, normally maintaining established levels of current service funding.

Due to declining levels of State funding support, it has become necessary to assess each campus a pro rata share of certain unfunded costs that are administered on a system-wide basis. These costs include the risk management program costs (including legal settlements), private fundraising costs, and workers’ compensation/unemployment insurance premiums.

In terms of financial integrity, external auditors audit the University of Hawai‘i annually. The University’s financial statements are prepared in accordance with generally accepted auditing standards and Government Accounting Standards (GASB) principles. In July of 2005, with changing auditing standards, the ACCJC accepted “the presentation of a combined balance sheet and income statement of the community college system as supplemental information to the University’s consolidated financial statements with an opinion on such supplemental information in relation to the University’s consolidated financial statements taken as a whole” as documentation of audit requirements for the University of Hawai‘i Community Colleges.

**Self Evaluation**

The College meets the standard.

State allocations made to the system are then pushed to the campus levels via the UHCC VPCC’s office. Budget determinations are made based on historical needs, legislative appropriates for
specific programs, and programmatic needs. At the campus level, budgets are determined by program. The allocations are determined based on annual meetings with Deans, Division Chairs and Coordinators. A review of the past annual budget and discussions of upcoming needs allows for tentative budgets to be in place.

**Actionable Improvement Plans**

No action is required.

*IV.B.1.d. The Institution or the Governing Board publishes the Board by-laws and policies specifying the Board’s size, duties, responsibilities, structure, and operating procedures.*

**Descriptive Summary**

The BOR maintains a website on which the by-laws, policies, and meeting minutes are regularly posted. All of the policies mentioned in this Standard are published on this site. [Office of the Board of Regents]

**Self Evaluation**

The College meets the standard.

**Actionable Improvement Plans**

No action is required.

*IV.B.1.e. The Governing Board acts in a manner consistent with its policies and by-laws. The board regularly evaluates its policies and practices and revises them as necessary.*

**Descriptive Summary**

The BOR conducts meetings and administers the business of the University System in accordance with the State Sunshine Law. BOR minutes are maintained and published following each meeting and are available on the website. BOR policy Chapter 2, Administration, Section 2-4 references BOR Policy on Board Self Evaluation. In addition, the Administration submits recommendations for policy and policy revisions as necessary. [Office of the Board of Regents; Board of Regents Policies and Bylaws - Chapter 2 Administration]

During 2010/2011, the BOR initiated and completed a review of all BOR policies to ensure they followed best practices and to meet the intent of revisions in three areas: “readily apparent changes that are long overdue; convert prescriptive statements to broader policy statements; and propose delegations of authority to enhance operational efficiency and effectiveness.” Vice Presidents were assigned specific chapters for review and revision. The University of Hawaii All Campus Council of Faculty Senate Chairs (ACCFSC) was advised about the proposed amendments as a result of the review via a memo from the BOR Chair on Feb. 3, 2011. At the Feb. 25, 2011, ACCFSC meeting concern was raised about the short turn-around time for faculty
consultation. In response to the request by the ACCFSC Co-Chair to the BOR, the deadline for feedback was extended. Individual Senates reviewed the proposed amendments and the respective Senate Chairs sent faculty feedback to the ACCFSC Co-Chairs. Proposed amendments to BOR Policies, Chapters 1-8 and 10-12, were approved by the BOR at its March 17, 2011 meeting. Language clarification through additional amendments occurred at the BOR meeting on April 21, 2011 for Chapters 1-8 and 10-12, as well as in-depth discussion of Chapter 9. All amendments and revisions were approved at this meeting. [Minutes, ACCFSC Meeting - February 25, 2011; Minutes, Board of Regents Meeting, March 17, 2011; Minutes, UH Board of Regents Meeting, April 21, 2011; Minutes, UH Board of Regents, January 20, 2011; University of Hawaii All Campus Council of Faculty Senate Chairs]

BOR Policy Chapter 2 Administration, Section 4, Policy on Board Self-Evaluation requires that the BOR shall conduct a self-study of its stewardship every two years. The policy includes the responsibility, process, and outcomes. [Board of Regents Policies and Bylaws - Chapter 2 Administration]

Minutes from the BOR Briefings and Workshop on Best Practices by the AGB's Dr. MacTaggart, Briefing and Workshop Conducted by WASC. There was another meeting of Briefing and Workshop on Best Practices conducted by the AGB's Dr. MacTaggart on September 29, 2011, but those minutes are not yet available. [Minutes, UH Board of Regents, January 20, 2011; Minutes, UH Board of Regents, April 1, 2010]

Self Evaluation

The College meets the standard.

**Actionable Improvement Plans**

No action is required.

*IV.B.1.f. The Governing Board has a program for Board development and new member orientation. It has a mechanism for providing for continuity of Board membership and staggered terms of office.*

**Descriptive Summary**

Governance of the University of Hawai‘i is vested in a fifteen-member Board of Regents nominated by a Regents Selection Advisory Committee, selected from this nominee list by the Governor, and confirmed by the State Senate. Hawaii Revised Statutes - §304A-104 Hawaii Statutes sets the term of office as five years except for the student member, whose term is two years. The statute provides for staggered terms. Every member may serve beyond the expiration date of the member’s term of appointment until the member’s successor has been appointed by the Governor and confirmed by the Senate. Members may serve no more than two consecutive five-year terms. [Hawaii Revised Statutes 304a-104 (2010)]
The President facilitates an Annual Briefing and Workshop on Best Practices for all Regents (conducted by Association Governing Boards). New Regent Orientation has been conducted by the UH EVP/Provost. Orientations were conducted on September 21, 2011; May 20, 2011; and August 24, 2010. [Marcia, is this last date correct as far as the year?] At the BOR February 23, 2012 Meeting, the BOR adopted changes in their by-laws to reflect the obligation to conduct timely orientation of new members. The action is reflected in the March 2012 BOR minutes [hold for link]. The University has developed the Board of Regents Reference Guide as the foundation. An updated copy was released in May 2011. [Minutes, UH Board of Regents, January 20, 2011;  February 23, 2012 BOR Minutes; Board of Regents Reference Guide - May 2011]

**Self Evaluation**

The College meets the standard.

The College, as mentioned in other parts of the Standard 4 Evaluation, will mirror this activity of providing an orientation to governance members. It is intended that this will address some of the communication and feedback concerns that have been expressed, and will help to ensure that representatives on governance committees regularly inform and consult with their constituents.

**Actionable Improvement Plans**

No action is required.

*IV.B.1.g. The Governing Board’s self-evaluation processes for assessing Board performance are clearly defined, implemented, and published in its policies or by-laws.*

**Descriptive Summary**

BOR Policy Chapter 2, Administration, Section 2-4 Policy on Board Self-Evaluation Chapter 2, Section 2-4 details the purpose, policy, responsibility, process, and outcomes for BOR self-evaluation. [Board of Regents Policies and Bylaws - Chapter 2 Administration]

**Self Evaluation**

The College meets the standard.

The College is working on a process to also require assessment of both Administration and the Governance Boards on an annual basis.

**Actionable Improvement Plans**

No action is required.

*IV.B.1.h. The Governing Board has a code of ethics that includes a clearly-defined policy for dealing with behavior that violates its code.*
Descriptive Summary

BOR Policy, Article X, and HRS Chapter 84 address the BOR’s stated process for dealing with unethical behavior. [Bylaws of the Board Of Regents Of The University of Hawaii]

Self Evaluation

The College meets the standard.

Actionable Improvement Plans

No action is required.

IV.B.1.i. The Governing Board is informed about and involved in the accreditation process.

Descriptive Summary

Accreditation is part of the training for new BOR members. The Vice President for Community Colleges keeps the BOR informed about the accreditation process. BOR meeting minutes April 1, 2010, evidence a three-hour workshop presented by the WASC President and Executive Director and the ACCJC president. The OVPCC coordinates the schedule of College Self-Evaluations submitted to the BOR. The BOR approves the Self –Evaluations in the August or September meeting. [Board of Regents Reference Guide - August 2009; Minutes, UH Board of Regents Meeting, August 24-25, 2006]

Self Evaluation

The College meets the standard.

Prior to the submission of any accreditation self study reports or progress, the BOR will review and provide approval of such reports. This process keeps the Board fully aware and up to date on accreditation issues and progress at the ten campuses.

Actionable Improvement Plans

No action is required.

IV.B.1.j. The governing board has the responsibility for selecting and evaluating the district/system Chief Administrator (most often known as the Chancellor) in a multi-college district/system or the College Chief Administrator (most often known as the President) in the case of a single college. The Governing Board delegates full responsibility and authority to him/her to implement and administer Board policies without Board interference and holds him/her accountable for the operation of the district/system or College, respectively.
In multi-college districts/systems, the Governing Board establishes a clearly-defined policy for selecting and evaluating the Presidents of the Colleges.

**Descriptive Summary**

The President of the University of Hawai‘i System has full responsibility and authority for execution of the policies authorized and established by the BOR. BOR Policy Chapter 2 Administration provides for the duties and evaluation of the President of the University of Hawai‘i System. Minutes from the BOR January 20, 2011 meeting show approval of the President’s goals for the academic year and approval extending the President’s contract with the University. [Board of Regents Policies and Bylaws - Chapter 2 Administration; Minutes, UH Board of Regents, January 20, 2011]

The BOR approves the appointment of the Vice President for Community Colleges who is evaluated by the President of the University System.

The BOR approves the appointment of each College Chancellor, who is evaluated by the Vice President for Community Colleges. As the Chancellors also report to the President of the University of Hawai‘i, the President will also evaluate the Chancellors.

Within the time frame of this Self-Study, the University completed successful searches for two Community College Chancellors and the President of the University of Hawai‘i System. BOR policies and procedures were followed in conducting the searches.

**Self Evaluation**

The College meets the standard.

The College was recently engaged in this process as it worked to select a new Chancellor to be in place on July 1, 2012. This process included the initial evaluation of candidates at the campus level through a search advisory committee whose members represent campus and community constituencies. A short list of candidates was then invited to visit the campus where they met with the Executive Interview Committee, the UHCC VPCC, and the System President, and held public meetings. A recommendation was then made to the Board for approval. Evaluation of the campus Chancellors occurs each year with an evaluation by the President. This evaluation is also reflective of the campus’ meeting the set strategic outcomes.

**Actionable Improvement Plans**

No action is required.

*IV.B.2. The President has primary responsibility for the quality of the institution he/she leads. He/she provides effective leadership in planning, organizing, budgeting, selecting and developing personnel, and assessing institutional effectiveness.*

*IV. B.2.a. The President plans, oversees, and evaluates an administrative structure organized and*
staffed to reflect the Institution's purposes, size, and complexity. He/she delegates authority to administrators and others consistent with their responsibilities, as appropriate.

**Descriptive Summary**

The Chancellor provides general direction for all College administration and development; plans, organizes, and directs the Institution’s academic and support programs in accordance with established policy and procedural guidelines and applicable statutes. The Chancellor oversees the management and operations of the College in the following functional areas:

- Campus planning and research.
- Academic program development and delivery, including credit and degree programs and non-credit training programs and related support services.
- Management of curricula, programs, and articulation with external colleges and organizations.
- International affairs.
- Student services.
- Library and learning resources, and other learning assistance services.
- Information and media technology services.
- Public affairs, marketing, and public information.
- Resource development, including fund raising.
- Finance, accounting, and budgeting.
- Human resource management.
- Physical plant management, including parking and security.
- Institutional research.
- Accreditation process.
- Statewide Honolulu Community College/K-12 Partnerships.

The College is made aware of the Chancellor’s participation in campus activities through minutes of meetings attended, as the Chancellor is a standing member of the Faculty Senate and the Planning Council. The Chancellor’s office sends out periodic campus-wide messages with updates as to initiatives, achievements, and challenges. At the start of each semester, the Chancellor provides an overview of College challenges, opportunities, and goals to the campus community at the General College Meeting. Periodically, the Chancellor conducts informational town hall meetings.

A document (Delineation of Duties) clarifies the roles of the Chancellor and the VCAA, VCAS, and Executive Assistant. This matrix outlines specific roles and duties of the Chancellor and Vice Chancellor of Academic Affairs. It differentiates roles and responsibilities related to reporting structure, leadership, governance and management, communication, outreach, long-range planning, and grant management. Specific actions and/or examples of tasks to be carried out by each position are cited to clarify the nature of these responsibilities. This chart of official duties and responsibilities was used in drafting the hiring advertisement and developing the screening criteria used to fill the position of Chancellor, and included information derived from the chart of official duties.
This delineation of administrative roles and responsibilities chart is posted on the College internal Intranet site. The most recent University of Hawai‘i system “functional statements” memo-outlining position descriptions for key administrative positions is posted on the College’s Intranet site. This chart outlining the duties and authority of all four administrative positions was shared with the campus at the February 2009 Town Meeting. There is an established system of coverage when key administrators are absent from campus. The Chancellor’s Secretary sends an email to the campus whenever the Chancellor, VCAA, or VCFAS are absent from the campus; this email indicates who has authority in his or her absence.

Honolulu Community College’s primary focus is ensuring student success. As part of the College’s mission, “the College is committed to providing the academic and student support to assist students as they progress through their respective courses and programs.” The campus leadership routinely evaluates student success data, student engagement data, and other measures that indicate the performance of the campus in meeting established institutional outcomes. To effectively manage the student support services needed to facilitate a student-centered focus, the campus undertook a major reorganizational effort beginning in Fall 2010. In an effort to better manage campus resources and a student-centered learning environment, the reorganization revolved around consolidating IT services, establishing a Dean for Academic Support for better management of support services for instruction, establishing of a Student Success Coordinator, consolidating non-credit activities under one Administrator, placing the Native Hawaiian program division within University College, placing the Music Entertainment and Learning Experience (MELE) under the Communications and Services division, and abolishing the Pacific Aerospace Training Center (PATC).

The College continues to prioritize filling administrative posts on a full-time basis as a major leadership need. Due to retirements and other personnel changes, the leadership continues to be somewhat fluid. The Chancellor was assigned as Interim Chancellor in July of 2008 and was appointed Chancellor in July of 2009; he recently announced his planned retirement as of June 30, 2012. A Chancellor Search Committee was formed in November 2011 and hopes to identify a new Chancellor to begin July 1, 2012. The Vice-Chancellor of Administrative Services (VCAS) retired December 31, 2011. The campus appointed an Interim VCAS while a search takes place. The Vice-Chancellor for Academic Affairs has been with the campus in that capacity since August 2007. There are three Academic Deans that oversee the instructional divisions; one appointment is currently an interim one and the process of selecting a new permanent Dean is in the beginning stages. This is also the case for the Dean of Student position, and the goal is to have these two positions filled by August 2012. The College continues to undergo senior leadership changes. Once in place, the new Chancellor will begin searches for the Vice Chancellor of Administrative Services and the Director of PCATT. Both positions report directly to the Chancellor, and it is imperative that the new Chancellor have an opportunity to select these members of the administrative team. It is expected those two positions would be in place by Spring 2013.

A concern in the last Self-Study was clarification of the duties and responsibilities of the Chancellor’s Executive Assistant. The Chancellor appointed a new Executive Assistant in April 2011. As consistent with the other community colleges with Executive Assistant positions, a
common job description was used for recruitment. A search committee consisting of current administrators was formed to review applications and conduct interviews and provide recommendations to the Chancellor. The Chancellor relies on the Executive Assistant (EA) to help in carrying out administrative duties. The role of the EA continues to shift depending on the needs of the Chancellor’s office. A primary focus of the current EA’s role is coordinating external affairs conducted through the Chancellor’s office, including donor activities, marketing functions, and international agreements. The Executive Assistant’s appointment or assignment will change based on the skill set and priority needs identified by the Chancellor.

**Self Evaluation**

The College meets the Standard.

The Chancellor has set forth several initiatives intended to improve the campus’s functioning, including the formalization of College policies, improving an inclusive system of budgeting and planning decision-making, and implementing a reorganization intended to improve campus functioning. The efficacy of the new administrative structure established under the Chancellor’s leadership will need to be evaluated once in place.

The Spring Accreditation Survey reflects that more than half of respondents believe the College’s organization structure is effective and conducive to progress. The Governance and Leadership survey results indicate that improvements are needed in the performance of the Chancellor’s office in facilitating College communication, including ensuring the integration of budgeting and planning prioritizations. Issues raised in survey comments indicate a need to ensure more timeliness in announcing pending issues and explaining final decisions, including publicizing supporting evidence and rationale for decisions. Comments in the survey and input from those providing feedback indicate that in part these concerns are caused by the frequent absence of the Chancellor due to external obligations. Another area of concern was use of long-standing interim appointments to fill administrative positions, which diminishes the opportunity for meaningful involvement by the campus community in the selection of key Administrators. The Chancellor’s office must demonstrate hands-on engagement in addressing concerns about timely and meaningful inclusion in decisions as well as transparent and accountable appointment of administrators.

**Actionable Improvement Plans**

No action is required.

IV.B.2.b. *The President guides institutional improvement of the teaching and learning environment by the following:*

- Establishing a collegial process that sets values, goals, and priorities.
- Ensuring that evaluation and planning rely on high quality research and analysis on external and internal conditions.
- Ensuring that educational planning is integrated with resource planning and distribution to achieve student learning outcomes.
- Establishing procedures to evaluate overall institutional planning and implementation
Descriptive Summary

In March 2008, a Memorandum of Understanding on the “Collegial Relationship Among Campus Constituencies” was adopted by the Planning Committee and signed off by the Chancellor. This document explicitly articulates expectations and responsibilities of all parties on campus, specifically Administration, Faculty, Staff, and Students, in communication, respect, and participation in decision-making processes. This MOU is posted on the College’s Intranet website.

The Chancellor, the Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs, and the Vice Chancellor of Administrative Services have conducted several presentations to the campus, sharing data and report information related to the College’s strategic goals and outcomes, budgeting needs, and priorities. These presentations have taken place at standing committee meetings, town meetings and General College meetings. PowerPoint presentations are also posted on the Intranet.

The increased commitment of the College to implementing data-based decisions is reflected in increased funding for IR personnel and efforts. It is also seen in the increased emphasis on use of data to justify resources for departments, reflected in prioritization of a budget implementation plan and applications for Perkins grant funding.

The Chancellor has led the College in efforts to align College strategic goals and outcomes, defined by data measures, with the UHCC System strategic plan. Policies that formalize expectations regarding the linking of assessment, planning, and budgeting activities have been implemented. The Chancellor participates with system leadership in carrying out and publicizing system measures of institutional outcomes.

Self Evaluation

The College meets the standard.

There have been revision and formalization of policies in a number of these areas, including conduct and use of program review data, integration of budgeting and assessment results, and expanding inclusion in dialogue of prioritization. The campus is part of system-wide efforts to function based on meeting strategic goals and measurement of outcomes.

While the procedures and structures are in place, the results from the Governance and Leadership survey and the Spring Accreditation Survey indicate that there is work to be done in informing and engaging campus awareness of these processes.

Actionable Improvement Plans

No action is required.

IV.B.2.c. The President assures the implementation of statutes, regulations, and governing board
policies and assures that institutional practices are consistent with institutional mission and policies.

**Descriptive Summary**

The Chancellor has all necessary authority to implement statutes and to assure that institutional practices are consistent with statutes, regulations, Board policies, and the College’s mission and policies.

**Self Evaluation**

The College meets the standard.

The Chancellor has the necessary authority to fulfill these responsibilities and maintains the institutional role of ensuring implementation of the College’s Mission Statement, as well as relevant statutes and regulations. The Chancellor was active in the recent process of redrafting and revising the College’s mission statement. The results of the Accreditation Survey indicate the campus community knows and understands the College’s mission, believes that mission is appropriate, and believes the College’s actions reflect its mission. College policies proposed and adopted are in alignment with Board policies.

**Actionable Improvement Plans**

No action required.

**IV.B.2.d. The president effectively controls budget and expenditures.**

**Descriptive Summary**

The College’s strategic planning and budgeting process guides budget decisions. The Chancellor is responsible for implementing that process. The process has been developed and refined; the current system entails Administration, Faculty, Staff and Student leaders analyzing programs and data to develop a strategic plan and an operating budget. The Planning Council and all governance bodies are directly part of the process. The budget requests are finalized by the campus and sent to the Board for approval. The approved budget then moves on to the Legislature and Governor for additional scrutiny.

**Self Evaluation**

The College meets the standard.

The PC has been in place for six years and has formalized and carried out several cycles of a participatory process for prioritizing budget decisions. In the past two years, improvements have been made to increase opportunities for governance bodies to evaluate, rank the order of, and discuss campus priorities. Policies are in place and the PC has kept the campus as a whole informed through posted documents regarding processes and opportunities for input into
prioritization of the budget.

Governance and leadership survey results indicate there remain concerns about the effectiveness of the Chancellor in demonstrating leadership to ensure this integration of planning with use of resources. Processes and policies are in place to ensure this integration. Therefore, this response likely reflects lack of campus awareness, related to previously discussed needs to improve communication by all institutional leaders and governance committees.

**Actionable Improvement Plans**

No action required.

IV.B.2.e. *The President works and communicates effectively with the communities served by the Institution.*

**Descriptive Summary**

To fulfill the College’s mission, the Chancellor is a member of numerous community associations, advisory boards, and executive committees. The means by which the Chancellor communicates with communities include 1) an Executive Advisory Board, 2) sharing of the Annual Report with local constituencies, and 3) membership in local, regional, and national organizations.

Executive Advisory Board:
Members of the Chancellor’s Executive Advisory Board consist of individuals from a range of industries in the community including education (High School, Early Education, private/public sector); automotive; finance; construction; non-profit sector; communications; advance technology; and alumni. Although the Board has not held meetings recently, the Chancellor communicates with members on an individual basis and his office is in the process of reconstituting and reorganizing the Board.

Annual Report:
One of the larger, highly visible, communication efforts recently undertaken was distribution of HCC’s Annual Report for 2009-2011 to all government officials, community and business partners, DOE partner schools, and the UH system. The Annual Report presents the Institution’s strategic and long-range plans, revenues and finances, and initiatives. Beginning in 2012, the Chancellor’s office will launch a blog site that will feature the Chancellor with updates about the College. The plan is to have the blog open for public viewing.

Membership:
The Chancellor is a member of several community organizations at the local, regional, and national levels including the following:
• ATCAH (Apprenticeship & Training Coordinators Association of Hawaii).
• KBA (Kalihi Business Association).
• Epic Ohana Youth Opportunity Initiative Community Partnership Hui.
• PCATT Advisory Board.
• The Oahu Workforce Development Council – A public/private partnership appointed by the mayor to advise the City and County of Honolulu on workforce development programs, expenditures, and policies.
• The Smaller Learning Communities Advisory Council – a public/private partnership advising the consortia of Hawai‘i public high schools that are the recipients of a multi-year federal school reform grant.
• PPEC (Pacific Post-Secondary Education Council).
• CHEA (Council for Higher Education).
• AACC (American Association of Community Colleges).
• ACCJC (Accrediting Commission for Community and Junior Colleges—Commission Chair).

Self Evaluation

The College meets the standard.

The Chancellor is a participating member in several local and national community organizations which represent groups served by and/or working with the College in its efforts to meet student needs.

Actionable Improvement Plans

No action is required.

IVB.3. In multi-college districts or systems the district/system provides primary leadership in setting and communicating expectations of educational excellence and integrity throughout the district/system and assures support for the effective operation of the colleges. It establishes clearly-defined roles of authority and responsibility between the colleges and the district/system and acts as the liaison between the colleges and the governing board.

IVB.3.a. The district/system clearly delineates and communicates the operational responsibilities and functions of the district/system from those of the College and consistently adheres to this delineation in practice.

Descriptive Summary

The University of Hawai‘i Community College system (UHCC) includes the seven community colleges (UH Maui College now accredited by WASC Senior). Colleges are located on the main Hawaiian islands of Hawai‘i, Kaua‘i, Maui, and O‘ahu. The islands of Lana‘i and Moloka‘i are served by Education Centers staffed and operated by University of Hawai‘i Maui College. The UHCC office is located on O‘ahu at a central site independent of the seven colleges. The seven colleges of the system form an interdependent network that is nested within the ten-institution University of Hawai‘i System.

Community College Chancellors have dual reporting to the President of the University of Hawai‘i System for University system-wide policy-making and decisions impacting the
The Office of the VPCC functional statement and the position description for the VPCC include descriptions of the executive leadership work of the Vice President, who provides primary leadership in setting and communicating expectations of educational excellence and integrity throughout the Community College System and assures support for the effective operation of the Community Colleges with staff support. The functional statement also makes clear that the Community College Chancellor has full responsibility and authority to implement and administer delegated system policies and is accountable for the operation of the College. The 2005 organization expanded the authority and responsibility of the Chancellor (e.g. personnel decisions).

Through a series of meetings in Spring 2006, the VPCC, the seven Community College Chancellors, and senior staff from the VPCC Office developed and agreed upon a functional roadmap delineating the operational responsibilities and functions of the University of Hawai‘i System Offices, the UHCC System Office, the BOR, the State of Hawai‘i, and the Colleges. The functions are regularly reviewed by the Council Community College Chancellors and updated as needed. Following a major review of BOR policies in Spring 2011 and the delegation of some functions to the President, Vice President, and Chancellors, UHCC Chancellors reviewed and revised the UHCC Functional Road Map in 2011-2012. [UHCC Campus-System Functions Map - January 27, 2012]

A number of UH System-Wide committees/workgroups and UHCC System-Wide committees/workgroups exist where discussion, information sharing, and consultation take place to advise/inform/make recommendations to the Chancellors and Vice President and the leaders of the System as appropriate. Several UHCC faculty and administration groups continue to work on developing new UHCC Policies and converting the former Chancellor for Community College Memoranda (CCCMs) CCCM Conversion to UH Community College Policies, as appropriate. The conversion begun in 2005 is ongoing. [UHCC Policy Conversion Analysis]

**Self Evaluation**

The College meets the standard.

The campus Chancellor and both Vice-Chancellors routinely meet with system groups to focus on coordinating and developing standard policy and practices. The implementation of those policies is then governed and monitored at the campus level where the delineation of duties occurs. Important policy formations that focus on budget, human resources, and academic-related issues are underway.

**Actionable Improvement Plans**

No action is required.
IV.B.3.b. The district/system provides effective services that support the colleges in their missions and functions.

Descriptive Summary

The Office of the Vice President for Community Colleges provides centralized support services in the areas of Administrative Affairs and Academic Affairs. The Associate Vice President for Community Colleges Academic Affairs (AVPCCAA) is responsible for providing leadership in internal operational policy-making that has impact on the development and implementation of Community College System-Wide academic plans, goals, objectives, and assessments. The office provides leadership, assistance, and coordination in the areas of 1) Academic Support Services, 2) Academic Planning, Assessment, and Policy Analysis, 3) Career and Technical Education, 4) Student Affairs, and 5) Workforce Development. June 2005 Reorganization Functional Statement

The Office of the Associate Vice President for Community Colleges Administrative Services (AVPCCAS) is responsible for facilitation and coordination in all aspects of administrative services for Community Colleges. The Office provides leadership, assistance, and coordination in the areas of 1) Budget and Planning, 2) Equal Employment Opportunity and Affirmative Action (EEO/AA), 3) Facilities and Environmental Health, Human Resources, [Marcia, should “Human Resources” be a separate item?] 4) Marketing Communications, and 5) Research, Training, Commercial Enterprises and Emergency Management. The University of Hawai‘i Capital Improvements Projects (CIP) is managed at the System level by the Office of Capital Improvements. The BOR established the UH Office of Capital Improvements to manage major CIP projects on University campuses. Overall Community College repair and maintenance and capital improvement are under the AVPCCAS. Colleges have responsibility for routine maintenance, and health and safety issues. Colleges work with consultants to develop Long Range Development Plans (LRDP) which are used by the System to develop capital improvement plans. [Reorganization Functional Statement - June 2005; Office of Capital Improvements]

Self Evaluation

The College meets the standard.

The College benefits greatly from the support provided by the various System Offices. Assistance is routinely sought regarding issues pertaining to personnel, large procurement needs and capital improvements. Coordination around emergency management training is also provided by the UHCC system.

Actionable Improvement Plans

No action is required.
IV.B.3.c. The district/system provides fair distribution of resources that are adequate to support the effective operations of the colleges.

Descriptive Summary

In accordance with State law, the University submits a biennial budget request, program, financial plan, and program performance reports to the Governor and Legislature for consideration by the Legislature when it convenes in regular session in every odd-numbered year. A supplemental budget request to amend any appropriation for the current fiscal biennium may also be submitted to the Legislature for approval when it convenes in regular session in even-numbered years. Operating and Capital Improvement Projects (CIP) funds for the University are appropriated by major organizational units, for instance, UH Manoa, UH Hilo, UH West O‘ahu, UH Community Colleges, and System-Wide Support. The statutes governing the State of Hawai‘i budget preparation process are primarily reflected under Chapter 37 of the Hawaii Revised Statutes. [Hawaii Budget Preparation Statutes]

The UHCC System Office coordinates the budget development and request process for the UHCC System which is viewed as a single unit in the University of Hawai‘i budget. The budget process is grounded in the strategic plans of the University of Hawai‘i System, the UH Community College System, and the individual College Strategic Plan. The Community College Strategic Planning Council (SPC) is the primary body for assuring system-wide participation in the UHCC strategic planning process. The membership of the SPC consists of the Chancellor, Faculty Senate Chair, and Student Government Chair from each college, and the Vice President and Associate Vice Presidents for the community colleges. The SPC develops a planning context which identifies system budget request categories and priorities to ensure consistency with UHCC Strategic Plan goals and objectives. SPC oversight ensures that strategic planning and budget development remain closely-linked processes. The guiding principles of the Community College Strategic Academic Planning Process, which defines the role of the Strategic Planning Council (SPC), are codified in UHCCP 4.101. The development process of the College budget request is described earlier in this report and available online. [Strategic Academic Planning - UHCCP # 4.101; Office of the Vice President for Community Colleges Budget Preparation]

At the UHCC system level, the seven Community College Chancellors, with support from the Associate Vice Presidents and their staff, collaboratively review, categorize, and prioritize the individual college budget requests. A key determinant in approving budget requests are quantifiable and measurable goals supporting the achievement and advancement of strategic planning goals. Although budget details are maintained at the individual college level, the Community College budget is summarized and consolidated at the University of Hawai‘i Community College system level.

All major organizational units participate in the University’s Budget Preparation Process and present budget proposals to the UH System Biennium Budget Advisory Committee. The UH Biennium Budget Committee is comprised of representatives from the baccalaureate campuses, the Community College System, the All Campus Council of Faculty Senate Chairs, the Puko’a (Native Hawaiian) Council, the UH Student Caucus, and members of the UH System Senior Management Team. The Biennium Budget Advisory Committee formulates and submits
recommendations to the University Executive Budget Committee. The recommendations are made in accordance with the FB 2011-13 Biennium Budget Policy Paper issued by the President, and set forth the process, strategic priorities, and timeline for the biennium budget process. The University Executive Budget Committee formulates a draft system-wide budget proposal, subject to consultation on a system-wide basis, and then submits a recommended biennium budget proposal to the President for consideration. The President reviews the budget proposal, and then submits the recommended budget proposal to the BOR for final approval. The University’s final BOR approved budget is presented to the Governor and Legislature for consideration and approval. At their discretion, the Governor and Legislature may add budget items to address high priority areas of concern of the State. [2007-2009 Biennium Budget Committee Members; 2011-2013 Biennium Budget Policy Paper]

Although position counts and funding are appropriated by the Legislature at the University’s major organizational level (Community College System), details on decisions related to individual campus budget requests are provided on Legislative worksheets. The practice of the UHCC system has been to appropriate College funds in accordance with Legislative intent.

While State general funds provide the most significant funding resource for the colleges, tuition revenues are a critical and growing component of college revenue streams. Tuition revenues have risen considerably over the past few years both as a result of higher tuition rates and the rapid growth in the student population. The Fall 2011 credit headcount enrollment for the Community Colleges was 34,100 students, an increase of a slight decrease from Fall 2010. Other non-general funding resources (e.g. Special funds, Revolving funds, Extramural Funds, UH Foundation, etc.) are also generated and retained by each college.

The VPCC, in consultation with the Council of Community College Chancellors, implemented a series of measures to differentially allocate resources across the colleges to meet strategic planning outcomes and address the needs identified in the program review process.

Act 188 Task Force (2008):

Act 188 was adopted by the 2008 State Legislature to establish a task force that would make recommendations on a budgetary system that “includes an equitable, consistent, and responsive funding formula for the distribution of fiscal resources to the various University of Hawai‘i campuses.” The formula would be linked to enrollment, assign different weights in recognition of the varying costs and revenues relating to educating different categories of students, and include an incentive and performance component. [Act 188, SLH 2008]

After deliberation and consultation with the University President and the Board of Regents, the Act 188 Task Force recommended to the Hawaii State Legislature that the University FB 2011-13 biennium budget include 1) an enrollment component that provides funds to the University based on actual enrollment increases and 2) an outcomes component that provides funds to the University, based on actual strategic outcomes related to graduation, Native Hawaiian graduation, Science Technology Engineering and Math (STEM) graduation, enrollment of low-income students and student transfer.
Due to the downturn in the State economy, funding for the requested components was not approved in the FB 2011-13. However, in FY 2012, the UHCC’s internally reallocated $3.5 million to provide incentive funding for meeting the goals contained in the UHCC Strategic Outcomes and Performance Measures, 2008 - 2015 and $1.5 million to supplement $1.7 million in general funds (total $3.2 million) for enrollment growth. Enrollment growth allocations are based on the increase in the number of credit hours taught over a FY 2007 baseline and include a differential calculation to recognize the different resource requirements for remedial and non-remedial instruction. [UHCC Strategic Outcomes and Performance Measures, 2008 - 2015; Community College Enrollment Growth Cost Differential Funding - Final FY 2011 Allocations]

An additional $2 million was also identified for system-wide reallocation to expand financial aid programs, improve remedial/developmental education, augment the Achieving the Dream initiative, and address other Strategic Planning-related requirements. Examples of other initiatives designed to ensure adequate resources system-wide include internal reallocations to support different need-based financial aid scholarship requirements at each college, Financial Aid Scholarship Allocations, and differential repairs and maintenance allocations to ensure that high priority repairs are addressed at each campus on a timely basis FY 2012 Repairs and Maintenance Plan. [FY 2012 Need Based Tuition Scholarships/Waivers - TFSF Reallocations; Facilities Repairs and Maintenance Plans for FY 2012]

The Vice President for Community Colleges has functional responsibility for providing a fair distribution of resources that are adequate to support the effective operations of the community colleges. The Vice President’s work is reviewed by the President for results and effectiveness. [Reorganization Functional Statement - June 2005]

**Self Evaluation**

The College meets the standard.

**Actionable Improvement Plans**

No action is required.

*I.V.B.3.d. The district/system effectively controls its expenditures.*

**Descriptive Summary**

The statutes governing the State of Hawaii budget execution process are primarily reflected under Chapter 37 of the Hawaii Revised Statutes. As required by State law, the University implements the budget execution process as provided in the Governor’s Budget Execution Policies. While the University is exempt from some of the special requirements set forth in the instructions, the primary fund allocation and control processes are maintained as required. The maintenance of allocations, ceilings, quarterly allotments, Form A-19 approval process, etc., provide appropriate monitoring, controls, and safeguards in the budget executive process. [Hawaii Revised Statutes Chapter 37; FY 12 Budget Execution Policies & Instructions]
The Financial Management Information System (FMIS) of the University of Hawai‘i was implemented on July 1, 1996, and provides the basic mechanism to monitor and control the financial resources of the University of Hawai‘i. FMIS assures observance of legal requirements, aids in the exercise of budgetary and management controls, and provides financial information pertaining to the various functions of the University. FMIS is designed to adhere to Federal, State, and University requirements, address management information needs, and comply with accounting principles for colleges and universities. UH Admin Procedures Accounting General The quarterly allotment (Form A-19) monitoring and control requirements are programmed in FMIS with transactions edit rejections currently maintained at the campus/fund level. A separate project based, expenditure category, contracts and grants module is in place to administer these types of funds. [Marcia: can you read the previous two sentences for terminology? I’m not sure if they’re accurate as is or should read differently.] Other funds (e.g. endowments, agency, bond, financial aid, etc.) are also maintained and controlled as appropriate under FMIS. [UH Systemwide Administrative Procedures A8.600 Accounting]

Fund management is accomplished through the Budget Level Summary System (BLS). The BLS system is a management tool designed to provide campus administrators with relevant data with which to appropriately manage available resources as well as to report and inform central administration, the Board of Regents, and the Legislature of the financial status of individual campus funds throughout the fiscal year. The BLS system projects the current fiscal year-end financial status of each fund based upon the consideration of current cash balances, projected current year expenditures/encumbrances (allotments), projected current year revenues, projected transfers/loans, and other relevant factors. The BLS system is integrated with the formal budget execution and control process established under FMIS and the State budget allocation system. The BLS system is updated on a quarterly basis (BLS reports are available at each campus). [BLS System Status - FY 2011 Closing and FY 2012 Initial Allocations]

The BLS system is also used to monitor the status of Special and Revolving fund cash reserves as compared with the standards set by the Community College Unrestricted Fund Reserve Policy. The UHCC’s Unrestricted Reserve Policy was established to ensure financial stability through the maintenance of adequate reserves for unforeseen or emergency situations. The status of Special and Revolving fund cash reserves is provided with BLS system information on a quarterly basis. [Unrestricted Fund Reserve Policy - General, Special, Revolving Funds - UHCCP # 8.201]

The University of Hawai‘i is in the process of developing and testing a replacement to FMIS. The new system, Kuali Financial System (KFS) is scheduled to go online on July 1, 2012. KFS is an open-source financial system, collaboratively designed among partner schools to meet the needs of all Carnegie Class Institutions by integrating best practice processes into its core design. The new system will improve efficiency, bring business practices up to date, and provide improved data-driven decision-making. The new system will also provide the mechanism to ensure compliance with all applicable Federal, State, and University requirements. [Kuali Financial System]
The VPCC has functional responsibility for ensuring that the Community College System effectively controls its expenditures. The Vice President’s work is reviewed by the President for results and effectiveness. [Reorganization Functional Statement - June 2005]

An independent audit is conducted annually for the entire University system. The independent audits include a combined balance sheet and income statement of the Community College System as supplemental information to the University’s consolidated financial statements. [Strategic Planning/Budget Development Consolidated Financial Statements]

The audits are prepared in accordance with Governmental Accounting Standards Board (GASB) principles, which establish the standards for external financial reporting for public colleges and universities. The audits provide external independent reviews of the University’s financial information and are key indicators of fiscal health and sound financial management.

**Self Evaluation**

The College meets the standard.

The College is responsible for the sound management of its financial resources. Accountability to the system occurs annually through the annual audit process. At the campus level, budget evaluation, departmental spending, and accounting management are monitored through an administrative approval process. Deans and Directors work closely with the Vice Chancellor for Administrative Services on spending needs and budget allocations.

**Actionable Improvement Plans**

No action is required.

*IV.B.3.e. The Chancellor gives full responsibility and authority to the Presidents of the Colleges to implement and administer delegated district/system policies without the Chancellor’s interference and holds them accountable for the operation of the colleges.*

**Descriptive Summary**

The University of Hawai‘i System has a single President, a Vice President for Community Colleges, and College Chancellors. Within the University of Hawai‘i System, IV.B.3.e refers to the UH President and the Vice President for Community Colleges’ giving full responsibility and authority to the Chancellors of the Colleges. The BOR approved organization of the University of Hawai‘i President’s office and the creation of the Office of the Vice President for Community Colleges, and the realigning of functions established an organizational infrastructure for the University of Hawai‘i System of Community Colleges while retaining the integrity of the individually accredited colleges. When approving the structure and positions, the President stated “that the new Vice President for Community Colleges will be responsible for community college-related system policies, resource allocation within the community colleges, and central service and support for the seven community colleges.” When asked who would control the funding at each of the community colleges, the President responded that “funding would be
influenced by the Vice President’s decision but campus operations and management would be the responsibility of the Chancellors. The decision as to how the money is distributed to each of the campuses ultimately would rest with the University President.” [Minutes, UH Board of Regents, June 21-22, 2005]

Community College Chancellors have authority and leadership responsibility for the immediate operation, management, administration, and governance of their campuses within BOR governing and Presidential administrative policy. [Board of Regents Policies and Bylaws - Chapter 4 Planning]

The position description of a Chancellor (GE102) gives full responsibility and authority to the Chancellor for all administrative and academic matters of the campus. [Chancellor Position Description]

The Vice President for Community Colleges has functional responsibility ensuring that Community College Chancellors have full responsibility and authority to implement and administer delegated system policies without interference and holds the Chancellors accountable for the operation of the colleges. The Vice President evaluates Community College Chancellors. The Vice President’s work is reviewed by the President for results and effectiveness. [Reorganization Functional Statement - June 2005]

**Self Evaluation**

The College meets the standard.

Over the last several years, a delineation of authority has moved to the campus Chancellor for many areas. This decision-making structure provides for better management by the Chancellor for campus-level decisions. In terms of personnel decision making, the Chancellor has the authority to make personnel appointment decisions two levels below his/her office. This allows the Chancellor to appoint positions at the Deans and Directors level. Vice-Chancellors are appointed by the UHCC VPCC at the recommendation of the campus Chancellor. Financial and procurement delineation of duties have also occurred, which allows the area of responsibility to fall at the campus level. This provides greater flexibility in purchasing and contract development.

**Actionable Improvement Plans**

No action is required.

*IV.B.3.f. The district/system acts as the liaison between the colleges and the governing board. The district/system and the colleges use effective methods of communication, and they exchange information in a timely manner.*

**Descriptive Summary**
The Office of the Vice President for Community Colleges acts as liaison between the community colleges and the BOR. The VPCC serves as an Administrative Representative to the BOR Community College Standing Committee. When presentations regarding the Community College System are made to the standing committee or to the full BOR, it is the VPCC who speaks for the system (November 2005 and April 2006 BOR Standing Committee minutes, full BOR minutes). Items forwarded to the BOR for approval, such as College Strategic Plans and College Institutional Self Evaluation Report, are forwarded under the signature of the VPCC. The functional road map provides more detail. [VPCC Position Description; Reorganization Functional Statement - June 2005; UHCC Campus-System Functions Map - May 8, 2006]

The VPCC is a member of the President’s Executive Council as well as a member on the ten-campus Council of Chancellors. The VPCC convenes regular meetings of the seven-campus Council of Community College Chancellors.

The VPCC visits each campus at least twice a year. During the Spring Campus Visits he holds an open campus forum to discuss the UHCC system and college-level performance. In the fall, he reviews major initiatives and the budget for the upcoming year. These regular opportunities to meet with the VPCC and to discuss campus issues and concerns are well-received and appreciated. [2011 Quick Look Strategic Plan - March 31, 2011]

Self Evaluation

The College meets the standard.

The College Chancellor is responsible for coordinating with the UHCC office. Items needing BOR action or approval are always consulted first with the UHCC VPCC office. The VPCC bi-annual visits and President’s annual visits provide important updates on system initiatives and outcome measures. These evaluations are then filtered down to the campus level for evaluation of the campus performance. In areas where the campus does not meet performance measure, the Chancellor is then responsible for creating a plan for improvement along with other campus constituents.

Actionable Improvement Plans

No action is required.

IV.B.3.g. The district/system regularly evaluates district/system role-delineation and governance and decision-making structures and processes to assure their integrity and effectiveness in assisting the colleges in meeting educational goals. The district/system widely communicates the results of these evaluations and uses them as the basis for improvement.

Descriptive Summary

The community college system is compiling best practices and processes into polices which are posted to the Community College website. Written policies are aligned with BOR and system
executive level polices, and provide for regular review and assessment of the policies. [UHCC Policies]

The VPCC and the Chancellors have agreed to and made public a UHCC Campus - System Functions Map. One of the system’s first polices (UHCCP 1.102 Community College Council of Faculty Senate Chairs) delineates the role of faculty governance and defines its advisory role to the VPCC. [UHCC Campus-System Functions Map - January 27, 2012; Community College Council of Faculty Senate Chairs - UHCCP #1.102]

UHCC Strategic Planning is codified UHCCP 4.101. The policy provides for a process and establishes the Community Colleges’ Strategic Planning Council (SPC) as the primary body for assuring system-wide participation in the UHCC strategic planning process. The policy identifies roles and responsibilities and includes the relationship to and responsibility of campus academic planning. [Strategic Academic Planning - UHCCP #4.101]

**Self Evaluation**

The College meets the standard as a result of the 2010-2011 review, revision, and approval by the BOR of all BOR policies, in consultation with system administration and faculty.

**Actionable Improvement Plans**

No action is required.
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