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I. Report Preparation

A. The Commission Action Letter

In its January 25, 2019, letter to Chancellor Louise Pagotto, the Commission required the College to address compliance with Standards I.B.7, I.B.8, IV.A.7 (College Recommendation 1) and Standards I.B.2, I.B.4, I.B.5 (College Recommendation 2).

Standards I.B.7, I.B.8, IV.A.7 (College Recommendation 1)

In order to meet the Standards, the Team recommends that the College regularly evaluate its institutional plans and governance and decision-making policies, procedures, and processes to ensure their effectiveness. Further, the Team recommends that the results of evaluations be widely communicated across the institution and used as a basis for making improvements.

Standard I.B.7
The institution regularly evaluates its policies and practices across all areas of the institution, including instructional programs, student and learning support services, resource management, and governance processes to assure their effectiveness in supporting academic quality and accomplishment of mission.

Standard I.B.8
The institution broadly communicates the results of all its assessment and evaluation activities so that the institution has a shared understanding of its strengths and weaknesses and sets appropriate priorities.

Standard IV.A.7
Leadership roles and the institution’s governance and decision-making policies, procedures, and processes are regularly evaluated to assure their integrity and effectiveness. The institution widely communicates the results of these evaluations and uses them as a basis for improvement.


In order to meet the Standards, the Team recommends that the College analyze and document the results of learning outcomes assessment across all disciplines and programs, and integrate this analysis and documentation into program review and institutional planning processes on a regular and consistent cycle. Further, the Team recommends that the College use the results of
this analysis and documentation to make improvements in student learning at the course, program, and institutional levels.

**Standard I.B.2**
The institution defines and assesses student learning outcomes for all instructional programs and student and learning support services. (ER11)

**Standard I.B.4**
The institution uses assessment data and organizes its institutional processes to support student learning and student achievement.

**Standard I.B.5**
The institution assesses accomplishment of its mission through program review and evaluation of goals and objectives, student learning outcomes, and student achievement. Quantitative and qualitative data are disaggregated for analysis by program type and mode of delivery.

**B. Introduction: No Ke Kauhale Ke Kuleana**

Our campus culture focuses on student success, where all members take responsibility, work together, and build a community that supports and celebrates students’ engagement, learning, achievement, and success. No Ke Kauhale Ke Kuleana (the responsibility of the community) derives from our steadfast commitment to students, beginning with our motto from Queen Julia Kapiʻolani: kūlia i ka nuʻu, strive for the highest. Student success forms the strong fibers that bind our community, encircling and uplifting all learners.

As we experienced a year of growth and change in response to the Commission’s recommendations, we kept students at the forefront of all our decision-making and planning. Since 2015, the College has implemented a Student Success Pathway (SSP) framework that is based on intentionally designed, clear, and structured educational experiences that guide students from their point of entry to graduation, transfer, and career:

![Image of Student Success Pathway]

*Figure 1. Kapiʻolani Community College Student Success Pathway.*

The six phases reflect momentum points where students need the most support to succeed. Our Student Success Council’s vision of neʻepapa, moving our campus community in unison
to advance student success, and the Student Success Pathways framework further guided our steps forward and promoted continual reflection and purposeful planning with the ultimate goal of improvement. The culmination of our extensive and intensive endeavors throughout the past year attests to our unwavering commitment to inspiring and supporting students to be successful in their learning and in their lives.

C. Overview of the Process

An accreditation workgroup led efforts to address the recommendations, which involved the entire campus (see Appendix A). Initially, these efforts were two-pronged as teams directed their focus toward their respective recommendations.

Those addressing Recommendation 1 turned their attention to plans, policies and governance organizations, working closely with authorized governance organization (AGO) chairs, council chairs, and College plan administrators to develop and implement a formal continuous improvement process that would unify efforts to plan, evaluate, and make data-informed decisions in a consistent and transparent manner. The College implemented all changes through collaborative sessions during which stakeholders provided feedback on the processes and tools being developed in order to maximize inclusivity and generate ownership.

![Figure 2. Kapi'olani Community College Continuous Improvement Process.](image)

Those focused on Recommendation 2 worked closely with Faculty Senate and the members of the Faculty Senate Student Learning Outcomes and Assessment (SLOA) Committee to evaluate and refine the processes and tools for the regular assessment of student learning to inform planning and improve courses and programs institution-wide. After consideration of and responses to input from stakeholders, the College adopted processes for meaningful discourse and data-informed planning for continuous improvement at the course, program and institutional level.
As the teams met to debrief their efforts as a workgroup, and individuals increasingly began working across teams, it became apparent that, while we had been referencing Recommendation 1 as “continuous improvement” and Recommendation 2 as “outcomes assessment,” the nature of both endeavors was the same—on all fronts, we were working to bolster our processes for planning, assessing/evaluating, communicating and reflecting upon findings to inform plans for improvement. Thus, the workgroup extended the scope of the continuous improvement model and infused it into numerous processes and tools, from learning assessment and program evaluation to the goal-setting and continuous improvement of our governance organizations, plans, processes and policies (see Appendix B for evolution of the approach to Continuous Improvement). The College visually integrated the model into related tools and even into meeting agendas (RP1 - CAC Agenda) to ensure we are living this model.

Next, redundancies and gaps were brought to light as we examined current processes and tools relevant to these areas and engaged with stakeholders institution-wide. We identified a number of ways to streamline existing processes and to consolidate and create new processes and tools in order to plan, collect, analyze, reflect on and communicate data in a manner that would meaningfully inform decision-making and close the loop on continuous improvement cycles.

The level of transparency inherent in the revised and newly developed processes and tools represents a fundamental cultural shift for our College. While stakeholders voiced some concerns as these processes were developed and adopted, overall, the campus has embraced this transformative change in a way that is both surprising and inspiring. The focus on inclusivity in this evolution has allowed us to enact the values of transparency and accountability. What began as a need to address a somewhat disappointing outcome of our last accreditation visit has truly afforded us an opportunity to re-evaluate and re-imagine the way our campus functions.

D. Kapi‘olani Community College Integrated Planning for Student Success

Through our collaborative work and discussions, we have rebuilt college processes to re-instill trust and clarity in roles, structures and processes. We determined that an integrated planning model would afford the College a synergistic approach to previously redundant or competing processes, align our actions with our values and goals, focus institutional decision-making on student success, and ensure that data-informed decision-making was driving continuous improvement. An integrated planning model would illustrate these concepts in a visual representation to effectively communicate the integration of planning processes with the campus.

A draft Integrated Planning Model was presented to the Chancellor, Executive Leadership Team (ELT) (RP2 - ELT minutes), and Chancellor’s Advisory Council (CAC) (RP3 - CAC
minutes) (RP4 - AGOS and Councils) for feedback before the Chancellor presented it to the campus community at the fall 2019 convocation.

The Integrated Planning Model is grounded in:

**Inclusivity** of the campus community in informing priorities and future Institutional Pillars (see page 28 for a description) and the Strategic Plan; participation in aligned processes focusing on continuous improvement. Efforts will break down silos and unify the campus.

**Transparency** of plans for continuous improvement and of decisions by all levels of campus leadership. Efforts will improve ownership in decision-making, thereby leading to increased trust and morale.

**Accountability** by campus leadership in the ways that they “live,” lead, operate (internally and externally), and make decisions with consistency through and based on the model. Efforts will grow a culture of sharing data, making decisions based on data, and closing the loop to understand the impact of our decisions.

This model, shown in Figure 3, has guided subsequent accreditation and continuous improvement efforts and is intended to serve as both a philosophy and process for continuous improvement and decision-making at Kapiʻolani CC.
Our values guide all that we do, including shaping our vision, mission and institutional pillars. These ground the Chancellor’s priorities and the College’s strategic directions, which are also informed by the campus community and system-wide priorities. We align all of our plans for action, from teaching and learning to resource allocation, to the student success framework and utilize data to both assess our progress and plan for the future.

The model affords us both focus, by prioritizing what’s important while moving forward and ensuring processes involve data-informed decision-making, and agility, by allowing us to adapt to changing campus needs.

Report Preparation Evidence

RP1 - CAC Agenda, 11.12.2019
RP2 - ELT Minutes, 8.5.2019
RP3 - CAC Minutes, 8.15.2019
RP4 - List of AGOs and Councils with description of their roles
II. Response to the Commission Action Letter

A. College Recommendation 1

In order to meet the Standards, the Team recommends that the College regularly evaluates its institutional plans and governance and decision-making policies, procedures, and processes to ensure their effectiveness. Further, the Team recommends that the results of evaluations be widely communicated across the institution and used as a basis for making improvements. (I.B.7, I.B.8, IV.A.7)

1. Continuous Improvement Surveys & Reports

In fall 2018, campus leadership launched a process to ensure regular evaluation of our “plans, governance and decision-making policies, procedures and processes.” The Chancellor convened meetings (CR1 - AGO meeting 1) (CR2 - AGO meeting 2) (CR3 - AGO meeting 3) with the Authorized Governance Organizations (AGOs): Faculty Senate, Student Congress, Staff Council and ‘Aha Kalāualani (Native Hawaiian Council), which represent all the constituents on campus. The AGOs agreed to conduct two surveys: one to gather information to improve processes within their executive committees (for example, the internal survey CR4 - ‘Aha Kalāualani Internal Survey) and the other to gather information to improve communication and their effectiveness in representing their constituents (for example, the external survey CR5 - ‘Aha Kalāualani External Survey). The AGOs agreed to use a set of common questions with the option to add custom questions to provide data on areas specific to their organization. The AGOs used the common questions to identify themes and created the opportunity to work on solutions collaboratively. The surveys were completed in spring 2019. Each AGO completed a report on the results of the surveys and from the analysis, goals were drafted for Fall 2019 (CR6 - ‘Aha Kalāualani CI Report). All the survey results for the AGOs are found on the Continuous Improvement webpage (CR7 - CI Report). Please click on the URL at the top of the document to access the webpage.)

To increase inclusivity and transparency, the following College councils adopted the surveys developed by the AGOs, using the same set of common questions and optional custom questions (RP4 - AGOs and Councils):

- Executive Leadership Team (ELT)
- Chancellor’s Advisory Council (CAC)
- Academic Affairs Council (AAC)
- Student Success Council (SSC)
- Student Affairs Leadership Team (SALT)
- Office of Continuing Education and Training Council (OCET)
- Counseling and Academic Advising Council (CAAC)
The AGO and College council surveys were reported at the end of the academic year in Continuous Improvement Reports and informed planning for the beginning of the academic year in fall 2019. The results and other continuous improvement documents were uploaded to the first iteration of the Continuous Improvement (CI) website (CR7 - CI Report).

2. Continuous Improvement + Student Success Pathway Plans (CI + SSP)

The surveys administered in spring 2019 started important dialogues across the campus. Three AGOs identified communication and broader participation as common problems and shared ideas for improvement (CR8 - AGO minutes). As the processes and tools were developed, redundancies in reporting became evident. Feedback from sessions with AGO and council chairs pointed to Student Success Pathway Plans (SSP) as a viable vehicle to streamline the documentation and communication of continuous improvement efforts. The revised Student Success Pathway plans now annually track:

- Goals - What specific, measurable outcomes do you want to achieve? One to three goals are recommended.
- Action Steps - What specific steps will you implement to achieve this goal?
- Resources - What resources are needed to carry out your plan?
- Assessment Strategy - What data is necessary to collect in order to determine whether/to what extent you achieved this goal?
- SSP Alignment - With what phase of the Student Success Pathway does this goal align? (see figure 4)
- Strategic Plan Alignment - All goals must align with either a strategic plan outcome or institutional priority.

![Figure 4: Kapiʻolani Community College Continuous Improvement + Student Success Pathways.](image)

Continuous Improvement + Student Success Pathway Plans (CI + SSP) Dashboard

The campus had already been using the Student Success Pathway Plans for two years to address metrics in the College’s Strategic Plan. Thus, the presentation of the information in an institutional dashboard was an easy transition for the campus. On the other hand, the transparency of the continuous improvement process across units represents a major cultural shift, which has been somewhat surprisingly embraced by stakeholders. The change from individuals’ keeping their plans within the department/unit to sharing them in a public dashboard is a major step forward in enacting the values adopted in the Integrated Planning Model. (CR9 - CI+ SSP Dashboard)
On August 23, 2019, the Authorized Governance Organization (AGO) chairs, council chairs and plan administrators met for briefings on the Integrated Planning Model, the consolidated Student Success Plans, the role that SSPs play in the continuous improvement cycle and how data are used for integrated planning (CR10 – Continuous Improvement Meeting). Meeting participants discussed creating specific, measurable, attainable, relevant and timely goals (SMART goals) for the 2019-2020 academic year, each tied to data. All the AGOs, councils and plan administrators filled out the “Plan” section of the SSPs by September 15, 2019, to identify where synergies existed, thereby creating more opportunities for collaboration.

On October 2, 2019, the AGO chairs, council chairs and plan administrators met to share their goals and identify similar themes (CR11 – Continuous Improvement Follow Up Meeting). The leaders reviewed the CI + SSP dashboard before the meeting. Several collaborative opportunities were identified and discussed. For example, one of the goals of the Distance Education (DE) plan was to identify degrees and certificates that can be offered exclusively online. The DE plan administrator is currently working with the Enrollment Management Team and the Marketing Team to focus a message specifically for returning adults to encourage them to take courses at their convenience (online) to resume their education.

As has been the practice for the SSPs over the past two years, goals and action plans were identified and, this time, uploaded to the new CI + SSP dashboard on September 15, 2019. Progress reports are due periodically: December 15, 2019, and February 1, 2020, with a summative assessment due on May 10, 2020, for this current cycle. These assessment points have been incorporated into the CI + SSP for participants to reflect upon the goals set forth at the beginning of the cycle. The two formative assessment points trigger individuals to answer the following questions:

a. What does the data say about whether/how well you are progressing towards your goals?
b. If your strategies and/or assessment methods are not working, how will you improve?

These formative checkpoints ensure that continuous consideration and re-calibrating of data and strategies are taking place prior to the summative report in which individuals officially close the loop on the annual continuous improvement cycle by analyzing data, reporting findings, and most importantly, directly tying those findings to next steps for goal-planning in the subsequent year. The two summative questions prompt the author to answer the following questions:

a. Summative findings - What does the data say about whether/to what extent you achieved your goal?
b. Inform next steps - Based on these findings, what are the next appropriate steps for the coming year?
3. Communication Across the Institution

To ensure “that the results of evaluations [are] widely communicated across the institution,” several efforts were launched. On February 13, 2019, the first of two Accreditation Town Hall meetings updated the campus about the progress being made to address the two recommendations. One of the suggestions from the first town hall was to create a webpage to track the progress on the recommendations. On March 13, 2019, the Accreditation Updates webpage (CR12 - Accreditation Updates Webpage) was launched. The second Accreditation Town Hall update took place on April 23, 2019. In addition, regular updates on the progress of both recommendations were made at the monthly Chancellor Advisory Council meetings. (CR13 - CAC minutes Jan. 2019), (CR14 - CAC minutes June 2019), (CR15 - CAC minutes Dec. 2019)

As processes were being developed and revised, additional requests were made for a single repository for all the processes and tools. The second iteration of the Continuous Improvement webpage (CR16 - Continuous Improvement webpage) became that repository and included the Integrated Planning Model for Student Success, the CI + SSP dashboard, the CI + CLR forms and instructions, and the CI + ARPD (see recommendation 2, page 19).

To ensure that “the College regularly evaluates its procedures and processes to ensure their effectiveness,” and with the aim of continuous improvement, the new Continuous Improvement processes and practices that have been put into place will themselves be evaluated and assessed for effectiveness by the Office for Institutional Effectiveness (OFIE) starting in summer 2020.

4. Policy Reviews

To ensure that “the College regularly evaluates its institutional plans and governance and decision-making policies, procedures, and processes to ensure their effectiveness,” the College’s policies are on a five-year review cycle. (See Appendix D for the policy review schedule.)

The process to review and/or revise a policy is outlined in K 1.100 Policy on the Policy Development Process (CR17 - K1.100). The first step is the proposer of the original policy or ad hoc committee reviews the policy and presents the revisions, if any, to the CAC. Feedback on the revisions is received during the subsequent month and incorporated into the document. After additional discussion, the final version is sent to the campus through the AGOs, department chairs and unit heads represented on the CAC for a vote. A month later, the CAC votes to approve the policy and the revised policy is uploaded to the Policy and Plans webpage (CR18 - Policy webpage) on Kapi‘olani Community College’s website. The Chancellor’s Advisory Council voted to approve revised policies K 1.112 and K 9.104 on February 13, 2020.
A policy may be reviewed before the five-year cycle, if immediate revisions are needed. For example, the CAC voted to approve revisions to Policy K 5.202, (CR19 - Policy K 5.202), Review of Established Programs, on October 8, 2019, to reflect the revisions to University of Hawai‘i (UH) Community College UHCC Policy 5.202.

B. College Recommendation 2

In order to meet the Standards, the Team recommends that the College analyze and document the results of learning outcomes assessment across all disciplines and programs, and integrate this analysis and documentation into program review and institutional planning processes on a regular and consistent cycle. Further, the Team recommends that the College use the results of this analysis and documentation to make improvements in student learning at the course, program, and institutional levels. (I.B.2, I.B.4, I.B.5)

1. Actions in Response to Recommendation 2

In order to meet the Standards, processes and tools were either created, revised or enhanced. The changes ensure that “the College analyze and document the results of learning outcomes assessment across all disciplines and programs, and integrate this analysis and documentation into program review and institutional planning processes on a regular and consistent cycle.”

In January 2019, the Institutional Self Evaluation Report (ISER) writing team created draft action items and a timeline to address Recommendation 2, identifying eight strategies. Five of the strategies were related to instructional decisions, which are the purview of the Faculty Senate; three of the strategies were institutional procedures to be addressed by the Chancellor’s Advisory Council (CAC):

1. Phase out the Taskstream assessment management system and replace with revised versions of the Course Learning Reports (CLRs) and Learning Assessment Schedule and Report (LASR). (Faculty Senate)
2. Ensure mapping is completed for course Student Learning Outcomes (SLOs) to Program Learning Outcomes (PLOs), General Education outcomes and Institutional Learning Outcomes (as applicable). (Faculty Senate)
3. Implement a five-year reporting cycle of course learning outcomes assessment (20% to be completed per year) beginning Fall 2019 and ending Spring 2024. (Faculty Senate)
4. Improve General Education outcomes to support assessment and fully implement them across the curriculum by Fall 2024. (Faculty Senate)
5. Ensure the alignment of information in syllabi and the catalog with the approved course outlines of record. (Faculty Senate)
6. Add a section to the Annual Report of Program Data (ARPD) to better connect assessment results to program improvement and resource allocation. ([CAC])

7. Change the Comprehensive Program Review (CPR) three-year cycle to a five-year cycle to align with the five-year cycle of course SLO assessments. ([CAC])

8. Re-examine and revise the resource allocation process (PAIR) for program improvement. ([CAC])

1.a. Faculty Senate (FS) Actions ([CR20 - Faculty Senate Resolutions])

In Spring 2019, the Chair of the Faculty Senate Student Learning Outcomes and Assessment (SLOA) Committee submitted Action Requests to Faculty Senate to address items 1-5. The SLOA Committee and the leadership, senators, and constituents of Faculty Senate made major changes to the processes and tools for student learning outcomes assessment to inform planning and improvement of courses and programs. Taskstream had been used for several years to track course SLO assessment, but the interface was difficult to use and not intuitive. The system became a deterrent for faculty to input their assessment data. At the recommendation of the SLOA committee and the institutional assessment coordinator, the Faculty Senate voted to phase out Taskstream and reinstate Course Learning Reports (CLRs) ([CR21 CI + CLR]) for course SLO assessments and Learning Assessment Schedule and Reports (LASRs) ([CR23 - LASR]), which departments had used in the past to track the progress of course SLO assessments. The content of the CLRs remained the same as the former version but now included mapping of course student learning outcomes to Program Learning Outcomes (PLOs), General Education outcomes, and Institutional Learning Outcomes (as applicable). The look of the CLRs was also altered to align with the continuous improvement format and the form itself was changed from PDFs and Word documents to Google Sheets.

The College adopted a five-year schedule for the assessment of all courses, with a goal of 20 percent of all course learning outcomes assessed each year. Assessment data that had been previously accessible only to program directors and department chairs are now being input on CI + CLRs and stored in team drives for transparency institution-wide. Processes for meaningful discourse and data-informed planning, informed by faculty input, are being adopted for continuous improvement at the course, program, and institutional level. In particular, the move towards institution-wide transparency is a significant change in campus culture, reflecting the commitment of the College to improve.

1.b. Chancellor’s Advisory Council (CAC) Actions

The three strategies under the purview of the Chancellor’s Advisory Council (CAC) were institution-wide initiatives. The Chancellor proposed changes to the Comprehensive Program Review (CPR), Annual Report of Program Data (ARPD), and resource allocation processes. These proposals were discussed and vetted thoroughly by the members of CAC.

1. Comprehensive Program Review (CPR) (spring 2019): The CPR cycle was changed from a three-year to a five-year cycle. All programs shall complete a comprehensive
program assessment every five years to align with the five-year course SLO assessment cycle and the course SLO assessments. The CAC voted to approve these and other changes to Policy 5.202, Review of Established Programs (CR24 - CAC Minutes) on October 8, 2019.

2. Annual Report of Program Data (ARPD) (fall 2019): The ARPD is a UH Community College system report and thus cannot be customized for our campus. To accomplish our strategy of better aligning assessment results to program improvement and resource allocation, a new process and tool were created (CR25 - CI + ARPD) (See paragraph on Program Outcomes Assessment through the ARPD, page 19).

3. Resource Allocation Process (fall 2019): The College reconfigured the College’s Budget Committee to include two representatives from each AGO and two members from CAC. The committee proposed a revised resource allocation process (CR26 - Budget Committee Minutes) (CR27 - Budget Committee Minutes), which was implemented in December 2019. (Description of the changes to the process is on page 23.)

2. Continuous Improvement + Course Learning Report (CI + CLR)

The Course Learning Reports (CLRs) (CR21 - CI + CLR) contain all the learning outcomes for each course, the schedule for when each outcome is to be assessed, the assessment methods used, the expected levels of achievement, the results of the assessment, the resources needed and next steps. CLRs also provide mapping of each course SLO to Program Learning Outcomes, General Education Outcomes, and Institutional Outcomes. The CI + CLR Google sheet allows for previous assessment data and next steps to be documented and tracked at the course level for review in future cycles, thereby ensuring that faculty close the loop on course assessments. The CI + CLR also allows faculty to document any discussions about resources that would improve student learning. This information contributes to the CI + ARPD and informs resource allocation decisions at the program and institutional level through the resource allocation process (see page 23).

To ensure transparency, collaboration and accountability, the newly revised Course Learning Reports (CLRs) were created as Google Sheets and stored in department folders within a shared drive called Course Learning Assessment Team Drives (known to department chairs as the PAPAYA shared drive, Providing Assistance Preparing All Your Assessments). Here is a sample of the CLRs from across the curriculum (CR22 – Sample CLRs). Access to the shared drive will be given to the members of the peer evaluation team once they are identified. The information is widely accessible, which encourages collaboration within and across programs and disciplines.

To account for the course learning assessments that were completed during the transition from Taskstream, the institutional assessment coordinator worked with the course coordinators and department chairs to download the course assessments previously stored in Taskstream. The
course assessment reports were stored in the CLR Department folder in the team drive for easy access.

**Figure 5. Kapi‘olani Community College Assessment of Student Learning.**

*Learning Assessment Schedule and Report (LASR)*
Each department chair utilizes the Learning Assessment Schedule and Report (LASR) (CR23 - LASR) to plan and track the progress of course-level assessments in each department or program. LASRs provide a clear view of the schedule for yearly assessment of at least 20 percent of the courses or SLOs and how that leads to 100 percent of the SLOs being assessed by the end of the five-year assessment cycle (fall 2019 to spring 2024).

In summer 2019, the department chairs, the deans, and the accreditation work group, which included the chair of the SLOA Committee, reviewed the new CLRs and LASRs and discussed other assessment-related topics such as mapping of courses to program, general education, and institutional learning outcomes (CR28 - CLR minutes) in preparation for campus-wide implementation in fall 2019. During fall convocation, the accreditation work group members presented the new CLRs to the faculty. During the deans’ and department chairs’ meetings, right after convocation, faculty were given the opportunity to use the new CLRs and encouraged to have conversations on their assessment activities with colleagues. On September 17, 2019, members of the Academic Affairs Council reviewed the processes (CR29 - AAC minutes). CLRs that were completed in the fall were uploaded to the CLR department folder by January 10, 2020.

**3. Continuous Improvement + Annual Report of Program Data (CI + ARPD)**
Annually, the University of Hawai‘i (UH) Community College System requires each community college to submit an Annual Report of Program Data (ARPD) for academic programs, academic support services such as library and tutoring, and student services. The ARPD is posted on a UH Community College website (CR30 - ARPD). To facilitate the
process, the UH Community College System provides an evaluation of overall program health based on key performance indicators of demand, efficiency, effectiveness, distance education, performance measures and, for Career and Technical Education programs, Perkins outcomes data. Individual programs input the results of course learning outcomes assessment to assess program learning outcomes for program improvement. On a separate tab, each program provides a report reflecting on the data and identifying action steps, resource implications and effectiveness in addressing the indicators and in improving program learning outcomes.

On April 15, 2019, in a meeting with the accreditation work group, the interim vice chancellor for academic affairs and the three academic deans agreed to review all the ARPDs completed by units under their supervision to extract the action plans, resource implications and, most importantly, course outcomes assessments leading to program improvement.

The Dean of Hospitality, Business, Legal and Technology worked with his department chairs, the institutional assessment coordinator, and the Office for Institutional Effectiveness to create a template to collect information for analysis in one place. The template was created, discussed, and subsequently revised to mirror the rest of the forms that track continuous improvement at the College. The CI + ARPD (CR25 - CI + ARPD) was uploaded and is accessible on the Continuous Improvement webpage.

ARPDs for academic year 2018-2019 were due to the UH Community College System at the end of fall 2019, after which the CI + ARPD process began with the program administrators completing the “Plan” section of the template to ensure adjustments were made to improve the programs in 2019-2020. The “Plan” section asks which program learning outcomes (PLO) will be assessed, the expected level of achievement for the PLO, how the PLO will be assessed, and which courses aligned with the PLO will be assessed. During the year, the “Execute”, “Analyze” and “Reflect” sections of the CI + ARPD form will be completed.

In spring 2020, the vice chancellors and deans reviewed the data in the CI + ARPD form and discussed resource needs for each program, which is an integral part of the resource allocation process. At a campus-wide meeting on February 20, 2020, the vice chancellors and deans reported on their priorities for resources based on ARPD data (see resource allocation process on page 23). The final review of the ARPDs will culminate with the overall synthesis in fall 2020 as the next ARPD cycle begins. Each vice chancellor and dean will be able to analyze data collected and note the themes that are emerging to inform the decision-making process. The impact of these changes is documented in the subsequent CI + ARPD reports.

The annual CI + ARPD document and process ensure the documentation of changes made based on a number of data points, including assessment of course learning outcomes. The analysis of the results of learning outcomes assessments will identify needed improvements to programs and inform academic planning for the institution as well as identify the resources needed to implement the action items in the plan.
4. Institutional Learning Outcomes Assessment

In spring 2016, the College’s General Education Board, the entity that predated the current Faculty Senate General Education Committee, and key faculty members began a dialogue about the essential learning outcomes for all students, regardless of length of program or certificate. These discussions culminated in the revising of the two College’s Institutional Learning Outcomes (ILOs) to four outcomes, adapted from the Association of American Colleges and Universities’ (AAC&U) Liberal Education and America’s Promise (LEAP) Essential Learning Outcomes.

In summer 2019, the College was awarded a grant to participate in the AAC&U Strengthening Guided Pathways and Career Success by Ensuring Students are Learning project. Over the next 18 months, a core team of one dean and four faculty will:

1. develop an action plan related to implementing a teaching, learning, and assessment framework;
2. provide an inventory of existing practices and data sources for assessing student proficiency of learning outcomes;
3. gather baseline data on identified learning outcomes associated with guided pathways, including equity data related to goals for student achievement;
4. identify where project-based learning and applied learning occur within the guided pathways curriculum and create a baseline for assessing the quality of those learning experiences; and
5. utilize both direct (i.e. AAC&U VALUE rubrics) and indirect forms of assessment to assess the efficacy of the teaching, learning, and assessment framework.

The team is assessing one of the College’s Institutional Learning Outcomes (ILOs):

Within professional, civic, and personal contexts, and in the pursuit of their current individual learning goals, Kapi’olani Community College students are able to use critical and creative thinking and reasoning.

To date, faculty across several concentration areas (e.g., psychology, education, engineering, computer sciences) have committed to being part of this pilot project. As the core team implements and refines the steps in their action plan to analyze and document the results of the ILO assessment (CR - 31 Action Plan), the ultimate goal is to create an assessment process that the College adopts for the continuous planning, data collection, analysis, and reflection of all ILOs.

5. Next Steps in Student Learning Outcomes Assessment

5.a. The Faculty Senate Student Learning Outcomes and Assessment (SLOA) Committee

The Faculty Senate Student Learning Outcomes and Assessment (SLOA) Committee is comprised of faculty from departments, student support services, and institutional support
services. The SLOA Committee’s mission is to support faculty in their efforts to continuously improve student learning through sound assessment principles, processes and practices.

The SLOA Committee is currently working on projects and recommendations to enhance faculty understanding of student learning assessment and create more opportunities for cross-discipline discussions on student learning that is informed by course assessment data. As part of the College’s continuous improvement, this committee will also regularly review the policies and the tools used for assessment documentation and reporting (such as the CI + CLR) to ensure student learning assessment informs decisions at the course, program, and institutional level.

In spring 2020, the SLOA Committee will finalize plans for A‘o (teaching/learning) Day to exchange teaching and counseling best practices and lead to regularly scheduled cross-discipline conversations about assessment. In these celebrations of successful approaches to increasing student success, faculty will experience the practices in the role of a student and commit to implementing at least one of the practices to determine if the new practice increased student success. This professional development activity creates the opportunity for the SLOA committee members and the institutional assessment coordinator to advise faculty on assessment strategies and facilitate cross-discipline assessment discussions.

5.b. Faculty-Driven Assessment Project
Faculty from multiple disciplines will collaborate to create an ‘Āina-based Assessment Framework in spring 2020 to enhance student learning through place-based pedagogy. Place-based instruction strives to increase students’ motivation and success through engagement in relevant content and the local community. The framework will include a rubric to assess the connection between the ILO of demonstrating “an active awareness of the Hawaiian Islands and the rich diversity of its peoples, in particular the values and history of the indigenous culture” and the campus commitment to professional development in ‘āina-based indigenous education.
C. Resource Allocation Process

Planning and Assessment Integration with Resource Allocation (PAIR)

The PAIR process, already in place for five years, is a multilayered review of the budget and requests for resources based on data from SSPs and ARPDs. Campus stakeholders identify needed resources in several ways: in the CI + CLR, which includes course learning outcomes assessment data; in the CI + ARPD, which includes program learning outcomes assessment data; and in the CI + SSP, which includes action plans aligned with the student success pathway. Requests are submitted in an Allocation Request Form (CR32 - ARF), which goes through various levels of review and prioritization.

Based on review of the prior process, the College made key changes to the resource request and allocation process to ensure that the allocation of resources is explicitly tied to data analysis leading to program improvement and to emphasize internal dialogue and prioritization prior to broader communication through campus-wide presentations (CR33 - ARPD to PAIR Process).

1. **Change in ranking procedure.** Once departments, units, or programs submit requests for additional resources, each Authorized Governance Organization (AGO) ranks the requests using the Resource Prioritization Rubric, (CR34 - Resource Prioritization Rubric), adapted from San Diego City College, with additional measures specific to each AGO. Subsequently, the Budget Committee, which includes two representatives from each AGO and two representatives from Chancellor’s Advisory Committee (CAC), ranks the requests using the Resource Prioritization Rubric. The AGO process ensures that each constituent group on campus has a voice. Conversely, the Budget Committee evaluates the requests from an institutional perspective. After discussing and ranking the requests, the Budget Committee makes recommendations to the CAC, where they are discussed, voted on, and a recommendation is submitted to the Chancellor for her review and approval. The Chancellor informs the campus of her final decision in a memo to the members of the CAC and in an announcement in the campus daily bulletin before the end of the spring semester.

2. **Change in presentation format.** Instead of a Town Hall meeting where individual requesters make a case for a resource need in front of the Authorized Governance Organizations (AGOs), the chancellor, vice chancellors, and deans presented the prioritized list of resource requests at a campus-wide meeting on February 20, 2020, to show how these requests address program improvements informing institutional plans and initiatives.

3. **Change in reporting procedure.** After resources are allocated, the department, unit, or program that receives the funding is required to report on the effectiveness of the funding to improve the program or service.
This process ensures full campus participation. The departments, units, and programs vet and discuss resource requests with deans and vice chancellors. The students, faculty, staff, and Native Hawaiians are represented through their respective AGOs. These discussions culminate with a vote through the CAC, giving each group represented earlier in the process one more review. If the Chancellor approves an allocation of resources, funding for the request is provided the subsequent fall. At the end of that fiscal year, the recipient of the funding is required to report on the results of the funding based on data. If the Chancellor disapproves an allocation of resources, she provides a justification for her decision in a memo to the CAC.

The College will review and assess the effectiveness of these changes in the allocation process at the end of the resource allocation cycle in Summer 2020.
III. Summary

To ensure that the College “regularly evaluates its policies and practices across all areas of the institution, including instructional programs, student and learning support services, resource management, and governance processes to assure their effectiveness in supporting academic quality and accomplishment of mission (I.B.7),” the College developed a series of processes for continuous improvement. What started as surveys and reports was integrated into the already established Student Success Pathway plans. The new CI + SSP form includes a section to assess the results of interventions for program or institutional improvement. Most importantly, the assessment results are utilized to inform subsequent planning on the program and institutional levels.

To ensure that the College “analyzes and documents the results of learning outcomes assessment across all disciplines and programs” (I.B.2, I.B.5), the College revised and re-established the CI + CLR forms. The College revised the LASR for departments to track their progress towards 100 percent assessment of all student learning outcomes within five years. The newly adopted policies and processes ensure student learning assessment data inform decisions at the program and institutional level through program changes and resource requests (CI+ARPD and PAIR).

The College revised the Planning and Assessment Integration with Resource Allocation (PAIR) process to tie more closely to data-informed assessments of programs through the CI + ARPD and the CI + SSP. The PAIR process informs institutional decisions regarding resources and utilizes information from the CI + ARPDs, which include assessment data at the program level as well as assessment data on student learning at the course level as reported in the CI + CLR. This integration of CLR data into the ARPD and subsequently into the PAIR process creates a connection between the student learning assessment data, the program assessment data, and resource allocations. The next steps and resources are documented and can be re-assessed the following cycle.

Finally, the College’s policies and institutional plans follow a five-year cycle of review and assessment, and governance organizations and advisory councils now review and assess goals on an annual cycle. To ensure that the continuous improvement process utilizes findings to inform next steps and closes the loop, the College has embedded the elements within the CI + CLR, the CI + ARPD, and the PAIR processes. All of these assessment cycles and their results are monitored, tracked and available institution-wide on the College’s websites.

The College’s CI + CLR, LASR, CI + ARPD, and PAIR forms include enhanced processes for transparency and collaborative dialogue, which contributes to the communication of assessment results across the institution and ensures that “the institution broadly
communicates the results of all of its assessment and evaluation activities so that the institution has a shared understanding of its strengths and weaknesses…” (I.B.8).

Both recommendations charge the College with utilizing evaluation and assessment findings to inform plans for improvement related to leadership roles; governance and decision-making policies, procedures, and processes (IV.A.7); and institutional programs and processes (I.B.4). The Integrated Planning for Student Success (IPSS) Model reinforces this practice of accountability in data-informed decision-making and the value of continuous improvement being embedded within all of the College’s planning processes and driving campus culture.
IV. The Future of Continuous Improvement at Kapiʻolani CC

A. Applying Integrated Planning to Continuous Improvement

Although the accreditation work group and stakeholders began a journey that they thought entailed addressing two separate recommendations, in the end, the journey took an unexpected and organic path that led to a much richer, holistic, and encompassing opportunity to truly improve in the important work that we do as a College and how we do it. As a living framework, the Integrated Planning for Student Success Model, driven by our vision and mission, embodies a college culture of continual reflection, assessment, purposeful decision-making, and growth focused on student success. The central tenets of this model require and encourage community, trust, transparency, and collective capacity.

Moving the different components and processes of the College in a unified direction to improve in what we do has required a shared and common vision. Just as a true focus on student success takes the collective efforts of a campus, the changes already made toward improvement have truly required the culture and mindset change of the entire “village”/community. With the aim of continuous improvement, the new processes and practices that have been put into place will themselves be evaluated and assessed for effectiveness by the Office for Institutional Effectiveness starting in spring 2020.

As a college community and as a college for the community that is focused on student success, we look forward to continually reflecting, evolving, and improving as we kūlia i ka nuʻu...strive for the highest.

B. Budgetary Considerations

The processes and tools to sustain continuous improvement and the Integrated Planning for Student Success Model have been established at an opportune time as the College faces a need to review the effectiveness and efficiency of all its programs and institutional processes in light of current budgetary considerations.

Tuition revenue accounts for approximately 50 percent of the College’s operational budget. Due to declining enrollment over the past several years and the concomitant decline in tuition revenue, the budget has been stretched, compelling the College to reduce spending in operational areas. However, in fiscal year 2020, more substantive interventions were needed to balance the budget. In August 2019, the administration made substantial cuts in spending by eliminating temporary positions and reducing student employees. Courses were required to be 66.67 percent full or they were canceled, unless the course was required to fulfill a certificate or degree requirement. Reducing classes reduced adjunct faculty costs.
At the spring 2020 convocation, the Chancellor announced that there were no immediate plans for any reduction in positions; however, positions that become vacant would only be filled if deemed essential to the College. The focus was on moving toward a more efficient College. A disappearing task force was created to offer options on a process for restructuring the College. These options were presented at the CAC meeting on February 13, 2020. The campus will be afforded many opportunities to participate in the process with the goal of eliminating redundancies, where possible, and streamlining our program offerings.

To guide the restructuring process, the College will initiate strategies for campus-wide discussions on institutional pillars (CR35 - Institutional Pillars) in summer 2020 for implementation in fall 2020. The process will involve systematically and collaboratively re-examining the College’s vision and mission as strategic themes or “pillars of excellence.” The pillars will apply to every part of the organization and define what major strategic thrusts/directions the College will pursue to achieve its vision and mission. Pillars will also guide institutional decisions, planning, and resource allocation priorities and will inform the development of our 2021-2026 Strategic Plan.

The Integrated Planning for Student Success Model allows us to move forward, “grounded in inclusivity, transparency and accountability.”

C. Institution-wide Learning Assessment

1. General Education Outcomes
New general education outcomes will be created by the Faculty Senate General Education Committee to be implemented across all programs by fall 2024, to align with the new five-year reporting cycle of course SLO assessments. The general education outcomes will be approved by the Faculty Senate by fall 2022 to provide the time for a curriculum review process to be in place to map course and program outcomes to the new general education outcomes and update program learning outcomes.

2. Institutional Learning Outcomes
As part of the Association of American Colleges and Universities (AAC&U) Strengthening Guided Pathways and Career Success by Ensuring Students are Learning project (CR31 - Action Plan), in fall 2020, the core team will present to the Chancellor’s Advisory Council (CAC) a clear and coherent assessment process for the continuous planning, data collection, analysis and reflection of the College’s Institutional Learning Outcomes (ILOs). The CAC representatives will share the process with their members to provide campus-wide feedback. The process will be refined and finalized for approval and adoption in spring 2021.
D. Building the 2021-2026 Strategic Plan

The College’s current Strategic Plan is being implemented and assessed through the Student Success Pathway. The College is committed to using the student success pathway model as a framework for annual performance review and assessment of strategic plan performance. This implementation and evaluation strategy will continue with the 2021-2026 strategic plan, to be developed starting summer 2020.

College Response Evidence

CR1 - AGO Meeting Minutes, 12.10.2018
CR2 - AGO Meeting Minutes, 1.29.2019
CR3 - AGO Meeting Minutes, 2.26.2019
CR4 - ʻAha Kalāualani Internal Survey
CR5 - ʻAha Kalāualani External Survey
CR6 - ʻAha Kalāualani Continuous Improvement Report
CR7 - Continuous Improvement Process
CR8 - AGO Meeting Minutes, 4.29.2019
CR9 - CI + SSP Dashboard
CR10 – Continuous Improvement Meeting Minutes, 8.23.2019
CR11 – Continuous Improvement Follow Up Meeting Minutes, 10.2.2019
CR12 - Accreditation Updates Webpage
CR13 - CAC Meeting Minutes, 1.8.2019
CR14 - CAC Meeting Minutes, 6.25.2019
CR15 - CAC Meeting Minutes, 12.3.2019
CR16 - Continuous Improvement Webpage
CR17 - Policy K1.100, Policy Development Process
CR18 - Policies and Plans Webpage
CR19 - Policy K5.202, Review of Established Programs
CR20 - Faculty Senate Resolutions
CR21 - CI + CLR (Continuous Improvement + Course Learning Reports
CR22 - Sample CLRs
CR23 - LASR (Learning Assessment Schedule and Report)
CR24 - CAC (Chancellor Advisory Council) Meeting Minutes, 10.8.2019
CR25 - CI + ARPD (Continuous Improvement + Annual Report of Program Data)
CR26 - Budget Committee Minutes, 9.5.2019
CR27 - Budget Committee Minutes, 10.17.2019
CR28 - CLR and LASR Meeting Minutes, 6.12.2019
CR29 - AAC (Academic Affairs Council) Meeting Minutes, 9.17.2019
CR30 - ARPD Website (Annual Report of Program Data)
CR31 - AAC&U Action Plan
CR32 - Revised Allocation Request Form (ARF)
CR33 - ARPD to PAIR Process (Flowchart)
CR34 - Resource Prioritization Rubric
CR35 - Institutional Pillars
V. Appendices

Appendix A: Timeline of Major Events

While innumerable meetings and discussions are ongoing at every level, the following list represents accreditation milestones or events where updates on progress were relayed in public forums:

▶ December 3, 2019 | Accreditation Updates to Chancellor’s Advisory Council
   Updates on our accreditation journey and future plans were presented and discussed.
   Presentation Slides

▶ October 8, 2019 | Accreditation Updates to Chancellor’s Advisory Council
   Updates on progress thus far and next steps were presented for ACCJC Recommendations 1 & 2.
   Presentation Slides

▶ October 2, 2019 | Cross-Collaborative Session w/ AGOs, Council, Plans
   AGO and Council leaders and campus plan administrators met to share goals and plans for the year, to identify potential collaborative opportunities, and to discuss ways these kinds of meaningful conversations can happen in the future.
   Notes

▶ September 17, 2019 | Updates to Academic Advisory Council
   The timeline and process for assessment planning at the course (CI + CLR) and program (CI + ARPD) levels was presented to Vice Chancellors, Deans and Department Chairs at AAC.

▶ August 23, 2019 | Planning Session for AGOs, Councils and Plans
   AGO and Council presidents and chairs met, along with administrators of plans for an introduction to the new Continuous Improvement for Student Success Pathway Plans (CI + SSP) procedures, timeline, forms and dashboard.
   Info Sheet

▶ August 21, 2019 | Accreditation Update at Campus Convocation
   Updates on progress thus far and next steps were presented for ACCJC Recommendations 1 & 2.
   Presentation Slides Recommendation 1

▶ August 15, 2019 | Accreditation Update to Chancellor’s Advisory Council
   Updates on progress thus far and next steps were presented for ACCJC Recommendations 1 & 2.
   Presentation Slides Recommendation 1

▶ June-August, 2019 | Integrated Planning for Student Success Model & Implications
   A new integrated planning model was developed. This development is not specifically in response to ACCJC recommendations, but has implications for Recs 1&2. This new approach is intended to foster:
   - inclusivity by breaking down silos and unifying the campus
- **transparency and ownership in decision-making**, which will lead to increased trust and higher morale
- **accountability** by creating a culture of sharing data, making decisions based on data, and closing the loop to understand the impact of our decisions.

It will also focus and prioritize what’s important while moving forward and allow us agility to adapt to changing campus needs.

In alignment with this new integrated planning model, the CI + SSP, CI + CLR, and CI + ARPD processes, forms and dashboards were developed to ensure continuous improvement and data-informed decision-making with a focus on student success across all levels of the institution as well as clear and transparent communication.

▶ **June 25, 2019 | Accreditation Update to Chancellor’s Advisory Council**

Updates on progress thus far and next steps were presented for ACCJC Recommendations 1 & 2. Presentation Slides Recommendation 1

▶ **June 4 & 12, 2019 | Leadership Sessions on Assessment**

Two two-hour sessions were held with deans and department chairs focusing on assessment at Kapi‘olani, including information on the new Course Learning Report (CLR) and how it will assist in mapping curriculum and inform the Learning Assessment Schedule and Report (LASR). Notes June 12 Summer Fun Session on CLRs and LASRs

▶ **April 29 – May 3, 2019 | ACCJC Partners in Excellence Conference**

Twelve individuals from Kapi‘olani CC attended the ACCJC conference to engage with ACCJC leadership and attendees from member institutions. Notes were collaboratively generated by attendees throughout the conference on Recommendation 1 and 2 as well as other key takeaways, and participants debriefed after returning to campus to identify strategies for implementation at Kapi‘olani CC.

Notes ACCJC Conference Takeaways

Seven individuals from our campus facilitated or presented sessions at the conference:

- Faculty Forum – Sally Pestana, co-facilitator
  
  Kapi‘olani CC’s Distance Ed Moonshot: Preparing Students, Faculty and our Institution for the Future – Jamie Sickel, Helen Torigoe, Kristie Malterre
- An Ideal Student-Centric Approach to Assessment – Donald Westover
- Sink, Burn, Blown Away, Dislocated: Mobilizing the Western Region for the Future (on Earth) – Robert Franco, Krista Hiser, Joseph Fullerton (San Mateo County CC)

▶ **April 23, 2019 | Town Hall Meeting**

A campus-wide town hall meeting will be held to discuss the progress and next steps on ACCJC Recommendations 1 & 2. Presentation Materials Recommendation 1 | Recommendation 2

▶ **April 2, 2019 | ACCJC Issues Kapi‘olani CC Certificate of Accreditation**

Letter from ACCJC | Certificate of Accreditation

▶ **March 13, 2019 | Launch of Accreditation Updates Webpage**
This webpage was created and published in response to the identified need for clear and transparent communication about accreditation progress.

▶ March 2, 2019 | Faculty Senate Approval of Action Requests (Rec 2)

Action Requests 1819016 – 1819019 support our ability to consistently analyze and report learning outcomes assessment that ties to program improvement.

▶ Feb 25, 2019 | Launch of Continuous Improvement Webpage (Rec 1)

The Continuous Improvement Webpage outlines our approach to meaningful evaluation and goal setting. Processes and timelines are provided for authorized governance organizations (AGOs), Councils, and Plans. This site will serve to increase transparency around the mission and role of these entities as well as how data informs their decisions and actions.

▶ Feb 13, 2019 | Town Hall Meeting

A campus-wide town hall meeting was held to discuss the ACCJC decision letter and next steps. Presentation Slides Recommendation 1 | Recommendation 2 Video (1 hr)

- Faculty & staff requested a webpage to communicate and catalog relevant plans and actions (this webpage was developed in response to this request)

▶ Feb 12, 2019 | CPR Cycle Aligned with Five-Year SLO Assessments

CAC endorsed the amendments to Policy K5.202 Review of Established Programs to change the Comprehensive Program Review (CPR) cycle to a five-year cycle to align with course SLO assessments. CAC Meeting Minutes with Amendments (Appendix B)

▶ Feb 1, 2019 | Formation of Accreditation Work Group Committee

Accreditation Work Group Charter

Members (selected based on experience with accreditation, assessment and/or evaluation or direct involvement in addressing recommendations):

- Lynn Hamada, Former ISER Writer
- Kristie Malterre, Former ISER Writer
- Veronica Ogata, Former ISER Writer
- Sheryl Shook, SLOA Committee Co-Chair
- Jamie Sickel, CELTT
- David Uedoi, SLOA Committee Chair
- Kara Plamann Wagener, OFIE
- Joanne Whitaker, ALO

▶ January 25, 2019 | ACCJC Decision Regarding Accreditation Status

Accreditation reaffirmed for 18 months, requiring a Follow-Up report and visit from a peer review team.
# Appendix B: Evolution of Continuous Improvement (CI)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Original CI</th>
<th>Revised CI</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Overview</strong></td>
<td>The initial Continuous Improvement model was written with a focus on the evaluation of institutional plans and governance and decision-making policies, procedures, and processes, the communication of those findings, and their use in decision-making processes.</td>
<td>This updated approach aligns with the Integrated Planning Model for Student Success and broadens the scope of continuous improvement, data-informed decision-making, and transparent communication to all stakeholders in the College by plugging in to the Student Success Pathway Plans (SSP), Course Learning Reports (CLR), and Annual Review of Program Data (ARPD).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Webpage</strong></td>
<td>Original CI Webpage</td>
<td>Revised CI Webpage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Scope</strong></td>
<td>AGOs, Councils, Plans</td>
<td>AGOs, Councils, Plans, Units, Departments, Programs, Courses, Policies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Tools:</strong></td>
<td>CI sheet</td>
<td>CI + SSP sheet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Evaluation &amp; Decision-Making</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>CI + ARPD*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CI + CLR sheet**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Tools:</strong></td>
<td>CI report (see webpage for data)</td>
<td>CI + SSP dashboard</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Communication</strong></td>
<td>CI dashboard (evolved before use)</td>
<td>CI + ARPD dashboard (synthesis)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>UHCC ARPD website</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>*Institution-wide access to unit data via password-protected webpage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>**Institution-wide access via team Drive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Process Timelines</strong></td>
<td>Staggered timelines: 9-month: AGOs, Councils 12-month: Plans</td>
<td>Unified timelines by process: CI + SSP: Annual cycle Outlined in CI + SSP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CI + CLR: 5-yr cycle (20% per year) Outlined in LASRs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CI + ARPD: Annual Rollout and Timeline</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Policies: (See timeline on webpage)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Appendix C: Glossary of Acronyms**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Acronym</th>
<th>Definition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AGOs</td>
<td>Authorized Governance Organizations: Faculty Senate, Student Congress, Staff Council and ‘Aha Kalāualani</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ARF</td>
<td>Allocation Request Form</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ARPD</td>
<td>Annual Report of Program Data</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CAC</td>
<td>Chancellor’s Advisory Council, the College’s most representative standing council advising the Chancellor. This council is composed of members of the Executive Leadership Team (ELT), department chairs, unit heads, Chairs/President of authorized governance organizations, and other key personnel. The CAC advises the Chancellor on policy and planning and other matters and serves as a communication channel for the Chancellor and the College.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CAAC</td>
<td>Counseling and Academic Advising Council, composed of counselors embedded in the Student Affairs and in the departments under Academic Affairs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CI</td>
<td>Continuous Improvement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CI + ARPD</td>
<td>Continuous Improvement + Annual Report of Program Data spreadsheet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CI + CLRs</td>
<td>Continuous Improvement + Course Learning Reports (form)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CI + SSP</td>
<td>Continuous Improvement + Student Success Plans (form)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ELT</td>
<td>Executive Leadership Team composed of the Chancellor, Vice Chancellors, Deans and Executive Assistant to the Chancellor.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CPR</td>
<td>Comprehensive Program Review (five-year review)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acronym</td>
<td>Description</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ILO</td>
<td>Institutional Learning Outcome</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ISER</td>
<td>Institutional Self Evaluation Report</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LASR</td>
<td>Learning Assessment Schedule and Report. Used primarily by department chairs to track the progress of course SLO assessments in departments.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OCET</td>
<td>Office of Continuing Education and Training</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OFIE</td>
<td>Office of Institutional Effectiveness. This office supports collegewide strategic planning, research on institutional and program effectiveness.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PAPAYA</td>
<td>Providing Assistance Preparing All Your Assessment, course learning assessment shared team drive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PAIR</td>
<td>Planning and Assessment Integration with Resource Allocation process</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PLO</td>
<td>Program Learning Outcome</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SALT</td>
<td>Student Affairs Leadership Team composed of program heads, admissions, financial aid, registrar and graduation and records.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SAO</td>
<td>Service Area Outcome</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SLO</td>
<td>Student Learning Outcome</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SSP</td>
<td>Student Success Pathway Plans</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UH</td>
<td>University of Hawai‘i</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UHCC</td>
<td>University of Hawai‘i Community Colleges</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VCAA</td>
<td>Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VCAS</td>
<td>Vice Chancellor for Administrative Services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VCSA</td>
<td>Vice Chancellor for Student Affairs</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Appendix D: Policy Review Schedule

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Policy No.</th>
<th>Policy Name</th>
<th>Date Created/Revised</th>
<th>Date Review</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>K 1.112</td>
<td>Participation in College Decision-Making Processes</td>
<td>March 19, 2014; February 13, 2020</td>
<td>February 13, 2025</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K 1.100</td>
<td>Policy on the Policy Development Process</td>
<td>September 26, 2017</td>
<td>September 26, 2022</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K 1.201</td>
<td>Shared Governance Policy</td>
<td>March 1, 2012, April 3, 2018</td>
<td>April 3, 2023</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K 5.202</td>
<td>Review of Established Programs</td>
<td>Spring 2012; Spring 2013; June 23, 2015; October 8, 2019</td>
<td>October 8, 2024</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K 9.104</td>
<td>Lecturer Evaluation Process</td>
<td>April 28, 2014; February 13, 2020</td>
<td>February 13, 2025</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K 9.203</td>
<td>Faculty Five-Year Review Procedures</td>
<td>June 24, 2014; June 23, 2015; August 8, 2018</td>
<td>August 8, 2023</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K 9.495</td>
<td>Vacancy Procedure</td>
<td>May 3, 2018</td>
<td>May 3, 2023</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix E: Evidence

Report Preparation Evidence

RP1 - [CAC Agenda, 11.12.2019]
RP2 - [ELT Minutes, 8.5.2019]
RP3 - [CAC Minutes, 8.15.2019]
RP4 - [List of AGOs and Councils with description of their roles]

College Response Evidence

CR1 - [AGO Meeting Minutes, 12.10.2018]
CR2 - [AGO Meeting Minutes, 1.29.2019]
CR3 - [AGO Meeting Minutes, 2.26.2019]
CR4 - [‘Aha Kaläualani Internal Survey]
CR5 - [‘Aha Kaläualani External Survey]
CR6 - [‘Aha Kaläualani Continuous Improvement Report]
CR7 - [Continuous Improvement Process]
CR8 - [AGO Meeting Minutes, 4.29.2019]
CR9 - [CI + SSP Dashboard]
CR10 - [Continuous Improvement Meeting Minutes, 8.23.2019]
CR11 - [Continuous Improvement Follow Up Meeting Minutes, 10.2.2019]
CR12 - [Accreditation Updates Webpage]
CR13 - [CAC Meeting Minutes, 1.8.2019]
CR14 - [CAC Meeting Minutes, 6.25.2019]
CR15 - [CAC Meeting Minutes, 12.3.2019]
CR16 - [Continuous Improvement Webpage]
CR17 - [Policy K1.100, Policy Development Process]
CR18 - [Policies and Plans Webpage]
CR19 - [Policy K5.202, Review of Established Programs]
CR20 - [Faculty Senate Resolutions]
CR21 - [CI + CLR (Continuous Improvement + Course Learning Reports]
CR22 - [Sample CLRs]
CR23 - [LASR (Learning Assessment Schedule and Report)]
CR24 - [CAC (Chancellor Advisory Council) Meeting Minutes, 10.8.2019]
CR25 - [CI + ARPD (Continuous Improvement + Annual Report of Program Data)]
CR26 - [Budget Committee Minutes, 9.5.2019]
CR27 - [Budget Committee Minutes, 10.17.2019]
CR28 - [CLR and LASR Meeting Minutes, 6.12.2019]
CR29 - [AAC (Academic Affairs Council) Meeting Minutes, 9.17.2019]