

RECEIVED

DEC 05 2013

*Accrediting Commission for
Community and Junior Colleges*

Evaluation Team Report

Follow-Up Report of Kapi‘olani Community College

December 2, 2013

Submitted by:

Jowel C. Laguerre, Ph.D.

Submitted to:

Accrediting Commission for Community and Junior Colleges,

Western Association of Schools and Colleges

This report represents the findings of the evaluation team that visited
Kapi‘olani Community College on November 16, 2013

Team Chair	Title	Institution
Jowel C. Laguerre, Ph.D.	Superintendent-President	Solano Community College

Team Members

Mark Snowwhite	Professor Emeritus	Crafton Hills College
----------------	--------------------	-----------------------

DATE: December 2, 2013
TO: Accrediting Commission for Community and Junior Colleges
FROM: Jowel C. Laguerre, Team Chair
SUBJECT: Report of Follow-Up Visit Team to Kapi'olani Community College

Introduction

Kapi'olani Community College (hereafter KCC) underwent a comprehensive accreditation review in the fall of 2012. A separate team conducted the University of Hawaii Community Colleges (UHCC) system evaluation; that team's report and recommendations were appended to and made part of the 2012 team report. In January of 2013 the Accrediting Commission for Community and Junior Colleges/Western Association of Schools and Colleges (hereafter ACCJC) reaffirmed Kapi'olani Community College's accreditation. The reaffirmation letter to the College noted that KCC must submit a Follow-Up Report responding to nine college recommendations and five system recommendations cited in the Commission's letter.

As required by the Commission, Kapi'olani Community College submitted a follow-up report on October 15, 2013 addressing the nine college recommendations and five system recommendations contained in the Commission's Action Letter. The report was followed by a visit on November 16, 2013 by the present evaluation team consisting of Dr. Jowel C. Laguerre (Chair) and Mr. Mark Snowwhite (a member of the October 2012 Team). A separate team visited the UHCC system office, and its report is incorporated in the report for KCC.

Prior to its visit, the evaluation team studied the 2012 Team Report, the Commission's Action Letter, Kapi'olani Community College's October 2013 Report to the Commission and the evidence which the college supplied as background to the report including KCC's 2012 Self-Study Report. During its visit, the team interviewed or met with approximately 30 members of the college community including administrators, faculty, staff members and students. During its visit, the team also reviewed additional written evidence provided to it by the College.

Kapi'olani Community College did an excellent job preparing for our visit. The physical facilities for our visit were excellent. Any request we made was met quickly and completely. We were made to feel totally at home by all those whom we met. The Team was impressed and grateful that so many faculty, students, staff and administrators were on hand to visit with us and to take care of all our needs for a successful visit. The spirit of Ohana ("all are considered like family") was quite obvious.

As noted by previous visiting teams, this team found that there is a productive dialogue involving all constituents at the college. We found a college that is confident about its future and mindful of its past. As with previous teams, this evaluation team found that Kapi'olani Community College is committed to meeting the Commission's Standards.

Our report speaks to each of the nine college recommendations which resulted from the October 2012 Comprehensive Visit. The UHCC system report addresses the five system recommendations and is appended and made part of this report. The Recommendations were:

College Recommendations

Recommendation 1.

In order to meet the Standard, and the recommendation made in 2006, to ensure improvements in planning processes, including program review, are integrated with resource allocations, the team recommends that the College provide clear descriptions of the planning timeline to demonstrate integration with the budgeting process. (I.B)

Recommendation 2.

In order to meet the Standards, the College planning processes should be effectively communicated to all College constituencies and reviewed on an annual basis to ensure that resource allocation leads to program and institutional improvement. (I.B.4, I.B.6).

Recommendation 3.

In order to meet the Standards, the team recommends that the College assess student learning outcomes for every course, instructional program, and student support program and incorporate the findings into course and program improvements. (ER 10, I.B, I.B.1, II.A.1.a, II.A.1.c, II.A.2.a, II.A.2.b, II.A.2.e, II.A.2.f, II.A.2.i, II.A.3, II.B.4, II.C.2)

Recommendation 4.

In order to meet the Standards, the team recommends that the College utilize student learning outcomes assessment to support institutional planning decisions. (I.B, I.B.1, II.A.1.a, II.A.1.c, II.A.2.a, II.A.2.b, II.A.2.e, II.A.2.f, II.A.2.i, II.A.3, II.B.4, II.C.2)

Recommendation 5.

In order to fully meet the Standards, the team recommends the College: 1) identify student learning outcomes for all student services programs, 2) assess student attainment of these outcomes, and 3) conduct dialogue to use assessment results to implement program improvements. (Standards II.B.4, II.C.2)

Recommendation 6.

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

Recommendation 7.

In order to meet the Standard, and the recommendation made in 2006, the team recommends that the College fill the vacancies deemed essential to the running of the College and remedy the time lag between the verbal commitment and an employee's start day of effected employees. (III.A.2)

Recommendation 8.

In order to meet the Standard, the team recommends that the College develop a technology plan to identify technology needs and inform the budgeting process (III.C.)

Recommendation 9.

In order to fully meet the Standards, it is recommended that the College clarify and strengthen the review, assessment and planning recommendation roles of the Policy, Planning and Assessment

Council to better serve and inform the College community and better align governance decision-making structures with those of the UH System. (IV.A., III.D., IV.B.)

UHCC System Recommendations

UHCC Recommendation 1: Institutional Mission and Effectiveness

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

- The VPCC and the Chancellors develop broad-based, ongoing, collegial dialogue between and among the UHCC and the colleges to better assess the breadth, quality, and usefulness of UHCC analytical tools (e.g., UHCC Annual Report of Program Data (ARPD)) and planning processes through feedback from college stakeholders. In addition, the UHCC and Chancellors should provide training for the appropriate use of the tools to support on-going improvement and effectiveness.
- The Chancellors provide clear descriptions and training regarding the planning timeline and budgeting process. The information and training should be available to all college constituencies and reviewed regularly to ensure accuracy for resource allocation that leads to program and institutional improvement (Standards I.B.3, I.B.1, II.A.1.c, II.A.2.a, e, f, II.B.1, II.B.3.a, and II.b.4, I.B.1, I.B.4, I.B.6).

UHCC Recommendation 2: Student Learning Programs and Services

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

UHCC Recommendation 3: Student Learning Programs and Services and Resources

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

UH Recommendation 4: Resources

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

UH Recommendation 5: Board and Administrative Organization

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

Note: The report from the UHCC System team on system recommendations is appended and made part of this report.

THIS TEAM'S FINDINGS, ANALYSIS OF FINDINGS AND CONCLUSIONS REGARDING EACH RECOMMENDATION

What follows are the Current Team's Findings and the Analysis of those Findings for each recommendation. Where appropriate we have referenced the evidence which we reviewed or interviews which support each finding.

Recommendation 1.

In order to meet the Standard, and the recommendation made in 2006, to ensure improvements in planning processes, including program review, are integrated with resource allocations, the team recommends that the College provide clear descriptions of the planning timeline to demonstrate integration with the budgeting process. (I.B)

Findings and Analysis

Kapi'olani Community College (KCC) has taken several steps to respond to recommendation 1. Through the 2013 Report and interviews held on site, the Team was able to verify that KCC has taken appropriate steps to clarify the planning process and timeline to demonstrate how program review and other planning activities inform the budgeting process.

Because the College is part of the University of Hawaii (UH), it relies on the system's Biennium Budget cycle as expressed in the Report "... in the 2014-2015 Fiscal Year, the College begins planning for the Biennium Budget for 2015-2017..." The report outlines and shows in charts how the system works. The system sets up its own performance indicators and expectations for the budget. The College has ongoing expenses it needs to account for and there is little room for changes, except when retirements and resignations happen. As explained in the Report, there have been opportunities over the past year with increases in enrollment for un-obligated funds. It is in that context to a greater extent that the College has been able to use the opportunities to increase its efforts to tie planning to budgeting. Furthermore, due to a shift in the state budget allocation from a higher percentage (73% of the College's budget) to a lesser percentage (51% of the College budget), the College has had to develop additional planning processes to affect the allocations of funds. For example, because of a greater reliance on tuition revenue and to respond to the expectations of standards, the "College began establishing a systematic process for the internal allocation of funds based on needs stated in tactical plans and prioritization of those needs to improve decision-making." The College is using the same process to fund equipment, award sabbaticals and distribute professional development funds, according to interviews conducted with faculty and staff leaders.

The College has developed a good planning system to allocate funds, even if they are not clearly available. These decisions are made based on rubrics that clearly tie learning outcomes, program reviews and planning to budgeting. Based on interviews conducted by the Team and materials provided in the report, it is clear that the budget system has greatly improved and that integration of planning and budgeting has occurred at Kapi'olani Community College. In conversations with various faculty and staff and students, it was clear that the College community has a great awareness of the budgeting process and the expectations for funding. This was clear not only for those in instructional

areas, but also in Student Affairs. The timing of all the college planning processes is in alignment with the deadlines put forth for the system budget process.

Conclusions

It is the opinion of the Team that Kapi'olani Community College has embraced the concept of planning tied to budgeting and that elements such as program reviews, Student Learning Outcomes and tactical plans all contribute to the budgeting process. The timing issues between budget deadlines and planning timelines has been resolved, including program review schedules. The Team encourages the College to involve staff at a deeper level in the planning and the development of Service Area Outcomes (SAOs) for the budget process.

Kapi'olani Community College meets the Standard.

Recommendation 2.

In order to meet the Standards, the College planning processes should be effectively communicated to all College constituencies and reviewed on an annual basis to ensure that resource allocation leads to program and institutional improvement. (I.B.4, I.B.6).

Findings and Analysis

Kapi'olani Community College has expanded its means of communicating its college planning and resource allocation processes. In addition to providing timelines for the various reports and requests, the faculty senate conducted four follow-up forums, each concentrating on a different aspect of planning activities, such as the use of student learning outcomes (SLO's) in decision-making. College reports indicate that attendance at these forums was high, between 20 and 30 attendees. More such forums will be scheduled.

The College shares the results of the strategic planning process at its convocations and by posting them on the college home page. More recently the College developed a strategic plan scorecard, which the Office of Institutional Effectiveness (OFIE) updates each year. In addition, the OFIE director works with representatives from the four Authorized Governance Organizations, representing faculty, students, support staff and native Hawaiian interests, to ensure participation from all campus constituencies.

After the 2012 team visit, the College revised its program review process to integrate tactical planning into the comprehensive program review so that tactical plans aligned with both the Annual Reports of Program Data and the three-year program review. This change helped make the planning and budgeting process easier to understand and use and addresses one of the concerns of the 2012 visiting team report.

Team interviews with faculty, staff and administrators indicated that communication about the planning and budgeting process is not a problem. The process is viewed as fair and reasonable.

To review the effectiveness of the planning and budgeting processes, the College's Report indicates that it "will assess the effectiveness of ... [its] communication of planning processes and related resource allocations to ensure that these allocations leads [sic] to program and institutional improvement" (p. 20). The OFIE plans to include questions in the survey that it conducts every three years to assess the effectiveness of the college's communication about the planning and budgeting processes and how these processes relate to resources allocation. The documentation of improvements based on the allocation of resources is a work in progress.

Also, faculty and program leaders indicated to the team that since they have been increasingly involved in developing student learning outcomes (SLO's), they are more engaged in using SLO assessments to develop plans and budget requests and that they are more optimistic that their work in planning will help provide them with needed resources.

Conclusions

The team concluded that Kapi'olani Community College provides information to the campus community about each of the three levels of its planning and budgeting processes and has changed the processes so that its components are better aligned, an adjustment that addresses a concern of the 2012 team report. For instance, tactical plans are now incorporated into the three-year comprehensive program reviews. In addition, forums are held to help those involved better understand how to provide the information needed for these processes. Informal feedback from deans and department heads and a campus-wide survey will provide the college with an assessment of whether it has improved its communication and assessment of planning and budgeting processes. Interviews reveal that faculty and program leaders are increasingly involved in planning and budgeting and optimistic about the results of the revised process.

Kapi'olani Community College meets the first part of the standard, which calls for effectively communicating the planning and budgeting processes to all parts of the college community. It is making progress toward assessing the effectiveness of these processes "to ensure that resource allocation leads to program and institutional improvement."

Recommendation 3.

In order to meet the Standards, the team recommends that the College assess student learning outcomes for every course, instructional program, and student support program and incorporate the findings into course and program improvements. (ER 10, I.B, I.B.1, II.A.1.a, II.A.1.c, II.A.2.a, II.A.2.b, II.A.2.e, II.A.2.f, II.A.2.i, II.A.3, II.B.4, II.C.2)

Findings and Analysis

When the team visited the College in 2012, all 24 of its degree and certificate programs had established student learning outcomes (SLO's), and all of them had gone through one cycle of assessment. Student and learning support activities had all developed and assessed SLO's. In addition, all of these programs used SLO's in their planning and program reviews and tactical plans for improvement. But at the course level, only 66 percent of courses had SLO's (referred to as *competencies* at the course level), and completed one cycle of assessment. The Student Support Services had student developmental outcomes (SDO's), a designation that was later changed to student learning outcomes.

The College's report, supported by documentation available electronically and interviews with administrators and faculty, indicates that currently, all of the courses taught in the last three years have SLO's that have gone through at least one cycle of outcomes assessment, and Student Support Services has changed its student developmental outcomes (SDO's) to SLO's and is now using the template required by the system to report its results. Assessment results are used in comprehensive program reviews (CPR's) to indicate degree of success and plans for improvement. According to the report and interviews the team verified that these reports are used to determine budgeting decisions, a fact that

encourages participation by those responsible for completing them.

To help support assessment, the college has expanded the coordinators from two to three and paid for professional development, including funds for several faculty members to attend a conference in Oregon last spring (2013). In addition, two assessment coaches are participating in the WASC Assessment Leadership Academy.

SLO's for programs and courses are available electronically from links in the College Report. The team found that the measures of SLO's in some academic departments vary, and how measures are developed is not always clear. In some instances the SLO is specified, but measures are determined individually by the instructor. The three SLO coordinators (who prefer to be referred to as *coaches*) explained that it was important to get faculty involved in the process even when their efforts were not exemplary. They assured the team that they intend to work to improve the process. Interviews reveal that an increasing number of faculty members accept their responsibility to measure student learning outcomes, especially as they see the importance of SLO's to planning and budget.

The archiving and access of SLO reports pose other concerns. The College's written response and interviews indicate that it is sometimes difficult to record results and retrieve SLO data for reports. The College is planning on using a system-wide program (Kuali) to solve this problem.

Conclusions

The College has provided support for addressing the need to complete work on SLO's. Also, faculty and administrators have worked well together to make as much progress as possible in reaching full compliance with the requirement to develop, measure, and use SLO's to improve instruction and services. At this point the college has assessed SLO's for all courses and programs, including most student services. Still, there is a need to refine the processes, demonstrate how results are incorporated into course and program improvements, and to improve how results are archived and available for review. These are necessary elements for the College to fully meet the standards.

Kapi'olani Community College partially meets the Standards.

Recommendation 4.

In order to meet the Standards, the team recommends that the College utilize student learning outcomes assessment to support institutional planning decisions. (I.B, I.B.1, II.A.1.a, II.A.1.c, II.A.2.a, II.A.2.b, II.A.2.e, II.A.2.f, II.A.2.i, II.A.3, II.B.4, II.C.2)

Findings and Analysis

According to the Report, Kapi'olani Community College has had a long history of planning. However, to meet the Standards and in response to Recommendation 4, the College has taken additional steps to include results of Student Learning Outcomes as an integral part of the planning processes. The Report and interviews with faculty and staff demonstrate that progressively the College has incorporated the assessment of student learning outcomes in its planning.

This integration started in the fall of 2011, prior to the last 2012 Team visit. However, the College

admitted that “reporting guidelines were not established and reporting was uneven.” The College made changes that took effect in the fall of 2012. The College graphically depicted the different stages of the development of planning. These changes have taken effect. While the report referred to program learning outcomes, interviews with the faculty and academic administrators identified course outcomes as being a major consideration in the improvement of planning to support decision-making. For this reason, it is not clear how the results from student learning outcomes assessments are aggregated into meaningful information used to inform institutional decision-making and resource allocation. Learning outcomes are now required as a major part of planning that help support decisions made by the College. However, with a primary focus on course-level outcomes, it is not clear how programmatic and institutional results become factors in institutional planning. The Team was able to verify the timing of reports to be part of the planning process that supports major decisions.

Conclusions

Evidence substantiated by the team as well as interviews conducted on site clearly indicate that Kapi‘olani Community College is using learning outcomes to support its culture of planning, and there are meaningful dialogs that take place. However, with the focus on course level outcomes, it is unclear how programmatic and institutional decisions based upon aggregated SLO assessment results, including trends and issues, is being accomplished at this time. All indications are that the institution is striving to ensure planning and decisions are made based on the learning outcomes, and that will evolve as SLO assessment results at all levels are available, analyzed, and linked to college decisions.

Kapi‘olani Community College partially meets the Standards.

Recommendation 5.

In order to fully meet the Standards, the team recommends the College: 1) identify student learning outcomes for all student services programs, 2) assess student attainment of these outcomes, and 3) conduct dialogue to use assessment results to implement program improvements. (Standards II.B.4, II.C.2)

Findings and Analysis

Kapi‘olani Community College assigns its counselors to different target groups, such as Disabilities Services Office, Health Services/EMS and Nursing, Honda International Center (study abroad), and Military Veterans Program. The development and use of counseling student learning outcomes has

evolved and continues to be refined. Before the 2012 team visit, counselors developed two specific developmental outcomes for all counseling programs:

Students will continue to grow through self-awareness.

Students will be responsible for their choices and make informed decisions.

Counseling outcomes were referred to as student developmental outcomes (SDO’s). The counseling faculty of each unit has assessed these outcomes and used the results to develop plans for improvement. These appear in the counselors' Next Steps document (Spring 2013) and in their most recent Student Services Comprehensive Program Review. These documents tie recommendations based on assessment

to budget requests.

Counselors interviewed by the team felt that their assessment creates uniformity among their different target populations. They also expressed the confidence that their efforts in assessment have resulted in funds for much needed handicapped accommodations and the decision to hire a Mental Health and Wellness counselor. They were very enthusiastic about their assessment work.

Progress in the area of the counseling outcomes has been steady. In the fall of 2012, after training by an assessment expert, Dr. John Hoffman, Student Services changed the *student developmental outcomes* to *student learning outcomes* and changed its reporting format to be consistent with other SLO reports; however, the outcomes themselves remained the same. It is not timely and appropriate for the College to consider how to ensure there is sufficient detail in the stated outcomes to provide for assessment results to improve practice and indicate areas for future planning.

In January 2013, the college sent five faculty members, one instructional and four counseling faculty, to a conference in Portland, OR, called "Building a Coordinated Student Affairs Assessment Effort." These five faculty members became the Student Affairs Leadership Team for Assessment headed by the Student Affairs Assessment Coach. The team worked to create more useful counseling SLO's. This group has planned a retreat in the very near future to complete its work. This will be an important stage for the effective application of SLOs in counseling and advising services.

The comprehensive evaluation team report noted the need for the College to list all of its student services so that a determination could be made about how to appropriately develop SLOs across those services. This continues to be a need. The focus to date has primarily been on the work of counseling. In order to fully address the recommendation and to meet the standard, there must be a swift progression beyond developing SLOs to assessing and using the results of student learning outcomes across the student services.

The more recently established student service programs, Mental Health and Wellness and First Year Experience, have begun to develop SLO measures. Also, SLO's and measures for admissions, financial aid, and transcript/graduation have been incorporated into the SLO's for counseling. The college should ensure the assessment of outcomes is sufficiently disaggregated to provide meaningful data on the services provided for the purpose of evaluation, planning, and improvement.

Conclusions

The counselors at the College have demonstrated a significant effort in developing outcomes, measuring those outcomes, and using the results to improve their services. The college has contributed resources for training and supported requests growing out of the comprehensive review. The college recognizes the need to expand student learning outcomes to other areas that serve students. In order to fully meet the standards, Kapi'olani Community College needs to engage all aspects of Student Services and other unit services in assessment of student learning outcomes.

The College partially meets the Standard.

Recommendation 6.

In order to meet the Standard, the UHCC and the colleges shall take appropriate actions to ensure that regular evaluations of all faculty members and others directly responsible for student

progress toward achieving stated student learning outcomes include, as a component of the evaluation, effectiveness in producing student learning outcomes. (Standard III.A.1.c)

Findings and Analysis

This recommendation is being handled at the system level and the Team relied on the system report to address the aspects of this recommendation related to having the policy in place. In consultation with the University of Hawai'i Professional Assembly (the faculty union), the University of Hawai'i Community College system has developed and given final approval of new evaluation policies for fulltime faculty and lecturers. These are available at <http://uhcc.hawaii.edu/OVPCC/policies/index.php> and attached here for ease of reference. Conversations with faculty leaders indicated support for the recommendation when it becomes a College requirement, though implementation has not yet begun.

Conclusion

Therefore, as to implementation of evaluations which include effectiveness in producing student learning outcomes, the Team concludes that the College does not meet the standard.

Recommendation 7.

In order to meet the Standard, and the recommendation made in 2006, the team recommends that the College fill the vacancies deemed essential to the running of the College and remedy the time lag between the verbal commitment and an employee's start day of effected employees. (III.A.2)

Findings and Analysis

As conveyed in the 2013 Report, there are multiple layers for hiring at the University of Hawaii System, of which Kapi'olani Community College is a member. There are state requirements for hiring and each layer brings its own complication. While these are understandable, the College took to heart the recommendation of the 2012 Team. With a change in management, there is clear indication that the College has taken steps necessary to fill vacancies and shorten the lag time between job offers and start of employment, required by the 2012 visiting Team.

Interviews with faculty and staff yielded satisfaction with the current hiring processes in Human Resources. They have noted a shorter timeline in the hiring process and have been able to have individuals reporting for work in a more timely fashion than in the past. The team notes the evidence, below, that shows progress made over the past four months since a new manager took office. The new Vice Chancellor for Administrative Services is likewise dedicated to streamlining the process and to continue the progress that has been made.

Offer Letter Date	Candidate Accepted Date	Employee Start Date	Notes
09/17/13	09/23/13	09/25/13	
05/02/13	05/05/13	08/19/13	Employee requested delayed start

			date due to relocation considerations.
08/07/13	08/15/13	08/01/13	Duty period started 08/19/13
06/27/13	06/27/13	07/15/13	
09/19/13	09/23/13	10/16/13	
09/20/13	09/25/13	10/01/13	
05/28/13	07/01/13	08/01/13	Hired for Fall 2013 with start date of 08/01/13
07/01/13	07/01/13	07/15/13	
08/20/13	08/21/13	09/04/13	
08/05/13	08/15/13	08/01/13	Duty period started 08/19/13
10/04/13	10/07/13	10/14/13	
11/01/13	11/01/13	11/04/13	
07/26/13	07/29/13	08/12/13	
07/26/13	07/29/13	08/12/13	
08/01/13	08/05/13	09/16/13	

Conclusion

Despite the fact that the Human Resources Manager is new, the evidence has shown that the College has satisfactorily responded to the recommendations and it is likely that the progress will be sustained.

The College meets the Standard.

Recommendation 8.

In order to meet the Standard, the team recommends that the College develop a technology plan to identify technology needs and inform the budgeting process (III.C.)

Findings and Analysis

The college has a technology plan document that provides a full context of the use of technology on campus and history of the development of practices for acquiring and maintaining technology. It points out the problems that the decentralized approach for acquiring technology has created, including waste of space and inefficiencies and the need to centralize efforts for purchasing hardware and software and develop policies about use and security, which is a major concern. It includes trends that the college needs to recognize and general suggestions for efficiencies of resources and solving problems such as security risks and obsolescence. For example, should the college allow mobile devices for those who claim they are needed for instruction and how should the College keep track of hardware inventory? (there is currently no list of computers and other devices on campus).

While this document represents a beginning of addressing the technology needs of the college, it does not include an actual plan, which would include action items, responsible persons, dates, and processes for decision-making. The coordinator of the college's Center for Excellence in Learning, Teaching and

Technology (CELTT) is aware that this document represents only a first step. She explained that she is optimistic that students will support a student technology fee that will help supplement college supplied funds to meet the technology needs of the campus. An interview with a student leader supported this idea. That group is already formed.

The Chancellor Advisory Council has chosen Technology as an area of emphasis. A technology working group from the Chancellor's Advisory Council (formally the Policy and Planning and Assessment Council) will be working with the Coordinator of CELTT to develop a detailed plan.

Chancellor Richards explained to the team that he understands the problems that are explained in the Technology Plan document and will support improvements. He indicated that he is willing to use College resources to implement improvements suggested by the plan.

Conclusions

The college is working towards developing a technology plan. It has a document entitled *Technology Plan*, but it is a preliminary report on the importance of technology, the state of technology on campus, the problems that need to be addressed, and some of the important trends to consider. While it lays out the work that a technology committee would be expected to do and choices that the college needs to make, it does not include planning information or even clear recommendations. This is an area the College needs to develop much more and to tie technology to the planning process.

Kapi'olani Community College partially meets the Standard.

Recommendation 9.

In order to fully meet the Standards, it is recommended that the College clarify and strengthen the review, assessment and planning recommendation roles of the Policy, Planning and Assessment Council to better serve and inform the College community and better align governance decision-making structures with those of the UH System. (IV.A., III.D., IV.B.)

Findings and Analysis

It is clear that the College has had the Policy, Planning and Assessment Council as part of its culture for a long time without assessing its usefulness in light of new developments and new groups that have been initiated at the College. The College, nevertheless, clearly documented the role of the PPAC in light of the governance structure at the University of Hawai'i System. The College also demonstrated the relationships with other internal governance structures. This self-assessment, primarily based on the recommendation of the 2012 Team, motivated the College to reassess the functioning of the PPAC. As a result of this retrospection, the College decided to totally revamp the Council.

The College conducted an assessment of the current PPAC structure to ascertain the members' view of it. The assessment further solicited input in making changes for the council. The results were enlightening in that the members provided almost unanimous feedback and directions for the Council. As a result of the feedback, the College has recently renamed the Council as the Chancellor Advisory Council (CAC) to ensure that it did not duplicate or confuse its role with those councils authorized by the Board of Regents.

To be more helpful to the Chancellor, the new Council changed the essential role of the PPAC from that of listening to one of dialog, or two-way communication. In order to strengthen the advisory role of the Council, the Chancellor has proposed six Work Groups. Its membership has been expanded to be more representative of the constituents. Duplication of functionality with other councils has been reduced, to prevent the same information from being shared at multiple meetings. To be more transparent and engage the College constituents the minutes of the meetings are being sent college-wide.

Conclusions

Throughout the day the Team had the opportunity to ask several faculty and staff about the Chancellor Advisory Council. The responses expressed optimism and a great level of satisfaction with the process for change and the opportunities provided for voices to advise the Chancellor and to represent their constituents or to be represented by their constituents. The College has satisfactorily addressed the recommendations of the team in regard to Recommendation Nine.

Kapi‘olani Community College meets the Standards.

Follow Up Visit Report

University of Hawai'i Community College System

2444 Dole Street
Honolulu, HI

A Confidential Report Prepared for the Accrediting
Commission for Community and Junior Colleges

This report represents the findings of the evaluation team that visited
University of Hawai'i Community College System
November 15, 2013

Dr. Helen Benjamin, Chair
System Evaluation Team

University of Hawai'i Community College System
FOLLOW UP VISIT TEAM
FRIDAY, NOVEMBER 15, 2013

Dr. Helen Benjamin (Chair)
Chancellor
Contra Costa Community College District
500 Court Street
Martinez, CA 94553

Dr. Thelma Scott-Skillman
Retired Interim Chancellor
San Francisco City College
3881 Errante Dr.
El Dorado Hills, CA 95762

Introduction

On November 15, 2013, Dr. Helen Benjamin and Dr. Thelma Scott-Skillman conducted a Follow Up Visit to the University of Hawai'i Community College System (UHCC). A comprehensive visit for the six colleges in the System and the System Office was conducted in October of 2012. Prior to the 2012 visit, one of the chairs of the college teams served as the "chair of chairs" and conducted the evaluation of the System Office. However, in the 2012 comprehensive visit, a separate team was established to conduct a visit for the System Office. Therefore, for the first time, a separate team was established for the one-day Follow Up Visit. The primary purpose of the Follow Up Visit was to document the progress the System had made toward resolving recommendations made by the comprehensive visiting team in 2012. The responses to the five System recommendations were included in the follow Up Report for each college.

The team chair met in advance of the visit by phone and through electronic means with the UHCC Vice President for Community Colleges (VPCC). Team members received the Follow Up Report in advance of the visit and had the opportunity to review the materials and visit the college and UHCC websites for information prior to their arrival at the System Office and the Hawaii Community College campus.

During the one-day visit, team members spent the morning at the System Office and the afternoon at the campus of Hawai'i Community College. The System Office was well prepared for the visit. The VPCC, the Director of Academic Planning, Assessment, and Policy Analysis, and the Executive Assistant to the VPCC met with the team to provide additional requested information, respond to queries needed in order for the team to complete its work, and provide details of actions taken by the System and the colleges in meeting the recommendations. A "tour" of the System website was provided, demonstrating easy access to and broad dissemination of essential information for all college and System constituencies as well as members of the public. Following the System Office visit, the team accompanied the VPCC to Hawai'i Community College where they continued discussions with the VPCC and met with the college chancellor, and attended a forum conducted by the VPCC. The forum held at Hawai'i Community College, was broadcast live with remote access to West Hawai'i Campus employees, located in Kona, HI. The VPCC updated more than 50 college employees in attendance on the progress on the System's strategic plan and the impact of the plan on their college in particular. The presentation, entitled "Moving Forward...2021", proved to be informational and inspirational for those in attendance.

The visit was very successful. It was obvious from the outset that the System Office and the colleges had taken the recommendations seriously and made considerable progress in the short time between receiving the recommendations from the Accrediting Commission on the October 2012 visit and the Follow Up Visit. Upon receiving the report of February 2013, the System Office led the colleges in focusing their collective energy on fulfilling the requirements made in the recommendations.

Recommendations made by the comprehensive visiting team of October 2012 and progress to date follow.

UHCC Recommendation 1: Institutional Mission and Effectiveness

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

- The VPCC and the Chancellors develop broad-based, ongoing, collegial dialogue between and among the UHCC and the colleges to better assess the breadth, quality, and usefulness of UHCC analytical tools (e.g., UHCC Annual Report of Program Data (ARPD)) and planning processes through feedback from college stakeholders. In addition, the UHCC and Chancellors should provide training for the appropriate use of the tools to support on-going improvement and effectiveness.
- The Chancellors provide clear descriptions and training regarding the planning timeline and budgeting process. The information and training should be available to all college constituencies and reviewed regularly to ensure accuracy for resource allocation that leads to program and institutional improvement (Standards I.B.3, I.B.1, II.A.1.c, II.A.2.a, e, f, II.B.1, II.B.3.a, and II.b.4, I.B.1, I.B.4, I.B.6).

Broad-based dialog and assessment of analytical tools:

The team found that there was on-going dialog regarding planning and the use of analytical tools provided by UHCC. Per UHCC Policy, Strategic Academic Planning, the VPCC convenes the full UHCC Strategic Planning Council (SPC) in the spring and fall of each year. The membership of the UHCC Strategic Planning Council consists of the Chancellor, Faculty Senate Chair, and student government chair of each college, and the Vice President and Associate Vice Presidents for the Community Colleges. The fall meeting is used to look at the strategic planning process and to introduce and/or review system-wide Strategic Planning initiatives. The spring meeting is used to review UHCC strategic outcomes and performance measures. The SPC monitors and advises on progress toward the UHCC Strategic Planning goals. The VPCC uses the Fall and Spring meetings to gather impressions and reactions to progress to date and to emphasize and maintain the focus on items/areas the UHCC has identified as important. The VPCC conducts follow-up visits to each college to present college-level detailed data and obtain feedback on the planning process, goals, and data. The following web site provides comprehensive information and evidence of the integrated planning process for the UHCC system and its colleges:

http://uhcc.hawaii.edu/OVPCC/strategic_planning/appendixA.php

All college chancellors and appropriate staff are represented on various system-wide councils and committees that review tools for accuracy and usefulness. In turn, similar training and broad-based dialog occurs on each campus for faculty and staff who are responsible for utilizing the tools to conduct program reviews, curricular updates, and the like. College researchers work closely with the system research office to further explore the use of the analytical tools and the interpretation of the data. The team was provided examples of how the college's requests for data and/or explanation of data and formulae were provided by the system.

The analytical tools provided by UHCC are utilized system wide allowing for comparable data and economy of scale in development. One example is Curriculum Central that has been used as a common repository for all curricula in the community college system. There will soon be a replacement, the Kualii Student/Curriculum Management System, which will continue to be the single repository for community college curriculum in the UH system. The visiting team received feedback that there was expressed concern regarding the lack of a common system for SLO assessment. Several colleges are developing their own in-house assessment tool. There was concern that this multiple college-level approach would lead to duplicate use of resources and non-comparability of data across the system. It

was expressed that the UHCC system was not supportive of developing a common SLO assessment system.

Planning description and training:

All of the community colleges in the University of Hawaii system are responsible for allocating funds received by the system and retained by the college according to planning and program review priorities. The UHCC system's Associate Vice President of Administrative Affairs meets regularly with the college to present information on its allocations, trends, and projections. The Chancellors and the College Councils in the system have been actively improving the planning and budgeting system to respond to changing needs and improve the system based on college participants' input. The colleges view these processes and the policies that support them as "living documents," meant to be regularly examined and changed based on experience. For example, the budgetary system was reviewed at the end of the previous academic year. This process resulted in increased and ~~current~~ updated information for consideration in allocating resources. Several visiting site teams observed the involvement of all appropriate groups in the budget and planning process and found evidence of changes to the processes that resulted from that involvement.

The visiting team for the UHCC system was able to attend the VPCC's fall presentation at Hawaii Community College, Hilo, HI. The presentation, which was live broadcasted, provided opportunity for employees at other college sites to receive data on progress towards the current Strategic Plan goals and future system and college enrollment projections. The presentation outlined possible changes from the current Strategic Plan that expires in 2015 to the next 2015 – 2020 Strategic Plan that is currently being developed. The organization and process for updating the Strategic Plan had been shared with the colleges during the VPCC's spring 2013 campus presentation. At the conclusion of the presentation, there was opportunity for questions and answers. Employees in attendance were attentive and seemed, based on the question and answer session, to be comfortable with the data and possible changes. Similar observations were shared by visiting team chairs of the colleges who were able to attend a presentation. Feedback on the planning and budget process obtained from both system and college employees conclude a more realistic and farsighted approach occurring now than in previous years. The current plan is evident of the inclusion of more ideas generated from the open dialog and process across all colleges.

UHCC uses an outcomes funding model that is directly linked to the University's established strategic outcomes. The measures adopted are directly from the strategic plan and the targets are the specific targets identified in the strategic outcomes adopted by the University in 2008.

Under this performance-funding model, most colleges have been able to meet all of their outcomes criteria and receive supplemental funding resulting in modest increase to campus funding base each year. Observation and analysis by visiting site team chairs conclude there is satisfaction with this funding model. While there is some concern regarding some of the 'bench marks', the campus leadership considers performance based funding measures to be fair.

The Annual Reports Program Data (ARPD) is standardized system-wide and is used by each campus to operate its own program review process. Each college is provided annual reports for all degree and certificate of achievement programs that are used by the colleges for their comprehensive program reviews.

Since the comprehensive accreditation visit in October 2012, all key data users have been surveyed to determine if any of the current data elements should be eliminated or if any new data elements should

be added to the ARPD. The surveys identified a gap in data information provided at new faculty, staff, and administrator orientation. The UHCC Institutional Research Cadre is developing key data information to be included in orientations as well as website “cheat sheets” to direct inquiries to available tools and data.

Each college web site and the system web site provide easy navigation, clear, and comprehensive information on the strategic planning and budget process. Reaction from the system administration and college constituent groups to resulting changes with the integrated planning and budget process is positive.

Conclusion

The System has addressed the recommendation and meets the Standard.

UHCC Recommendation 2: Student Learning Programs and Services

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

At the time of the visit in October of 2012, the System was aware that four colleges (Hawai'i Community College, Honolulu Community College, Kaua'i Community College, and Leeward Community) were out of compliance with granting the Associate of Applied Science degree (AAS). The level of English and math courses required for completion of the AAS degree was at or below the developmental education level and should have been higher.

In May of 2012, the General Education requirement to satisfy the recommendation was codified in UHCCP #5.200 General Education in All Degree Programs. Math and English requirements are now at the transfer level equivalent. It has been documented that all four colleges offering the AAS degree have implemented the new policy.

Conclusion

The System has addressed the recommendation and meets the Standard.

UHCC Recommendation 3: Student Learning Programs and Services and Resources

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

It was concluded in the October 2012 visit that the System met all of Standard III.A except Standard III.A.C.1, as a tenured faculty member who does not request promotion, or a faculty member who has completed all requirements of tenure and promotion, does not have the same requirement to analyze student-learning outcomes for improvement of effectiveness. The team found on this visit that the System has negotiated with its bargaining unit, developed, and approved a policy that has been updated for the first time since 1990. The updated policy reflects current ACCJC requirements and includes a provision for the inclusion of the tenured faculty member's obligation to be evaluated based on, among other things, his/her effectiveness in producing student-learning outcomes. In addition, a policy on the evaluation of lecturers has also been negotiated and approved. While the change in evaluation requirements has been negotiated, there has not been the opportunity since negotiation of this new

evaluation provision to implement the change at the colleges and document evaluations with this component.

Conclusion

The System has addressed the recommendation and meets the Standard. However, implementation of the negotiated evaluation requirements has not yet happened and been documented.

UH Recommendation 4: Resources

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

The System took a novel, creative, and appropriate approach in its response to this recommendation. The System is in the process of creating “a dynamic, online resource” rather than develop a written plan that will provide pertinent information to users. The major sections of the resource follow infrastructure, enterprise business applications, business process improvements, academic, applications, and policies. The resource is currently under development and scheduled for completion in the spring of 2014. The team previewed the web site and found it to be an excellent resource for users with “just in time” information on current and future projects as well as long-term trends. The resulting information should strengthen the program review process and strategic planning to support resource allocations.

Conclusion

The System is in the process of addressing the recommendation but does not yet fully meet the Standard.

UH Recommendation 5: Board and Administrative Organization

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

The Board has been undergoing a thorough self-assessment that began during the October 2012 visit. They engaged the services of an experienced consultant who has led them through a rigorous process reviewing every aspect of their responsibilities. The result is a list of recommendations that will improve the effectiveness of the board.

Regarding the adoption of a regular evaluation schedule for the review of BOR policies and procedures, the UH System is in the process of developing an online policy management system that will allow for regularly scheduled development, review, revision, and tracking of policies and procedures. Because of the self-evaluation during the last several months, the BOR is on schedule with its self-evaluation and meeting the requirement of board policy that indicates that the evaluation must be dedicated solely to the work of the BOR. Indeed, this has been the case.

Conclusion

This recommendation has been partially addressed. Because the process for developing the policy management system is underway, the System partially meets the Standard.