

EXTERNAL EVALUATION REPORT

Kapi`olani Community College
4303 Diamond Head Rd
Honolulu, HI 96816

This report represents the findings of the evaluation team that visited
Kapi`olani Community College from October 15-18, 2018

Willard Lewallen
Team Chair

**Kapi`olani Community College
Comprehensive Evaluation Visit**

Contents

Team Roster.....	3
Summary of Evaluation Report	4
Major Findings and Recommendations of the 2018 External Evaluation Team	6
Introduction.....	8
Eligibility Requirements	10
Checklist for Evaluating Compliance with Federal Regulations and Related Commission Policies	12
Public Notification of an Evaluation Team Visit and Third Party Comment	12
Standards and Performance with Respect to Student Achievement	12
Credits, Program Length, and Tuition	14
Transfer Policies	14
Distance Education and Correspondence Education.....	15
Student Complaints.....	16
Institutional Disclosure and Advertising and Recruitment Materials	17
Title IV Compliance	17
Standard I.....	19
I.A. Mission	19
I.B. Assuring Academic Quality and Institutional Effectiveness	20
I.C. Institutional Integrity	25
Standard II.....	28
Student Learning Programs and Support Services.....	28
II.A. Instructional Programs	28
II.B. Library and Learning Support Services.....	32
II.C. Student Support Services.....	35
Standard III	38
III.A. Human Resources	38
III.B. Physical Resources.....	41
III.C. Technology Resources	42
III.D. Financial Resources	44
Standard IV	48
IV.A. Decision-Making Roles and Processes	48
IV.B. Chief Executive Officer	51
IV.C. Governing Board.....	55
IV.D. Multi-College Districts or Systems.....	60
Quality Focus Essay.....	66

Team Roster

Dr. Willard Lewallen (Chair)
Superintendent/President
Hartnell Community College District

Dr. Brian Lofman (Team Assistant)
Dean of Institutional Planning, Research and Effectiveness
Hartnell College

ACADEMIC MEMBERS

Ms. Virginia May
Professor of Mathematics/Statistics
Sacramento City College

Ms. Cyndie Luna
Communication Instructor, Faculty ALO
Fresno City College

Dr. Derek Lerch
Chief Instructional Officer
Feather River College

Ms. Shawn Abbott
Faculty, Business and Computers
College of the Siskiyous

ADMINISTRATIVE MEMBERS

Dr. Catherine Webb
Dean of Planning, Research, & Institutional Effectiveness
Monterey Peninsula College

Dr. Martha Garcia
Superintendent/President
Imperial Valley Community College District

Ms. Sheri Sterner
Dean, Research, Planning and Institutional Effectiveness
Orange Coast College

Dr. W. Andrew Dunn
Vice Chancellor, Finance & Administrative Services
Coast Community College District

ACCJC LIAISON

Dr. Steven Reynolds
Vice President

OTHER MEMBERS

Dr. Henry Shannon (System Team Chair)
President
Chaffey College

Ms. Julie Sanchez (System Team Assistant)
Executive Assistant
Chaffey College

Summary of Evaluation Report

INSTITUTION: Kapi‘olani Community College

DATES OF VISIT: October 15-18, 2018

TEAM CHAIR: Willard Lewallen

A ten member accreditation team visited Kapi‘olani Community College (KCC) October 15-18, 2018, for the purpose of determining whether the College continues to meet Accreditation Standards, Eligibility Requirements, Commission Policies, and USDE regulations. The team evaluated how well the College is achieving its stated purposes, providing recommendations for quality assurance and institutional improvement, and submitting recommendations to the Accrediting Commission for Community and Junior Colleges (ACCJC) regarding the accredited status of the College.

In preparation for the visit, the team chair attended a team chair workshop on August 2, 2018, and conducted a pre-visit via video conference on August 21, 2018. During the visit, the chair met with campus leadership and key personnel. The entire external review team received team training provided by staff from ACCJC on September 5, 2018.

The evaluation team received the College’s self-evaluation documents (ISER) and supporting evidence several weeks prior to the site visit. Team members found the ISER to be a comprehensive, well-written document detailing the processes used by the College to address Eligibility Requirements, Commission Standards, and Commission Policies. The team confirmed that the ISER was developed through broad participation by the entire college community including faculty, staff, students, and administration. The College continued its progress between the time of writing and the team visit and provided additional evidence before and during the site visit. The team found that the College provided an accurate picture of the College through the ISER. The College also prepared a Quality Focus Essay (QFE), for which the team has provided comments.

Prior to the visit, team members completed their team assignments, identified areas for further investigation, and provided a list of interview requests. On the morning of October 15, some team members visited additional learning sites where KCC delivers educational services. The team members spent the afternoon of October 15 settling into the team room, receiving a tour of the campus, reviewing materials and evidence, and preparing for the remainder of the visit. The College hosted an introduction and welcome reception for the team in the afternoon on October 15.

During the visit, team members met with approximately 40 student, faculty, classified staff, and administrators in formal meetings, group interviews, and individual interviews. The team chair met with representatives from the University of Hawai‘i System, the University of Hawai‘i

Community College Unit, and members of the Board of Regents of the University of Hawai'i System. Some team members made informal observations of classes and other campus activities. During two open forums approximately 50 faculty, staff, students, and former students shared their perspectives about the College with members of the evaluation team.

The team found the College was well-prepared for the team visit and the team felt welcomed by the entire campus community. The team was impressed by the College's swift responsiveness to requests for additional information, the depth of engagement within all employee groups in the accreditation reaffirmation process, and the widespread demonstration of a deep commitment to serving their students and community.

The team found that the College satisfies all Standards, except where noted in the recommendations section, Eligibility Requirements, Commission Policies and USDE regulations. The team also identified a number of practices for which the College excels in meeting the Standards that are documented in four commendations for KCC.

Major Findings and Recommendations of the 2018 External Evaluation Team

Team Commendations

College Commendation 1

The Team commends the students and the employees of the College for their commitment to respecting and celebrating the indigenous culture of Hawai‘i and for ensuring that it is embedded in college life and practices. (II.B.2, IV.A.2)

College Commendation 2

The Team commends the College for its commitment to engaging all student populations including indigenous and international students through the development and maintenance of meaningful support structures that include robust student organizations and extensive resources for targeted populations. (II.C.1, II.C.5)

College Commendation 3

The Team commends the College for its design of the Kapi‘olani Engagement, Learning, and Achievement (KELA) model, an exemplary structure that incorporates student engagement throughout the system of institutional effectiveness measures. (IV.A.1)

College Commendation 4

The Team commends the Chancellor for creating opportunities for employees to engage in meaningful, respectful, and effective dialogue regarding the College’s operations, goals, and plans. (IV.B.6)

System Commendation 1

The University of Hawai‘i Community College System is commended for its island-centered mission in identifying new programs, and for its successful system-wide implementation of technology across the system to support program planning and tracking in clarification of students’ academic pathways. (IV.D.5)

Team Recommendations

Recommendations to Meet Standards:

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 the basis for making improvements. (I.B.7, I.B.8, IV.A.7)

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)

Recommendations for Improvement:

System Recommendation 1

In order to improve institutional effectiveness, the team recommends that the system develop and implement an assessment process to measure the effectiveness of role delineations, governance and decision-making processes to ensure their integrity. (IV.D.7)

Introduction

Kapi'olani Technical School was established in central Honolulu in 1946, thirteen years before Hawai'i statehood. In 1965, the technical school added a liberal arts program and became an open-door community college within the University of Hawai'i (UH) System. It was renamed Kapi'olani Community College and added the health sciences to its career education offerings. In 1974, the University of Hawai'i Board of Regents approved a relocation of the campus to 52 acres on the slopes of Lē'ahi (Diamond Head). Eight acres were later designated for the Hawai'i Film Studio, leaving the campus with 44 acres. The College serves primarily the City and County of Honolulu, but some career programs as well as distance education offerings attract students throughout the state, including some from underserved rural communities. The College has 19 programs with specific programmatic accreditations. The College also offers health programs at Leeward and Hawai'i Community Colleges and at UH Maui College and offers a culinary program at the Culinary Institute of the Pacific

Four Major Developments at the College

The College experienced four major developments since the last comprehensive accreditation review:

1) New Strategic Plan for 2015-2021

In fall 2013 the College, in conjunction and collaboration with the UH and UH Community Colleges (UHCC), began a new strategic planning process. This process included the development and publication of new mission, vision, and values statements in both Hawaiian and English and was completed in fall 2016.

2) Alignment of Student Success Pathway with Strategic Plan measures

Another major development was the alignment of Student Success Pathway (SSP) with the four strategic directions and 50 performance measures in the Strategic Plan for 2015-2021. In summer 2016, the UHCC adopted the Student Success Pathway (SSP) model to organize the seven community colleges around a cohesive and unified agenda to maximize and scale efforts for student success. The College's SSP model was shared with the Chancellor's Advisory Council (CAC) in fall 2016. The Council was given an opportunity to provide feedback, and revisions were made based on that feedback. In spring 2017, all departments, units, programs, and authorized governance organizations (a total of 53) completed an SSP template that delineates how each of these entities is contributing to student success and how their contributions align with the Strategic Plan.

3) Enrollment decline

The third major development was a decline in total enrollment from 7,816 in fall 2015 to 7,095 in fall 2017.

4) Change in leadership

The fourth major development was the unexpected departure in spring 2016 of the chancellor after more than 35 years of campus leadership as dean of instruction, senior

academic dean, vice chancellor for academic affairs, and chancellor. A long-time faculty member and campus leader, Dr. Louise Pagotto, was appointed as the interim chancellor during this transition period. On April 17, 2018, at a campuswide meeting, the UH vice president for community colleges announced that he had recommended to the university president the appointment of the interim chancellor as the next permanent chancellor for Kapi'olani Community College. Dr. Pagotto became chancellor on June 8, 2018.

Eligibility Requirements

1. Authority

The team confirmed that Kapi'olani Community College is a comprehensive two-year community college authorized to operate as a postsecondary degree-granting educational institution by the State of Hawai'i, the Board of Regents of the University of Hawai'i, and the University of Hawai'i Community Colleges. The College has maintained continuous accreditation by ACCJC since 1970.

Conclusion: The College meets ER 1.

2. Operational Status

Kapi'olani Community College has been in continuous operation since its inception in 1946. The Office for Institutional Effectiveness publishes data related to college enrollment (fall 2012 to present) and program review on its website. Comprehensive program reviews for degree-granting programs provide further documentation of active enrollment and completion rates for certificates and degrees in Career & Technical Education, Health, and Arts & Sciences.

Conclusion: The College meets ER 2.

3. Degrees

At the College, a substantial portion of the educational offerings are programs that lead to degrees, many of which are two years in length. A significant proportion of the students are enrolled in such programs.

Conclusion: The College meets ER 3.

4. Chief Executive Officer

The Chancellor (CEO) of KCC has been appointed by the UH System Board of Regents, has the authority to administer Board of Regents policies, UHCC policies, and KCC policies, and whose full-time responsibility is to the institution. The Chancellor does not serve as the Chair of the Board of Regents.

Conclusion: The College meets ER 4.

5. Financial Accountability

The overarching direction of budget development at the campus level is driven by the institutional mission and the Strategic Plan. The Planning and Assessment Integration with Resource Allocation (PAIR) process serves as a basis for an open, transparent, and integrated planning process. Multiple tools are employed as a vehicle for the regular assessment of financial management processes and to ensure accountability. Among these tools are Program Review, External Audit, Internal Audit, and the Internal Controls and Business Issues Report.

Conclusion: The College meets ER 5.

Checklist for Evaluating Compliance with Federal Regulations and Related Commission Policies

The evaluation items detailed in this Checklist are those which fall specifically under federal regulations and related Commission policies, beyond what is articulated in the Accreditation Standards; there may be other evaluation items under ACCJC standards address the same or similar subject matter. Evaluation teams will evaluate the institution's compliance with standards as well as the specific Checklist elements from federal regulations and related Commission policies noted here.

Public Notification of an Evaluation Team Visit and Third Party Comment

[Regulation citation: 602.23(b).]

Evaluation Items:

- X The institution has made an appropriate and timely effort to solicit third party comment in advance of a comprehensive evaluation visit. (Standard I.C.12)
- X The institution cooperates with the evaluation team in any necessary follow-up related to the third party comment. (Standard I.C.12)
- X The institution demonstrates compliance with the Commission *Policy on Rights and Responsibilities of the Commission and Member Institutions* as to third party comment.

Conclusion Check-Off (mark one):

- X The team has reviewed the elements of this component and has found the institution to meet the Commission's requirements.
- _____ The team has reviewed the elements of this component and has found the institution to meet the Commission's requirements, but follow-up is recommended.
- _____ The team has reviewed the elements of this component and found the institution does not meet the Commission's requirements.

Narrative:

The team confirmed that the College solicited third-party comments about the evaluation visit through three key opportunities to provide comment: online through the college web site, in writing directly to the College, and through meetings with the public leading up to the visit. The team found no third party comment related to this visit.

Standards and Performance with Respect to Student Achievement

Evaluation Items:

X	The institution has defined elements of student achievement performance across the institution, and has identified the expected measure of performance within each defined element. Course completion is included as one of these elements of student achievement. Other elements of student achievement performance for measurement have been determined as appropriate to the institution's mission.
X	The institution has defined elements of student achievement performance within each instructional program, and has identified the expected measure of performance within each defined element. The defined elements include, but are not limited to, job placement rates for program completers, and for programs in fields where licensure is required, the licensure examination passage rates for program completers.
X	The institution-set standards for programs and across the institution are relevant to guide self-evaluation and institutional improvement; the defined elements and expected performance levels are appropriate within higher education; the results are reported regularly across the campus; and the definition of elements and results are used in program-level and institution-wide planning to evaluate how well the institution fulfills its mission, to determine needed changes, to allocating resources, and to make improvements.
X	The institution analyzes its performance as to the institution-set standards and as to student achievement, and takes appropriate measures in areas where its performance is not at the expected level.

[Regulation citations: 602.16(a)(1)(i); 602.17(f); 602.19 (a-e).]

Conclusion Check-Off (mark one):

X	The team has reviewed the elements of this component and has found the institution to meet the Commission's requirements.
	The team has reviewed the elements of this component and has found the institution to meet the Commission's requirements, but that follow-up is recommended.
	The team has reviewed the elements of this component and found the institution does not meet the Commission's requirements.

Narrative:

The College sets and evaluates institution-set standards for student performance according to a framework for student achievement established by the University of Hawai'i Community Colleges (UHCC). Institution-set standards include both a baseline standard and an aspirational target. Institution-set standards are aligned with planning and resource allocation processes and monitored through institutional processes, including program review and the Strategic Plan Scorecard. The College implements measures to improve in areas where performance does not meet established baselines.

Credits, Program Length, and Tuition

[Regulation citations: 600.2 (definition of credit hour); 602.16(a)(1)(viii); 602.24(e), (f); 668.2; 668.9.]

Evaluation Items:

- Credit hour assignments and degree program lengths are within the range of good practice in higher education (in policy and procedure). (Standard II.A.9)
- The assignment of credit hours and degree program lengths is verified by the institution, and is reliable and accurate across classroom based courses, laboratory classes, distance education classes, and for courses that involve clinical practice (if applicable to the institution). (Standard II.A.9)
- Tuition is consistent across degree programs (or there is a rational basis for any program-specific tuition). (Standard I.C.2)
- Any clock hour conversions to credit hours adhere to the Department of Education's conversion formula, both in policy and procedure, and in practice. (Standard II.A.9)
- The institution demonstrates compliance with the Commission *Policy on Institutional Degrees and Credits*.

Conclusion Check-Off (mark one):

- The team has reviewed the elements of this component and has found the institution to meet the Commission's requirements.
- The team has reviewed the elements of this component and has found the institution to meet the Commission's requirements, but that follow-up is recommended.
- The team has reviewed the elements of this component and found the institution does not meet the Commission's requirements.

Narrative:

The College applies good practice in higher education when assigning credit hours and determining program lengths. This is applicable to classroom, lab, clinical practice, and distance education programs. Tuition is consistent across degree programs and clock hour conversions to credit hours align to the Department of Education's conversion formula. Finally, College practices align with the Commission *Policy on Institutional Degrees and Credits*.

Transfer Policies

Evaluation Items:

X	Transfer policies are appropriately disclosed to students and to the public.
X	Policies contain information about the criteria the institution uses to accept credits for transfer.
X	The institution complies with the Commission <i>Policy on Transfer of Credit</i> .

[Regulation citations: 602.16(a)(1)(viii); 602.17(a)(3); 602.24(e); 668.43(a)(ii).]

Conclusion Check-Off (mark one):

X	The team has reviewed the elements of this component and has found the institution to meet the Commission's requirements.
	The team has reviewed the elements of this component and has found the institution to meet the Commission's requirements, but that follow-up is recommended.
	The team has reviewed the elements of this component and found the institution does not meet the Commission's requirements.

Narrative:

The College policies and information regarding transfer are available to students on the College website and in the catalog. To evaluate and grant transfer credit, College faculty, counselors, students, and staff use STAR GPS to determine general education, major and transfer requirements within the University of Hawai'i System. When appropriate, course descriptions and Course Outlines of Record are reviewed to determine where a course is equivalent.

Distance Education and Correspondence Education

[Regulation citations: 602.16(a)(1)(iv), (vi); 602.17(g); 668.38.]

Evaluation Items:

- The institution has policies and procedures for defining and classifying a course as offered by distance education or correspondence education, in alignment with USDE definitions. (Standard II.A.7)
- There is an accurate and consistent application of the policies and procedures for determining if a course is offered by distance education (with regular and substantive interaction with the instructor, initiated by the instructor, and online activities are included as part of a student's grade) or correspondence education (online activities are primarily "paperwork related," including reading posted materials, posting homework and completing examinations, and interaction with the instructor is initiated by the student as needed). (Standard II.A.7)
- The institution has appropriate means and consistently applies those means for verifying the identity of a student who participates in a distance education or correspondence education course or program, and for ensuring that student information is protected.
- The technology infrastructure is sufficient to maintain and sustain the distance education and correspondence education offerings. (Standard III.C.1)
- The institution demonstrates compliance with the Commission *Policy on Distance Education and Correspondence Education*.

Conclusion Check-Off (mark one):

- The team has reviewed the elements of this component and has found the institution to meet the Commission's requirements.
- The team has reviewed the elements of this component and has found the institution to meet the Commission's requirements, but that follow-up is recommended.
- The team has reviewed the elements of this component and found the institution does not meet the Commission's requirements.

Narrative:

The College has policies and procedures in place for determining appropriateness of offering a course in a Distance Education format, as well as classifying a course as Distance Education in alignment with USDE definitions. Policies and procedures are applied in an accurate and consistent fashion to determine if a course is offered in a Distance Education format. Instructors are given training and clear direction for instructor initiated regular and substantive interaction with Distance Education students. The College has appropriate means for verifying student identity and is piloting online proctoring. The technology infrastructure is appropriate to support the Distance Education program and instructional designers support Distance Education faculty. The College complies with the Commission *Policy on Institutional Advertising, Student Recruitment, and Representation of Accredited Status*.

Student Complaints

[Regulation citations: 602.16(a)(1)(ix); 668.43.]

Evaluation Items:

- The institution has clear policies and procedures for handling student complaints, and the current policies and procedures are accessible to students in the college catalog and online. (Standard I.C.2)
- The student complaint files for the previous six years (since the last comprehensive evaluation) are available; the files demonstrate accurate implementation of the complaint policies and procedures.
- The team analysis of the student complaint files identifies any issues that may be indicative of the institution’s noncompliance with any Accreditation Standards.
- The institution posts on its website the names of associations, agencies and governmental bodies that accredit, approve, or license the institution and any of its programs, and provides contact information for filing complaints with such entities. (Standard I.C.1)
- The institution demonstrates compliance with the Commission *Policy on Representation of Accredited Status* and the *Policy on Student and Public Complaints Against Institutions*.

Conclusion Check-Off (mark one):

- The team has reviewed the elements of this component and has found the institution to meet the Commission’s requirements.
- The team has reviewed the elements of this component and has found the institution to meet the Commission’s requirements, but that follow-up is recommended.
- The team has reviewed the elements of this component and found the institution does not meet the Commission’s requirements.

Narrative:

The College has clear and accessible policies and procedures for student complaints that are available through the catalog and the website. The Team verified that the College collects, maintains, and responds to student complaints appropriately, including complaints received over the past six years. Through a review of the student complaints, the team verified that there was no evidence of systematic complaints that would indicate noncompliance with the Accreditation Standards. The names and contact information for accrediting bodies are posted on the College website. Evidence indicates that the College complies with the *Policy on Representation of Accredited Status and the Policy on Student and Public Complaints Against Institutions*.

Institutional Disclosure and Advertising and Recruitment Materials

[Regulation citations: 602.16(a)(1)(vii); 668.6.]

Evaluation Items:

- X The institution provides accurate, timely (current), and appropriately detailed information to students and the public about its programs, locations, and policies. (Standard I.C.2)
- X The institution complies with the Commission *Policy on Institutional Advertising, Student Recruitment, and Representation of Accredited Status*.
- X The institution provides required information concerning its accredited status as described above in the section on Student Complaints. (Standard I.C.2)

Conclusion Check-Off (mark one):

- X The team has reviewed the elements of this component and has found the institution to meet the Commission's requirements.
- _____ The team has reviewed the elements of this component and has found the institution to meet the Commission's requirements, but that follow-up is recommended.
- _____ The team has reviewed the elements of this component and found the institution does not meet the Commission's requirements.

Narrative:

The College catalog and website provide accurate, timely, and appropriately detailed information to students and the public regarding programs, locations, and policies. All information is reviewed on a regular cycle to ensure accuracy. The College complies with *Commission Policy on Institutional Advertising, Student Recruitment, and Representation of Accredited Status* by ensuring accuracy in publications and advertising and sharing all documents regarding the College's accreditation status. The College also provides the required information and programmatic accreditors as described in the Student Complaints section.

Title IV Compliance

[Regulation citations: 602.16(a)(1)(v); 602.16(a)(1)(x); 602.19(b); 668.5; 668.15; 668.16; 668.71 et seq.]

Evaluation Items:

- The institution has presented evidence on the required components of the Title IV Program, including findings from any audits and program or other review activities by the USDE. (Standard III.D.15)
- The institution has addressed any issues raised by the USDE as to financial responsibility requirements, program record-keeping, etc. If issues were not timely addressed, the institution demonstrates it has the fiscal and administrative capacity to timely address issues in the future and to retain compliance with Title IV program requirements. (Standard III.D.15)
- The institution’s student loan default rates are within the acceptable range defined by the USDE. Remedial efforts have been undertaken when default rates near or meet a level outside the acceptable range. (Standard III.D.15)
- Contractual relationships of the institution to offer or receive educational, library, and support services meet the Accreditation Standards and have been approved by the Commission through substantive change if required. (Standard III.D.16)
- The institution demonstrates compliance with the Commission *Policy on Contractual Relationships with Non-Regionally Accredited Organizations* and the *Policy on Institutional Compliance with Title IV*.

Conclusion Check-Off (mark one):

- The team has reviewed the elements of this component and has found the institution to meet the Commission’s requirements.
- The team has reviewed the elements of this component and has found the institution to meet the Commission’s requirements, but that follow-up is recommended.
- The team has reviewed the elements of this component and found the institution does not meet the Commission’s requirements.

Narrative:

Title IV of the Higher Education Act of 1965 covers the administration of the student financial aid program. The College has demonstrated effective administration of this program. The College’s default rates on student loans fall within the acceptable range under federal guidelines and parameters. The College’s three-year cohort default rates during the last published cohort years were 14.9 percent in 2014, 11.5 percent in 2013, and 11.8 percent in 2012. Further, the most recent audit of the program (2015-16) resulted in no findings.

Standard I

Mission, Academic Quality and Institutional Effectiveness

I.A. Mission

General Observations

Kapi‘olani Community College has and communicates widely an institutional mission that speaks directly to its commitment to student success, guides decision-making and planning, and informs its degree, certificate, program, and service offerings. The College uses data on student engagement, learning, and achievement to evaluate the extent to which the mission is accomplished.

Findings and Evidence

The Team found that the mission statement refers directly to key aspects of institutional purpose: the College’s broad educational purposes of *academic, career, and lifelong learning*; the intended student population, which encompasses *indigenous, local, national, and international students*; and the types of degrees and credentials, including *certificates and associate degrees*, with reference also made to *transfer pathways*. The College offers specific pre-collegiate and pre-professional programs in addition to non-credit programs. Commitment to student engagement, learning, and achievement is championed and implemented through the Kapi‘olani Engagement, Learning, and Achievement (KELA) model, which allows for the assessment of efforts employed to achieve student success. The KELA model effectively demonstrates the institution’s purposeful approach to assessing data on student engagement, learning, and achievement systematically in college-wide planning and decision-making. (I.A.1, ER 6)

The College uses data to assess the extent of student engagement, student learning, and student achievement as operationalized through the KELA model. For example, the College student engagement data were reviewed to find that part-time and Native Hawaiian students are the least likely groups to utilize academic support services, and analyzed student achievement data resulting in focused attention on underrepresented groups, including Filipino, Native Hawaiian, Pacific Islander, and Pell receiving students. Student success is broadly demonstrated through student achievement measures such as awards, including degrees and certificates, and transfer to 4-year institutions. Institution-set standards, scorecards, and annual reports with disaggregated student achievement data showcase the extent to which goals and targets are met. (I.A.2)

The College’s programs and services are aligned with institutional mission through concerted efforts to serve various student sub-populations, such as Native Hawaiians, international students, and students facing financial barriers. Through interviews with College leaders and other staff, the Team found that the mission guides policy-making and informs goal-setting and planning which, in turn, shape resource allocation decisions and the development, implementation, and evaluation of institutional programs and services. (I.A.3)

The College mission is widely communicated through its posting on the College website, its sharing among constituents, displays in classrooms, inclusion in the College's Annual Report, and by reference in presentations. The mission statement was most recently reviewed and revised in 2016. The governing board approved the revised mission statement in March of 2017. (I.A.4, ER 6)

Overall, the Team found that the mission is stated clearly; emphasizes both student access to college programs and services, and student success through student engagement, learning, and achievement; points to the diversity of students served and types of programs offered; informs institutional goals, planning, strategic priorities, resource allocation, operational activities, and the selection and assessment of key student success metrics; and is widely communicated.

Conclusion

The College meets Standard I.A.

I.B. Assuring Academic Quality and Institutional Effectiveness

General Observations

The KCC mission reflects an institutional commitment to student outcomes, equity, and engagement. These values are reflected in policies and practices related to assuring academic quality and institutional effectiveness, as well as in the design of the Kapi'olani Engagement, Learning, and Achievement (KELA) framework that is used to guide institutional dialogue and evaluation. The institution monitors the quality and effectiveness of its programs and learning support services through a systematic program review process that includes examination of performance metrics and disaggregated student achievement data that are relevant to the mission of the College and broader University of Hawai'i system. Additionally, each College unit completes Student Success Pathway Plans that align program-level planning to the College's 2015-2021 Strategic Plan. Program and institutional planning are integrated with resource allocation through the Planning and Assessment Integration with Resource Allocation (PAIR) and allocation request (ARF) processes, which include consideration of how the funded items are expected to support Strategic Plan measures, program improvements, and/or learning/service outcomes.

Findings and Evidence

The College engages in collegial dialogue about student outcomes, student equity, academic quality, institutional effectiveness, and continuous improvement of student learning and achievement. The Team found evidence of rich dialogue around student learning, equity, and success in the minutes of committee meetings, including the Chancellor's Advisory Council, Administrative Staff Council, and Vice Chancellors' Advisory Council, Faculty Senate, and Authorized Governance Organizations (AGOs). Dialogue is supported by data and analysis

emerging from the Comprehensive Program Review (CPR) and Annual Report of Program Data (ARPD) processes. The CPR and ARPD processes formalize dialogue around student achievement around common sets of metrics that have been disaggregated for subpopulations relevant to the institutional mission; these processes support monitoring and discussion of performance trends over time. Dialogue around student achievement is also reflected in the completion and discussion of Student Success Pathway (SSP) plans and through the discussion of annual resource requests. Dialogue around student outcomes also occurs in meetings of the Faculty Senate SLO Assessment Committee, within the Assessment Fridays curriculum offered by the Assessment Coaches, and within program-specific groups such as the Counseling Assessment Leaders Group. Evidence of sustained dialogue around student outcomes and assessment practices is particularly evident in the Assessment Friday workshops. Since fall 2015, the College's SLO assessment coaches have offered an Assessment Fridays workshop series designed to share best practices, increase faculty engagement in assessment, and share examples of improvement emerging from assessment results. Specific activities such as "SLO Stories" reflect the broader practice of "talk story" embedded in the College culture and central to its values of respect, engagement, and community. (I.B.1)

The College has defined learning outcomes for instructional and student & learning support services, which can be seen in the College catalog and in Comprehensive Program Review (CPR) documents (ER 11). However, after reviewing assessment results housed in Annual Report of Program Data (ARPD), CPR, and Taskstream reports, the Team concluded that documentation and reporting of outcomes assessment results does not occur consistently across instructional programs. The CPR template provides a mechanism to confirm whether Program Learning Outcomes (PLOs) have been assessed, but does not include information about cycles of assessment for PLOs, making it difficult for the College to track and sustain assessment cycles. Similarly, Course Assessment Plans, which ensure that course learning outcomes are assessed at least once within a five-year cycle, are not consistently documented in ARPDs and CPRs for all units, making it more difficult to identify courses where SLO assessment has not been analyzed or reported. The College is transitioning its assessment reporting practices into a new system (Taskstream) in order to improve documentation and tracking of cycles. During the visit, the Team confirmed that the College hired a full-time Assessment Coordinator in July 2018 in order to address this self-identified area of improvement. The College has also identified improvements to learning outcomes assessment practices as one of two action projects in its Quality Focus Essay. (I.B.2, I.B.4, ER 11)

In collaboration with other colleges in the UHCC system, the College has established institution set standards that include both a baseline threshold and an aspirational target. These data are reported annually through the ACCJC Annual Reports. All Annual Reports submitted since 2010 are publicly available on the College website. Targets for the institutional effectiveness measures monitored through the Annual Report of Program Data and institutional performance metrics mirror the baseline targets for institution-set standards. During the visit, the Team confirmed that the College uses these processes to monitor progress against the institution-set standards. As of the writing of the ISER, the College is evaluating and revising its policy for the Review of Established Programs (K5.202) in order to more intentionally align the institution-set standards with its program review processes and Student Success Pathway framework. The College

anticipates that this change will further strengthen the integration of institution-set standards within the College's system of planning. (I.B.3, ER 11)

The College organizes and implements institutional processes to support student learning and student achievement. The Team found that the College has made an intentional effort to align program-level planning with the strategic directions and goals in the Student Success Pathway framework. For example, as of 2017, all College units address performance measures and strategic goals related to student learning and success in their Student Success Pathways (SSP) plans, and programs provide an SSP progress report three times per year. However, while the College uses data stemming from outcomes assessment results to improve student learning and achievement within individual departments and programs, the Team concluded the institutional processes for these improvements are inconsistent and often occur in isolation of each other. The College acknowledged in its ISER and during interviews that its approach could be more systematic, particularly with regard to improvements stemming from the assessment, and reporting of the assessments of student learning outcomes. (I.B.4)

The College assesses accomplishment of its mission through the evaluation of metrics in the Strategic Plan Scorecard, alignment of Student Success Pathways plans, and a robust system of program review that includes all instructional, student support, academic support, and administrative services units. The Annual Report of Program Data (ARPD) template provides each program with an opportunity for analyses of measures related to program health, effectiveness, and student success. Where appropriate, data provided in the template for each program have been disaggregated by mode of delivery and for subpopulations of students relevant to the institutional mission. Comprehensive Program Reviews (CPRs) for each program are completed every three years, and provide opportunities to document evaluations of program-specific goals. In addition to program health and student success metrics, CPRs allow programs to demonstrate how they "prepare students for their productive futures," a key component of the College mission. In addition to regular CPR and ARPD, the Student Success Pathway (SSP) plans map unit-level goals and actions to institutional outcomes and Strategic Plans. The College's KELA framework aligns this work and emphasizes student engagement as a critical component of mission fulfillment. Based on the evidence and discussions with College personnel, the Team found that mechanisms for program review are broadly understood and regularly followed. However, based on an analysis of ARPD, CPR, and outcomes assessment results documentation, the Team concluded these processes could be further improved by more consistent inclusion of learning outcomes assessment results. Although ARPD and CPR templates provide an opportunity for reflection on the results of outcomes assessments, the results of assessments do not appear to be consistently incorporated into program review documents. The College plans to improve its outcomes assessment practices and documentation of results through its QFE action project. (I.B.5)

The College has a clearly defined commitment to improving educational and economic outcomes for Native Hawaiian and low-income students. Therefore, the focus on disaggregating data related to Native Hawaiian, Filipinos, Pacific Islanders and Pell students is consistent with the College mission and status as a Native Hawaiian serving institution. The College currently disaggregates learning outcomes for developmental (i.e., pre-college) courses. Achievement data

for these subpopulations are monitored through performance funding metrics, the Institution-set Standards, and the Strategic Plan Scorecard. Disaggregated achievement data are also monitored at the program level through the Annual Report of Program Data (ARPD) and Comprehensive Program Review (CPR). The ISER provides examples of targeted interventions designed to increase success and achievement within specific subpopulations of students for which performance gaps were uncovered. (I.B.6)

College policy K1.100 establishes the expectation that all College policies and their associated procedures and implementation protocols will be evaluated every 5 years at minimum. The Chancellor's Advisory Council (CAC) established a calendar for policy review in the 2017-18 academic year. The College also developed a calendar for reviewing its primary college-wide plans (e.g., Enrollment Management, Sustainability, Technology, etc.) in the 2017-18 year; the review of these plans occurs during monthly of the Chancellor's Advisory Council (CAC). The team examined CAC minutes from the 2017-18 year and verified that the College is generally on track with these reviews. Both of these review processes are in their first cycle. The College is encouraged to conduct an evaluation of the cycles once they have concluded to determine their continued effectiveness. (I.B.7)

Evidentiary documents provided by the College in the ISER and during the visit demonstrate that the College has recently conducted evaluations of institutional planning and resource allocation processes. These evaluations include a meta-analysis of the Annual Report of Program Data (ARPD) process and an institutional review of the PAIR/ARF process. Although the findings from these evaluations provided the College with rich insight into the utility and usability of these planning mechanisms, the Team did not see evidence indicating that the results of the evaluations were used to inform improvements. The Team also did not see evidence that evaluations such as these are conducted on a regular and ongoing basis. As a result, the Team concluded that the College lacks a regular and systematic evaluation cycle for its planning and continuous improvement processes. (I.B.7)

Evaluation and assessment activities in place at the College include effectiveness measures and performance goals. Progress with regard to system-wide effectiveness measures and performance goals (e.g., targeted enrollment, completion, etc.) is communicated to campus constituencies through regular reports from the Vice President of the UHCC system. At the college level, progress towards Strategic Goals is assessed and communicated in the annual Strategic Plan Scorecard reports, available from the Office for Institutional Effectiveness (OFIE) website. Results of program-level evaluations are published in Annual Report of Program Data (ARPD) and Comprehensive Program Review (CPR) reports, also available from the OFIE website. However, after reviewing the evidence provided by the College and meeting with College personnel during the site visit, the Team did not find evidence that communication of these evaluation and assessment activities is sufficient to lead to a shared understanding of institutional strengths, weaknesses, and priorities. The Team verified that improving communication of evaluation results is an expected outcome the College's QFE action projects. (I.B.8)

The College has developed a structure for comprehensive institutional planning, the integration of regular, ongoing program review and resource allocation processes. Program and institutional

planning documents are linked to resource allocation through the Planning and Assessment Integration with Resource Allocation (PAIR) process, described in college policy K1.111. As part of this process, each department prepares a 5-year budget plan, which is designed to strengthen mid-range planning and address both short-term and long-term resource needs. Any member of the college personnel may request additional resources through the Allocation Request Form (ARF), which includes consideration of how the funded items are expected to support Strategic Plan measures, program improvements, and/or learning/service outcomes. During spring 2018, the Chancellor's Advisory Council recommended changes to the ARF process in order to improve participation and consistency. During the visit, the Team reviewed evidence of the College's evaluative dialogue and evaluation of this process. At the time of the site visit, changes emerging from the evaluation had been approved for the 2018-19 planning cycle. (I.B.9)

As part of its integrated planning system, the College monitors performance metrics (including institution-set standards) to evaluate the health of its programs and services and assess the degree to which it meets its mission. Each academic, student services, and administrative unit completes a Comprehensive Program Review on a three-year cycle. Annually, each unit completes a thorough review of program-specific performance metrics (determined at the UHCC level) in order to track the overall health and vitality of the program. Further, Student Success Pathway Plans link program-level planning to the college's 2015-2021 Strategic Plan. The Strategic Plan includes a description for meeting specific performance outcomes set at the UHCC level. Structures for the incorporation of outcomes assessment results into planning processes (e.g., ARPD, ARF) and documentation of those processes (e.g., Taskstream) are in place. (I.B.9, ER 19).

Conclusion

The College meets Standard I.B except for Standards I.B.2, I.B.4, I.B.5, I.B.7, and I.B.8.

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 the basis for making improvements. (I.B.7, I.B.8, IV.A.7)

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)

I.C. Institutional Integrity

General Observations

The College demonstrates integrity, clarity, and accuracy in its efforts to communicate with all constituents, including College personnel, students, potential students, and the public. Documents are current and regularly updated. The College catalog provides comprehensive and current information to all constituents, and is available online. The College provides accurate and current information to students and the public regarding programs, requirements, policies, procedures, student achievement, and student learning through the College website and other media. The College meets all timelines and obligations with ACCJC, as well as programmatic accreditors and this information is available to the public. College policies available to the public, and these policies are evaluated every five years, or as needed.

Findings and Evidence

The College provides current and accurate information to all constituents through a variety of publications. The College catalog provides a wealth of information and the College has developed a thorough review process to ensure proper review of the document before publication. Program information and course and program level outcomes are made available in the College catalog. This information is also reviewed at new student and new employee orientations. (I.C.1, ER 20)

The College catalog is updated annually and includes required catalog information including general information, student requirements, and information regarding major policies and procedures affecting students. The College prints the names and degrees of administrators and faculty in the College catalog. The College makes note of the importance of high-quality interaction between faculty and students in the College catalog. (I.C.2, ER 20)

The College communicates assessment results through a variety of methods. The University of Hawai‘i system progress on Strategic Directions to faculty and staff each fall. The College makes assessment results available primarily through program review documents. Program data, as well as student learning assessment results, are recorded in the program review and made available online to current and prospective students as well as the public. As discussed in the Quality Focus Essay, the College is working toward increased faculty engagement in the process. Achievement data are made available through the Office for Institutional Effectiveness website, and the College’s Scorecard on attainment of Strategic Plan Outcomes is also available to the public. (I.C.3, ER 19)

The College describes its degrees and certificates in respect to content, course requirements and sequencing, and program/course level learning outcomes in multiple areas including the catalog, program websites, and the STAR Guided Pathway system. (I.C.4)

The College operates based on relevant policies and procedures that are published appropriately. In fall 2017, the College approved a process for policy development. The College has created a Schedule of Policy Review that aligns with a five-year cycle. (I.C.5)

The College is clear regarding the total cost of education. Tuition, fees, and other expenses are posted clearly in a variety of places on the College website. Programs with additional expenses clearly indicate such expenses on program website. Financial Aid information is easily accessible via the website. The College has demonstrated a commitment to providing Open Educational Resources. Courses with zero cost textbooks are clearly marked and searchable by that criteria. (I.C.6)

The University of Hawai‘i, Title 20, Chapter 20 Statement on Rights and Responsibilities of the University of Hawai‘i Community and the University of Hawai‘i Community College Statement on Professional Ethics for faculty clearly delineate expectations regarding professional conduct. In addition, the collective bargaining agreement and the college catalog demonstrate the system and college’s commitment to protection of academic freedom. (I.C.7, ER 13)

System and College Policies (BORP 12.201, UHEP 12.214 and 7.208, UHCC Policy 5.211, and KCC Student Conduct Code) clearly outline expectations for honesty, integrity for college personnel, as well as expectations for behavior and honesty for students including consequences for dishonesty. The Student Conduct Code is available online, but is not included in the College catalog. (I.C.8)

Established policies outline the importance of academic freedom and professionalism in faculty conduct and behavior. Professionalism is further emphasized in the collective bargaining agreement, and in the faculty evaluation process. (I.C.9)

While KCC has policies in place related to academic freedom, standards of behavior, and professional ethics, the College is an open access public institution that does not require conformity to codes of conduct that seek to instill specific beliefs or world views (I.C.10).

The College does not operate in a foreign location. (I.C.11)

The College complies with all requirements set forth by ACCJC. The College submits required documents in a timely fashion and all documents, including communication, are available on an easily accessible webpage. (I.C.12, ER 21).

The College demonstrates honesty and integrity in its relationships with external agencies that includes longstanding successful relationships and partnerships with agencies such as the USDOE-funded Native Hawaiian Career and Technical Education project, the Hawai‘i P-20 Partnerships for Education initiative, and a number of clinical sites supporting nursing and dental assisting programs. Along with ACCJC, the College also has relationships with several accrediting agencies for specific programs and demonstrates consistent, timely, and accurate reporting to these agencies. The College complies with all program accreditor requirements, and

in cases where issues identified, the College has worked diligently to remedy them in a timely fashion. All information is made available on the College website. (I.C.12, ER 21)

The College is committed to financial integrity and ensures this through conflict of interest statements and policies that are signed annually by employees and the Board of Regents. The Board of Regents also submits annual financial statements to the State Ethics Board. (I.C.14)

Conclusion

The College meets Standard I.C.

Standard II

Student Learning Programs and Support Services

II.A. Instructional Programs

General Observations

The College offers a broad array of courses and programs that lead to a certificate, degree, and/or transfer that meet current higher education standards. The institution has a comprehensive program review process to promote continuous improvement and effectiveness of all programs, regardless of level, type, and delivery mode or location.

The College is consistently striving for improvement via dialogue, assessment and professional development. The College has specific policies, processes, and guidelines in place for outcomes assessment and program review. The College is transitioning from Curriculum Central to Taskstream for outcomes assessment which should streamline processes. Assessment and Engagement were identified as two action projects in the Quality Focus Essay with the intention of improving engagement and assessment practices. Faculty input is incorporated into the review and assessment of all curriculum through the curriculum committee. Courses are offered at each of its physical locations, as well as in online and hybrid delivery formats. Review of Distance Education (DE) courses and interviews with DE faculty and instructional designers demonstrated the foundation for a robust distance education program. The addition of a DE Coordinator has facilitated momentum in implementation of the DE plan, as well as a strong faculty development program surrounding DE.

The College's website, catalog and supporting evidence address the elements of standard IIA. The programs are evaluated through Annual Report of Program Data (ARPD) and the Comprehensive Program Review (CPR). Programs and coursework align with the mission and have specified learning outcomes. Career Technical Education (CTE) programs meet employment standards and prepare students for licensure and certification. A co-requisite model was created in 2015 to help students succeed in college level courses and reduce the levels of developmental English and Math.

The scheduling of courses, along with STAR GPS, is aiming to provide a path that will enable students to complete education goals in a timely fashion. The College is committed to closing achievement gaps for specific demographic populations by developing programs such as the Summer Bridge Program focused on STEM for All. All programs include a component of general education, unless it is a CTE certificate. Finally, degrees and awards are based on student attainment under general practices followed in higher education.

Findings and Evidence

The College offers appropriate curriculum, including online and hybrid courses, to directly support the College mission. A Distance Education Plan was developed to ensure a structured approach in developing and expanding online education. All courses and programs have defined student learning outcomes, and course level outcomes are intended to be mapped to program level outcomes; however, not all programs have completed the mapping process. The five-year program review and curriculum processes ensure quality and appropriateness of curriculum aligned with the College mission. The College is currently in the process of transitioning from Curriculum Central to the more dynamic Taskstream system to store SLO data, which will streamline the program mapping process. (II.A.1, ER 9, ER 11)

The College implements a thorough process for curriculum review and faculty are provided with training materials to assist them through the process. Courses must be approved through the curriculum review process to be offered in a DE format. Faculty also complete a Worksheet for determining course DE Eligibility to offer courses in a DE format. Review of the DE courses provided by the College indicated appropriate levels of regular and substantive contact in the forms of discussion boards, announcements, and feedback on student work. The College provides excellent opportunities for faculty development, and some of them are long term such as the Title III Curriculum Fellowships. (II.A.2)

The UH System and the College have established policies and processes for assessment of student learning outcomes. There is a five-year assessment cycle with specific instructions provided in the Course Level Assessment Plan. The College tracked student learning assessments through Word and Excel documents, which was cumbersome and made mapping and accessing assessment results difficult. This prompted the decision to implement Taskstream and the College is in the process of the transition. The College engages in dialogue regarding student learning assessment, and provides regular opportunities for discussion such as Assessment Fridays. The Team reviewed a random sampling of syllabi while on campus, as well as a full set of syllabi from a particular course and found that the in most cases the student learning outcomes in the syllabi were in alignment with those in the course outline of record. Some syllabi reviewed contained updated student learning outcomes, and while they were in alignment with the course outline of record it is important to update the outcomes in the course outline of record to reflect current practice in a timely fashion. Syllabi are reviewed at the department level and all departments provide faculty with standard items to include in the syllabi, such as relevant policies. Syllabi are routinely reviewed as part of the faculty evaluation. (II.A.3)

The College appropriately distinguishes between pre-collegiate and college-level curriculum. The UH Community Colleges has moved from a prerequisite to a co-requisite model to facilitate timely completion of college-level courses. As a part of this movement, the College eliminated its pre-collegiate department integrating the faculty back into the regular math and English departments. The Star Pathways system further supports students progressing through this course sequence. (II.A.4)

The College degrees and programs follow general higher education practices. The College has clearly defined and published policies that outline the requirements for all degrees and programs offered. Information about degree and program requirements are available in both policy documents set by the System, as well as through publications including the College catalog and website. The College has established general education requirements that align with degree and transfer requirements within the System. Associate degrees require a minimum of 60 credits, UHCC Policy 5.203 requires that high quality instruction and appropriate breadth, depth, rigor and synthesis of learning characterize all program credentials. Students must earn a grade point average of 2.0 or higher and they must obtain a “C” or better in all courses required for a specific program. (II.A.5)

The University of Hawai‘i Enrollment Management Plan (2017-2020) describes the goals, strategies, and tactics of the University of Hawai‘i campuses to shape their enrollments. It is a framework to guide overall enrollment, retention and degree completion efforts. In alignment with the System the College’s Enrollment Management Plan clarified institutional priorities and objectives that target increased enrollment and program completion. The STAR Guided Pathways System was implemented to assist students to complete in a timely manner, the system demonstrates systematically scheduled courses and serves a guide for students. (II.A.6)

The College has developed an infrastructure 2015-2017 Strategic Plan to support diverse student populations and directly close the achievement gaps for the following populations: Native Hawaiians, Pacific Islanders, Filipinos and Pell Recipients. The College offers face-to-face, distance education, and hybrid courses to students. DE students have the opportunity to access tutoring 24/7 through Brainfuse. Faculty offer different teaching methodologies, including culture-based learning. An example of culture-based learning is the College Project Olonā, which is an intensive six-week summer bridge program that helps prepare recent high school graduates for STEM careers. Project Olonā promotes culture-based curriculum and learning opportunities and strives to close the Native American student success gaps. The College also conducted the Community College Survey of Student Engagement (CCSSE) which highlighted areas of success, needing improvement and learning support needs. (II.A.7)

The College does not offer department wide courses/or program examinations. Career Technical Education (CTE) Programs offer students the opportunity to take external industry qualifying examinations to prepare them for licensure or certification. The College in alignment with UHCC Policy 5.302 provides college credit to students’ prior learning experience via an examination based on content or a rubric-based review and assessment of a portfolio submitted by the student. (II.A.8)

The College catalog clearly articulates the requirements for degrees and certificates, in addition to graduation requirements. The curriculum and program review processes enable dialogue between faculty, staff, and administrators regarding development and assessment of programs and their expected learning outcomes. The College is in the process of mapping course-level outcomes to program-level outcomes in Taskstream. The College offers courses and programs within acceptable norms of credit calculation as stipulated in UHCC Policy 5.228. (II.A.9)

The System prioritizes and integrates system wide transfer goals in the UH System Integrated Academic and Facilities Plan. The College publishes appropriate transfer-of-credit policies and information in its catalog. Transfer information is provided through individual and group workshops offered by the counseling department and Transfer Specialists. STAR GPS automatically updates and identifies transfer requirements to match any changing course requirements regarding university transfer. A Transfer Specialist was hired by the University of Hawai‘i at Mānoa (UHM) to assist the College students with transfer process regardless of chosen transfer institution. The College’s KeKaulike Information and Service Center (KISC) in collaboration with faculty, counselors, program coordinators and department chairs are primarily responsible for evaluating transfer credits. Articulation agreements are in place via Memorandum of Agreements. (II.A.10, ER 10)

All degrees are mapped to appropriate general education outcomes. Outcomes vary based on A.S. or A.A. degrees. In addition, the College has identified four ILOs, one of which is engaging in diverse perspectives. In alignment with the mission, students earning an associate in arts degree will complete global and multiculturalism perspectives, Hawaiian, Asian, and Pacific Issues Focus, and Hawaiian/Second Language requirements. Overall, the College has developed appropriate general education level outcomes. (II.A.11)

The College’s philosophy on general education is stipulated in the catalog. General education is integrated in transfer and career technical education programs. General Education outcomes were developed by faculty; however, they are not included in career technical education programs. The College’s associate in arts degrees include a component of general education, including SLO’s, competencies to prepare students for civil engagement, life-long learning, and comprehension in the arts and humanities, the sciences, mathematics and social sciences. There are five bodies that provide oversight of courses meeting general education requirements and graduation requirements. The goal of the General Education Board is to provide a mechanism to enable faculty to engage in discussions, address related concerns and streamline processes. The general education course sequence is embedded in each degree in alignment with transfer expectations of the University of Hawai‘i. (II.A.12, ER 12)

The College offers a total of 75 programs including associate degrees and certificates of achievement ensuring that the courses included in the degrees are in a focused area of study and include foundational knowledge and skills as well as opportunities for students to develop mastery of skills. The associate in arts in liberal arts is an interdisciplinary degree, with learning outcomes related to the broad areas of a liberal education. In addition to the interdisciplinary liberal arts degree, the College developed liberal arts concentrations, where courses within an area of inquiry meet baccalaureate degree requirements. All associate in science degrees, particularly the CTE programs, focus on at a minimum one area of inquiry. The College demonstrates that the degree programs generally include one area of inquiry. (II.A.13)

The College maintains an active advisory committee of external industry experts and faculty from the appropriate discipline for each CTE program. Where appropriate, career requirements are integrated in courses and programs (e.g., medical assistant and paralegal degree) to enable students to complete industry-required content and prepare for national industry licensure exams.

CTE programs demonstrate that they prepare students to gain experience, reinforce learning outcomes and make industry connections. The College's most recent data demonstrate that programs requiring national licensure have met or surpassed the institutional standard for examination pass rates. (II.A.14)

The College provides appropriate pathways for enrolled students to complete their educational programs when programs are discontinued or modified. The College follows UHCC Policy 5.202: Review of Established Programs and Board of Regents Policy 5.201: Instructional Programs to discontinue programs and modify program requirements significantly. The College followed the policies stipulated in 2013 when the Exercise and Sports Sciences (ESS) Program was discontinued due to declining enrollments and limited instructional space and equipment constraints. New programs are initially approved by the Board of Regents as provisional programs and after one cycle (two years for certificate, four years for associate degrees), a program may be approved as established. Once programs are approved as provisional or established, the College must prepare an annual report that documents performance outcomes, key benchmarks and plans for improvement. (II.A.15)

The College engages in a regular cycle of program review. All programs complete an Annual Report of Program Data, and a Comprehensive Program Review every three years. Programs analyze achievement data and develop plans for improvement. (II.A.16)

The College does not offer any baccalaureate degrees.

Conclusion

The College meets Standard II.A.

II.B. Library and Learning Support Services

General Observations

KCC provides sufficient library and learning support resources and services for students and adequate personnel responsible for student learning and support for the educational programs regardless of location and means of delivery. The College's Library and Learning Resource (LLR) unit, which is comprised of the Library, Testing Center, the Lamakū Learning Center, which includes the Study Hub, and an open computer lab are aligned with the mission and provide services resources tailored to the Kapi'olani community. In addition, students, faculty and staff have access to resources from other University of Hawai'i System Libraries.

Findings and Evidence

The College has a full-service library with a website to search for library materials such as books, e-books, articles from magazines and journals, and films on DVDs or streaming video.

The library collections are sufficient in terms of quantity, currency, depth, and variety. The Library regularly purchases recently published materials to support the curriculum, as detailed in the Library's Collection Development Policy. Liaison librarians communicate regularly with the faculty for current curriculum needs and departments undergoing professional accreditation to discuss subject coverage within the Library's collection. In addition, there is a Hawaiian Resource Specialist who has expertise to select materials related to Hawai'i and Hawaiian culture which supports the College's vision to be a model indigenous-serving institution. Library usage statistics provide evidence of broad access for borrowed and downloaded materials. In 2017, 84 percent of students surveyed Agree or Strongly Agree that they are satisfied with the library services offered. (II.B.2, ER 17)

Librarians provide one-on-one support both in-person at the reference desk, and remotely through phone calls and by email. There are academic support workshops through the Secrets of Success (SOS) program in areas such as college note-taking, Microsoft Word basics, scholarship writing, and career exploration. (II.B.1)

Tutoring services are available across the College. The Study Hub, located in the LLR provides tutors ranging from peer tutors, faculty volunteers, to community volunteers. Currently, there are two faculty volunteer tutors, one retired and one adjunct that help out with tutoring services. As a result of discussions regarding volunteer services, Administrative Procedure Form 9.041 and the included Volunteer Survey are under review for an update. In addition, many faculty opt to hold office hours in the Study Hub to avail themselves to more students in a central location. The Study Hub, which received College Reading & Learning Association (CRLA) Level I Certified Tutor Certification, is part of the Lamakū Learning Center. Following recommendations from the National College Learning Center Association's definition of a learning center, Lamakū supports the College's diverse student population by providing access to an array of other activities such as Tai Chi, Well-Being Sessions, and Makerspaces to nurture the holistic academic growth of students. The center's adaptive, interactive space promotes inclusive learning and fosters engagement while striving to develop lifelong learners. Tutoring services outside of the library include the STEM Center; Business, Legal, and Technology Lab; TRiO; and online tutoring through Brainfuse Tutoring or the Online Learning Academy at University of Hawai'i at Mānoa. (II.B.1)

Computer labs exist throughout the College, with the largest lab, the Lama Open Lab, located in the LLR. There is also a Testing Center for all testing accommodation needs in areas such as distance education courses, make-up tests, ADA compliance, and mutual proctoring with other campuses in the system so that students may take exams at most the convenient campus. These facilities have adequate equipment appropriate for each location such as desktop or laptop computers, Microsoft software, printers, and scanners. The LLR staff report problems with the Open Lab in an online reporting log and at twice-monthly KAP-LIB-IT meetings. IT problem reports have resulted in improving firewall protection for the campus, replacing the print card vending and reader systems, and adding software such as Acrobat Pro and plug-ins to support MyMathLab and My IT Lab. While the College strives to update all equipment as needed every three years, evidence shows the updates to be taking place about every five years through 2023.

Student surveys show that they are satisfied with the current equipment and this update timeline is effective. (II.B.1, II.B.2)

Evidence indicates that the LLR unit is responsive to the evolving needs of the college community through surveys, student learning outcome assessment, and program evaluations. For example, there is an Annual Report of Program Data (ARPD) for tutoring which includes efficiency indicators and Community College Survey of Student Engagement (CCSSE) tutoring data, but does not include data from all tutoring sites at the College. After a review of all such services, all campus tutoring and several mentoring programs began to co-host monthly “Rise & Shine” events to increase students’ awareness of available support. The LLR also compiles data on usage of the open computer lab and responses on the annual library survey related to the lab. The data are shared in an annual report by the Digital Initiatives Librarian. (II.B.3)

Some student comments regarding services for online education, indicated concern or a desire for more online and tutoring services in the evenings and on weekends. The library staff monitors these concerns regularly, and has even expanded the services at times. Usage evidence has shown that there is very little, if any use of the services after 7:00 pm on weeknights or on Saturdays. Staff will continue to assess student need and modify availability of such services as needed. (II.B.3)

The College maintains formal agreements with database vendors and collaborates with the UH System and Hawai‘i Public Library System to provide library services such as the Hawai‘i Voyager library catalog and shared databases through the Hawai‘i Library Consortium, the UH Community Colleges libraries, and the Medical Libraries Consortium of Hawai‘i (MLCH). Online tutoring services are provided through a partnership with the UHCC to provide Brainfuse and through UH Mānoa for free access to English, math and science tutoring via the Online Learning Academy. There are industry standard security measures in place such as username and password to access library computers and databases as well as 3M security labels on physical materials. The e-resources are evaluated via usage statistics, cost, and an annual spring survey. The LLR evaluates the effectiveness of all services on a regular basis. (II.B.4, ER 17)

The College has an extension of the nursing program at Leeward Community College (LCC) as a satellite site. LCC provides a full range of services to the Kapi‘olani students; these are the same services provided to the LCC students. In addition, KCC nursing faculty and staff are available at the LCC satellite site for the students’ program specific needs. (II.B.4, ER 17)

Conclusion

The College meets Standard II.B.

College Commendation 1

The Team commends the students and the employees of the College for their commitment to respecting and celebrating the indigenous culture of Hawai‘i and for ensuring that it is embedded in college life and practices. (II.B.2, IV.A.2)

II.C. Student Support Services

General Observations

The College provides an array of student support services to its diverse student population. The College has implemented a variety of initiatives to improve access to services at the main campus as well as to provide services to off-campus students. These services follow from the College's commitment to its broad and inclusive mission: KCC recognizes that it is an open-entry college that serves indigenous and international students and has developed meaningful support structures for these populations. The College has effective and comprehensive support structures in place for students served by the institution.

KCC refined and re-evaluated services and learning outcomes regarding various support structures. Through this reflection, the College has developed extensive support services for all of the student populations identified in its mission. The College uses a decentralized counseling/advising model that effectively serves student needs. Additionally, KCC is working diligently on improving student placement systems for math and English to increase student success.

Findings and Evidence

KCC offers a commendable and responsive array of student support services to the students at its main campus and is offering adequate services to its programs that serve off-campus and online students. Services provided include orientation events, first-year experience and transfer-year experience programs, and program-specific counselors and advisors. Additionally, the College has programs specific to Native Hawaiian populations, high-school outreach, disability support services, TRiO (educationally and economically disadvantaged students), veterans' services, mental health services, employment prep services, programs for student-parents, and early alert services for students experiencing academic success difficulties at the beginning of semesters. The College evaluates the effectiveness of its student support services through internal reflection such as program review and SLO assessment, as well as through survey feedback from students such as the Community College Survey of Student Engagement (CCSSE). In addition to satisfaction surveys, Student Services assesses how their programs meet the objectives, goals, and mission of the College, whether students recognize and use the services, and if there is evidence of success. An example of improvements made as a result of the program review process include changes to the tour structure in the Kuilei Outreach Program. Areas for improvement were also identified through program review and included program-specific action plans. (II.C.1)

The College evaluates its broad range of student support services, demonstrates their effectiveness, and makes plans for their improvement when applicable. This evaluation occurs through annual and comprehensive program review processes, grant-specific program review and reporting (e.g., TRiO, TAACCCT), and student survey data (CCSSE). The Team reviewed evidence that captured annual reflection through program reviews in which action plans were created to address self-identified areas for improvement. Additionally, the College has

established inclusive communication and decision-making structures where employees meet regularly to review program services and ensure consistency in student support. Although the Student Affairs area acknowledges that it needs to continue to revisit and refine student learning outcomes, the Team verified through interviews that the area uses data and dialog on student engagement, learning, and success at the forefront of all decision making in pursuit of continuous improvement. (II.C.1, II.C.2, ER 15)

The College offers comprehensive student services that have defined learning outcomes and are assessed as part of the established program review process. Since its last comprehensive visit, KCC has reviewed and refined the sometimes elusive learning outcomes for its student support services. These services foster student learning and development within the context of the College mission, especially as they relate to the broad range of students served by KCC. Efforts have been made to improve services and to address gaps that impact students' abilities to succeed. Examples of recent efforts to improve access to services include: improving services to prospective students through refined campus tours, developing and implementing a multiple-measures framework with which to more accurately place students at the appropriate math and English levels, and expanding services to student-parents. (II.C.3, ER 15)

The team determined that the College offers comprehensive co-curricular programs (no athletics) that contribute to student engagement and cultural identity outside of the classroom and further support the College's mission. Examples include student organizations for specific populations and interest areas (e.g., veterans, sustainability initiatives), as well as a comprehensive student governance structure that empowers students to contribute to various aspects of campus life and decision-making. The team interviews with student leaders confirmed the active participation in all committees. (II.C.4)

The College has qualified counselors and academic advisors in a decentralized model that allows for counselors/advisors to develop expertise in specific academic programs. In order to support its diverse and international student body; a number of them speak one or more languages in addition to English including: Japanese, Chinese, and Korean. Counseling services are provided in a wide range of delivery methods (e.g., face-to-face appointments, phone appointments for students unable to visit campus), and workshops are provided covering career exploration, financial aid application, to name a few. Counselors and advisors attend regular information meetings, and attend workshops and conferences to ensure they remain current in their field. Student satisfaction surveys indicated that a majority of students took advantage of the academic and career counseling services. Comprised of a group of committed and motivated counselors, the Counseling and Academic Advising Council meets monthly to provide a venue for regular and coordinated communication across the College's decentralized counseling services. The ability of this body to advocate for counseling needs is somewhat stymied due to the lack of inclusive integration with administrative representatives such as the Vice Chancellor for Student Affairs and Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs. (II.C.5)

The College has an admissions policy consistent with its mission as outlined in Policy 5.211 that supports open enrollment. The College does limit enrollment in select programs such as nursing and follows clearly communicated and established guidelines in these cases. The College defines pathways to student completion and transfer goals and publishes this information in the catalog

and through its website. The College admits students through an online application process established by the UH system. (II.C.6, ER 16)

The College uses placement instruments approved and validated by University of Hawai'i system. Previously, the College had used Compass, but switched to Accuplacer since the last comprehensive evaluation. Placement instruments, along with multiple measures such as high school GPA, are used to place students into course sequences. KCC is actively reviewing placement rules for math and English in order to maximize the likelihood of student success and minimize the time to degree completion. (II.C.7)

The College follows Policies 7.022, 2.214, and 2.215 to secure and maintain student records. The security of student information is maintained by Admissions and Records and Information Technology Services. Electronic images are stored securely to ensure security and redundancy. The College follows Family Education Rights and Privacy Act (FERPA) requirements, which requires a student's permission to release educational records to third parties. (II.C.8)

Conclusion

The College meets Standard II.C.

College Commendation 2

The Team commends the College for its commitment to engaging all student populations including indigenous and international students through the development and maintenance of meaningful support structures that include robust student organizations and extensive resources for targeted populations. (II.C.1, II.C.5)

Standard III Resources

III.A. Human Resources

General Observations

As part of the ten campus University of Hawai‘i System, Kapi‘olani Community College’s personnel policies are primarily established at the System or State level. These policies are well-documented and are aligned with the Standards. Review of the Institutional Research & Analysis Office’s annual staffing reports reveals stable staffing levels. In recent years, despite significant declines in enrollment, the College continues to maintain close to 500 full-time equivalent employees. Through financial and time commitments, the College has strengthened its investment in professional development and training on human-resource related topics. In addition, the relatively recent implementation of the Administrative Leadership Feedback System (ALF) is consistent with efforts to assess administrative effectiveness and encourage improvement. These ongoing efforts serve to strengthen the College’s alignment with the Standard.

Findings and Evidence

The College, in coordination with the human resource departments of UHCC, the University of Hawai‘i and the state of Hawai‘i, employs a variety of well-documented procedures to support the hiring of qualified administrators, faculty and staff. Employees at the College are either state of Hawai‘i civil service employees (support staff) or University of Hawai‘i Board of Regents’ appointees (faculty, professional and executive/managerial staff). Through standardized forms and multiple websites, personnel procedures are transparent and available to the public. New positions are prioritized and authorized through the PAIR process, which requires documentation and discussion of the position’s alignment with the College’s mission. (III.A.1)

Minimum qualifications for faculty are identified at the UHCC level. Faculty job descriptions, as documented by the recent opening for an Information Technology Instructor, encompass qualifications and responsibilities consistent with the Standard. While relatively rare, the Chancellor may approve the hiring of an “acting instructor” who does not fully meet the minimum qualifications. In such an event, a defined time period is established for the “acting instructor” to subsequently meet the minimum qualifications. (III.A.2)

Administrative, professional and support personnel hiring is conducted in accordance with System policies. Executive Policy 9.212 clearly articulates the process for the hiring of administrators and other employees responsible for educational programs. (III.A.3)

Required degrees for College employees are verified by Human Resources as an express condition of hiring. Official transcripts are maintained as part of the employee's personnel file. (III.A.4)

Procedures for employee performance evaluations are governed by the Board of Regents Policy for Board of Regents appointees or Hawai'i's Performance Appraisal System for civil service employees. The stated intervals for performance evaluation are driven by the employee classification. The timely completion of performance evaluations is monitored in multiple areas. Through use of an Excel spreadsheet, the Human Resources Director tracks timely completion of performance evaluations for civil service and administrative, professional and technical (APT) staff. The bulk of faculty evaluations are monitored by the Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs. Evidence demonstrated that performance appraisals for all employees are systematically completed according to established intervals. Processes for evaluation, promotion and tenure are well documented and readily available to staff online. Student input is sought on a regular basis through CES (Course Evaluation System). The relatively recent implementation of the Administrative Leadership Feedback System (ALF) further reflects the intent to assess employee effectiveness and encourage improvement. (III.A.5)

The FACSTAFF Table, available through the System's Institutional Research and Analysis Office, provides historical data for full- and part-time faculty. This data reflects a stable faculty staffing pattern (consistently over 400 Board of Regents appointees) despite recent declines in enrollment. The College asserts that it is able to deliver all needed curricula through its mix of full- and part-time faculty. Efficiency indicators contained within the Annual Reports of Program Data (ARPD) further support this assertion through analysis of program class sizes and FTE BOR Appointed Faculty. (III.A.7, ER 14)

Part-time lecturers at KCC are connected to the College community through membership in the faculty collective bargaining unit. In addition, part-time lecturers are encouraged to attend orientations and professional development opportunities. Based on interviews with lecturers, the College has successfully forged a sense of connection with its part-time teaching staff, particularly at the department or program level. While a wealth of online information is readily available to lecturers, lecturers new to the College sometimes struggle in navigating the College's many policies and resources. Through interviews, the Team learned that a succinct handbook would be helpful to part-time lecturers. Pursuant to Policy K9.104, division/department chairs are charged with both the performance evaluation of part-time lecturers and maintenance of evaluation archives. On an ongoing basis, student survey input is solicited for all courses. The intervals for formal evaluation are dependent upon the number of units the lecturer has taught within the system (and the subsequent classification as A, B or C lecturer). (III.A.8)

As with faculty, the FACSTAFF Table, available through the System's Institutional Research and Analysis Office, provides historical data for staffing levels at the College. This data reflects a stable staffing pattern despite several years of declining enrollment. Various planning and program review processes provide for the ongoing reflection as to the College's staffing needs. (III.A.9)

As of the writing of the ISER, all administrative positions within the KCC organizational chart were filled. Evidence demonstrated that administrators possess the appropriate preparation and expertise necessary to provide continuity and effective administrative leadership and services that support the institution's mission and purposes. (III.A.10, ER 8)

Personnel policies and procedures are extensive and easily accessible online. Interviews with leadership of the three separate unions representing College employees as well as certain responses to the 2018 "Getting Better at Getting Better" Campus Climate Survey suggest some concerns regarding the consistent and equitable administration of the written policies and procedures. Through interviews, the Team learned that improvements have been made in clarifying policies, training screening committees and fostering transparency in personnel decisions. In 2016, the University of Hawai'i implemented a whistleblower hotline which encourages the reporting of any violations of policies or procedures. The hotline is intended to allow for anonymous reporting. (III.A.11)

At both the System and College level, regular assessments are conducted in regards to employment equity and diversity. Affirmative action efforts and remedial actions are initiated when necessary. Various organizations support and advocate for specific employee subgroups including women, Native Hawaiians and LGBTQ+ members. In addition, the abundance of campus activities celebrating diversity contributes to the College's support of diversity. (III.A.12)

As members of the University of Hawai'i System, College employees are subject to the ethical rules and regulations of the state of Hawai'i. Specific employee groups are also subject to ethics provisions contained within their individual contracts. Consequences for ethical violations are identified in multiple documents. (III.A.13)

In 2017, Kapi'olani embarked on a significant reinvestment in professional development. Both on-campus and off-campus opportunities are available to faculty, staff and administration. CELTT, as well as a series of faculty designed professional development experiences, support the professional needs of College personnel. Additional professional development resources are also available at the System level. Professional development activities are assessed explicitly through surveys and also through secondary student success data. (III.A.14)

The security and confidentiality of personnel records is guided by System policies, state law and collective bargaining agreements. During the site visit, the team was able to confirm adherence to the stated policies. (III.A.15)

Conclusion

The College meets Standard III.A.

III.B. Physical Resources

General Observations

College facilities are well-maintained. Routine maintenance and operations (M&O) services including janitorial, grounds and maintenance are managed by the Auxiliary Services (AUX) unit of the College. The process for capital project development is collaborative, requiring interface among the State of Hawai‘i [GO Bonds], the University of Hawai‘i (UH) System, the University of Hawai‘i Community College (UHCC) Unit, and the individual College (Kapi‘olani).

Findings and Evidence

The College Auxiliary Services (AUX) provides routine maintenance and operations services for the campus. AUX consists of three organizational subunits including Janitorial, Building Maintenance, and Grounds. Another branch of the organization, the Safety and Emergency Management (SEM) unit, is charged with maintaining campus safety, and a safe and secure learning environment for the students, faculty, staff of Kapi‘olani College. The College is committed to a barrier-free and inclusive environment. As such, student and employee accommodation requests/needs are addressed in a manner consistent with the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA), parts 504 and 508 of the Federal Rehabilitation Act of 1973, and University of Hawai‘i (UH) policy. (III.B.1, III.B.2)

Long term facility development is guided by the UHCC Strategic Direction 2015-21, and the College’s Long Term Development Plan. These documents provide both a vision for facilities and reflects a sustainable approach incorporating modern technology and pedagogical approaches, as well as serving to frame future development. Capital improvements are largely funded through legislative appropriation and include 1) capital improvement program (CIP) projects, 2) minor CIP projects, and 3) capital renewal and deferred maintenance projects. (III.B.2)

Planned equipment replacement is undertaken system-wide. The College plans, evaluates, and monitors physical plant condition and work orders using several tools including the Facilities Renewal Reinvestment Model (FRRM), e-facilities AiM, and scheduler software. (III.B.3)

The most recently completed major capital project includes the Culinary Institute of the Pacific – The \$30.5 million Phase I portion of the Culinary Institute of the Pacific was placed in service on April 17, 2017. Phase I includes the infrastructure for the entire project, a parking lot, two single story laboratory buildings, a student lounge, and an outdoor cooking area. Phase II will include an auditorium, administration building, classrooms, laboratories, and a restaurant. New out-year projects are largely focused on small capital renewal/deferred maintenance type projects.

The documents and plans in place to address long-range capital planning include the Long Range Development Plan [LRDP], the College Strategic Plan, which is itself aligned with the UHCC strategic plan, and university policies. These provide the direction for all long-range capital

plans. The LRDP reflects a building inventory indicating which buildings are to be retained, renovated, or demolished. The UH and UHCC policy framework calls for long-range capital development plans to include not only estimates of planning, design, construction and equipping new facilities, but to also include the on-going cost of operating these new facilities. This total-cost-of-ownership approach reflects a holistic means of budgeting for new development. Only those projects reflected in the LRDP and approved by the Board of Regents are authorized for construction. (III.B.4)

Conclusion

The College meets Standard III.B.

III.C. Technology Resources

General Observations

Through system-wide and local college processes and budgeting, Kapi‘olani College provides an adequate array of technology resources for students and employees. The College relies heavily on the Center for Excellence in Learning, Teaching, and Technology (CELTT) to organize, implement, and assess the technology services provided to the campus. CELTT integrates with the broader University of Hawai‘i (UH) system by having representation on the UH Chancellor’s Advisory Council. CELTT includes faculty and staff representatives and responds to technology needs identified through a variety of mechanisms including best practices from the field and surveys to students and employees regarding their satisfaction with technology resources. Additionally, CELTT organizes and delivers regular instruction on both broad and focused topics for faculty, staff, and administrators; the Library and Learning Resources delivers regular training to students. In addition to the overarching work of CELTT, the College maintains a variety of more focused technology groups that cover topics such as instructional design, graphics production, application development, customer care, and information security. These groups have far-ranging responsibilities that include compliance with ADA and FERPA, as well as more innovative projects and professional development.

As part of the larger UH system, large scale enterprise software systems (e.g., PeopleSoft, Banner, LauLima LMS) are supported by the UH Information Technology Services (UH ITS). This system support also sets broad policies related to technology use and security.

Large-scale planning related to technology is captured and monitored in the Technology Plan that is maintained by CELTT. KCC has organized its various technology initiatives by broad categories in the Technology Plan and updates the status of the various initiatives regularly. These planning efforts are naturally focused on the main KCC campus, but CELTT has continued to address the needs of off-campus sites, such as for the culinary and nursing programs.

Findings and Evidence

The Center for Excellence in Learning, Teaching, and Technology (CELTT) effectively utilizes its 2018-2021 Technology Plan to continuously assess, maintain, and replace its technology resources. The Team finds that KCC uses the Technology Plan to capture, categorize, and monitor technology initiatives and this document serves to communicate the status of various initiatives as it is updated annually in January through the oversight of the Chancellor's Advisory Council. KCC uses established criteria to prioritize initiatives in the Technology Plan ranging from Health and Safety (greatest weight) to Impact on a Specific Course (lowest weight). The Team found the criteria to be clear and appropriate to the mission and operation of the College. The College has made significant investments in updating technology (\$250,000 in 2017) and also purchased a technology inventory management system in 2015 to better forecast replacement schedules for hardware and software. Through KCC's combined efforts related to planning, updating, replacing, and supporting technology use, the College has been able to ensure that its technology infrastructure and technical services appropriately and adequately support its mission, operations, programs, and services. (III.C.1, III.C.2)

KCC has demonstrated a commitment to assessing the efficacy of its technology resources and related programs. The College collected survey data in 2012, 2016, and 2018 that, among other things, provided employee feedback on campus technology services. Student input was gathered through the 2016 Community College Survey of Student Engagement (CCSSE). Through both of these surveys, students and employees overwhelmingly felt that technology resources and trainings were adequate and supported their work. Additionally, some elements of the employee surveys document improvement in the campus' perception of technology resources and training over the various survey years. (III.C.3)

Based on tours of classrooms and computer labs at the main campus and other off-site locations, technology resources are maintained to assure reliable access, safety, and security. CELTT is responsible for designing network hardware and data storage that provides for failure-tolerant redundancy. These efforts are captured in the Technology Plan and are overseen by the College's information security specialist. Through the site visit and associated interviews and contrary to the narrative in the self-evaluation, the Team found evidence of past decisions related to technology initiatives that were disconnected from planning and guidance offered by CELTT, specifically for the off-site Culinary Institute of the Pacific. Despite this occurrence, the Team verified that subsequent planning and decision making has more clearly integrated appropriate guidance from CELTT. (III.C.3)

The College and UH system have adequate policies and procedures that guide the appropriate use of technology in the teaching and learning processes, and provide appropriate instruction and training for all users of its technology resources. CELTT organizes and delivers regular instruction on both broad and focused topics for faculty, staff, and administrators; the Library and Learning Resources delivers regular training to students. In addition to the regular trainings made available through these bodies, the College has accessible and effective systems (Resolve for employees, SOS for students) for receiving, tracking, and responding to specific questions related to technology resources. (III.C.4)

As part of the larger UH system, KCC's technology usage is subject to UH policy 2.210 et seq. that specifies the system's expectations for use and management of technology resources. Additionally, the team verified that UH ITS also provides relevant state statutes and other applicable standards and regulations (e.g., HIPAA, FERPA, FIMSA). Locally, CELTT applies these broad policies by creating campus procedures that support the appropriate use of technology. (III.C.5)

Conclusion

The College meets Standard III.C.

III.D. Financial Resources

General Observations

Kapi'olani College relies on state appropriated revenues (General Funds), as well as dedicated local revenues, to effectively fund operations in order to keep post-secondary education accessible to communities and populations served by the institution.

Findings and Evidence

In addition to state provided General Funds, another source of operating revenue identified was the 1995 legislative establishment of the Tuition and Fees Special Fund (TFSF). The University is permitted to retain and expend revenues earned from this tuition based fund source in order to "maintain and improve the University's programs and operations." These two sources, General Funds and TFSF, represent the College's unrestricted operating budget. Other special funds help fund various aspects of the college operation, but they are categorical in nature and restricted to particular uses such as non-credit instruction, summer session instruction, conferences, and student activities. Further, extramural, or grant type funds are secured to assist with certain research and training activities. (III.D.1, ER 18)

Current year operational resources generally equate to prior year General Fund levels coupled with funding for new contractual requirements and initiatives, less any budgetary reductions. Unexpended TFSF revenue provides the basis for the college's cash reserve. UHCC Policy 8.201 specifies reserve amounts including a 5% Minimum Cash Reserve, a Target Reserve that may be maintained at an amount above the 5% minimum reserve, and up to 10% of unrestricted funds expenditures. For the Community College system, the Reserve Status Report reflects total fund balance of \$32.7 million or 16.1% for FY 2015, \$46.2 million or 22.75% for FY 2016, and \$51.8 million or 24.25% for FY 2017. For Kapi'olani College, the Reserve Status Report reflects total fund balance of \$8.2 million or 17.2% for FY 2015, \$11.9 million or 23.9%, for FY 2016, and \$12 million or 23.5% for FY 2017. (III.D.1, ER 18)

Budgetary planning is initiated with the submission of a financial operating plan to the Board of Regents. Although the college has struggled to meet certain performance metrics, performance funding currently reflects approximately four percent of operating resources across the system. Financial planning is informed by both the UH Mission, and system and college plans. The timing of the planning process is driven both by the UH system and state budget development. Budget review and approval, including quarterly reports, for all campuses, the UH system office and the office of the BOR, takes place by the BOR under clearly delineated processes. (III.D.2)

While the overarching direction of budget development at the campus level is driven by the Strategic Plan, the Planning and Assessment Integration with Resource Allocation (PAIR) process serves as a basis for open, transparent, and integrated planning. The PAIR flow chart reflects the college allocation request process and also provides evidence of an integrated planning process. (III.D.1, III.D.3)

The University of Hawai'i Community College System Office (UHCC) has the overall authority for the allocation of unrestricted operating resources (GF and TFSF). An allocation report is made available to the colleges each year in the early fall and provides a basis for revenue and expense projection by each college for the year. (III.D.4)

An administrative software system, promulgated at the UH level, provides a platform to conduct the business of the college and a common framework for internal controls. The testing of various internal control mechanisms is also a part of the scope of work of the external auditor. (III.D.5)

The College's financial and budget related documents are accurate and credible as evidenced by the external audit report where it is noted that the financial statements presented fairly the financial position and cash flows of the university. (III.D.6)

An independent auditing firm conducts a financial and compliance audit for the UH System on an annual basis. Part of the consolidated financial statements is the agreed-upon "Report of Independent Auditors on Supplemental Information," including the statement of net assets and the statement of revenue, expenses, and changes in net assets for the UHCCs. Affected units and administrative or support unit staff discuss and develop corrective action plans. Such plans are communicated to the auditor in a timely fashion. Audit findings are generally resolved in the year following receipt of the finding. One finding from the 2015-16 FY remained unresolved [2015-04] at year end and rolled forward to the 2016-17 FY as Finding 2016-005 (supplemental audit report). Of the findings in the most recent report, none have been directed toward Kapi'olani College. (III.D.7)

Program review provides a vehicle for the regular assessment of financial management processes. In addition to the external audit, the Hawai'i Office of the State Auditor is required to review Special, Revolving, and Trust Funds every fifth year. Further, the UH Internal Audit unit conducts periodic reviews to help ensure compliance with various legal and regulatory matters. Lastly, the Internal Controls and Business Issues Report is another tool to assist with the enhancement of business and finance operations and accountability. (III.D.5, III.D.8)

Meeting the reserve requirements, as noted elsewhere in this report, ensures the College will have sufficient working capital to meet its day-to-day operating requirements. The UH Office of Risk Management provides a means for the UH System to identify and manage risks associated with college operations. The State Risk Management and Insurance Administration program provides automobile, property, and liability coverage. (III.D.9)

The College draws on a variety of financial reports and tools including monthly budget and cash flow reports, and quarterly status reports, in order to plan, monitor and report on the fiscal health of the College. KCC also demonstrates effective oversight for financial aid programs, grants, contractual relationships and auxiliary organizations through appropriate processes, policies, and procedures. (III.D.10)

The College conducts short and long-term financial planning as a part of budget development to meet its obligations including payments of long-term liabilities and obligations, including debt, health benefits, insurance costs, and building maintenance costs. While enrollments are largely decoupled from base funding amounts, the continued decline in enrollments raises some concern, and is actually noted as one of three major developments in the Institutional Self-Evaluation Report (ISER). Further, long-term projections indicate the traditional college-going population, as well as the age 25-54 age group demographic, will continue to soften. (III.D.11)

The State of Hawai'i is self-insured and provides insurance policies and coverages for all state agencies including the University of Hawai'i and its ten campuses. The College has a delegated responsibility to review potentially high-risk programs and activities and to ensure that these programs and activities are properly assessed to minimize or prevent liability concerns. The UH Office of Risk Management provides a means for the UH System to identify and manage risks associated with college operations. The State Risk Management and Insurance Administration program provides automobile, property, and liability coverage. The UHCC campuses do not issue debt for Other Post-Employment. (III.D.12)

Collective bargaining is a tri-partite endeavor involving labor, the state of Hawaii, and the UH System. While out-year obligations are present under current employment contracts, negotiated increases for General Fund (GF) employees are funded through additional state appropriations. (III.D.12)

The UH System uses a variety of sources, including federal and state support, revenue bonds, bank loans, gifts, and other expendable resources to finance capital projects. The UH does not have authority to issue General Obligation (GO) bonds; that is a function of the state. The UH does issue revenue bonds, debt instruments for which a revenue stream is identified to service the debt incurred, to fund certain capital projects. Total debt service for the College is approximately \$1,000,000 per year. Operating budget for the College is approximately \$50,000,000 per year for all sources of funding. There is no adverse impact on meeting all current fiscal obligations. Debt service obligations are reflected in annual budget plans and are utilized in manners appropriate to their source and intent. (III.D.13, III.D.14)

The College's default rates on student loans fall within the acceptable range under federal guidelines and parameters. According to the United States Department of Education, institutions with a three-year cohort loan default rate of 30 percent or greater for three consecutive years may be subject to the loss of the Direct Loan Program and/or the Federal Pell Grant Program. The College's three-year cohort default rates during the last published cohort years were 14.9 percent in 2014, 11.5 percent in 2013, and 11.8 percent in 2012. (III.D.15)

Management of contractual agreements with external entities is provided by program staff and the College's Administrative Services staff. This work is guided by policies at the College, UH System, and university levels. Risk mitigation in contract development negotiation is sought both through negotiation, policy, and consultation with the UH Office of General Counsel. (III.D.16)

Conclusion

The College meets Standard III.D.

Standard IV Leadership and Governance

IV.A. Decision-Making Roles and Processes

General Observations

The College supports innovation and institutional excellence. The linkage of professional development supporting innovation through augmented funding illustrates the college's commitment to innovation. The list of innovative projects and programs the College has implemented is evidence of the College's commitment. The College demonstrates a deep commitment to inclusive and robust dialogue in its decision-making processes utilizing its governance system. The College has defined two participatory processes for governance based on assigned leadership (i.e., Advisory Councils) or elected leadership (i.e., Authorized Governance Organizations) that are outlined in operational policy. In addition to communication by constituent representatives and publicly posting governance minutes, the College has implemented a variety of ways to expand communication about decision-making and governance. The College's recent improvements to documenting and communicating its governance and decision-making processes are aimed at increasing understanding and transparency among its constituents. Faculty, staff, and student survey findings about its decision-making and governance systems have provided some insight into the effectiveness of their processes, but the College lacks a robust and comprehensive evaluation process leading to evaluating the structure and efficacy of their processes.

Findings and Evidence

The Team found ample evidence that College leadership encourages innovation and institutional improvement from all constituents across the campus. Interviews with faculty, staff, administration, and students illustrate an organization focused on innovation and institutional improvement, but also on engagement and the local culture. The College describes foundational statements illustrating the Office of the Chancellor's responsibility for maintaining successful and responsive environments for the community, students, and staff. These statements cite the inclusion of participative practices to ensure effective implementation of ideas, particularly when policies are impacted or have significant institution wide-implications. Many examples were provided by the College, such as their commitment to a shared vision, the Student Success Pathways Program, and professional development supporting innovative practices, programs, employee skills and teaching. Another standout example the team noted was the design of the Kapi'olani Engagement, Learning, and Achievement (KELA) framework used to support institutional dialogue and evaluation. The College has a commitment to ensuring all constituents are encouraged to implement practices that are innovative and lead to institutional excellence. (IV.A.1)

The College has adequate policies and governance structures that have been vetted and approved. The University of Hawai‘i Board of Regents have established system-wide policies regarding governance for the system colleges. The University of Hawai‘i Professional Assembly (faculty union) CBA established clear guidelines on faculty scope and authority in decision-making. University of Hawai‘i Board of Regents policy as well as the College’s local shared governance policy outlines governance roles and authorized governance organizations (AGOs) for constituent-based participation for students, faculty, staff, and Native Hawaiian faculty and staff. The Team verified that local college policy (K1.201) developed by the Chancellor’s Advisory Committee (CAC), comprised of college leadership and constituent representatives, clearly outlines the college’s shared governance policy and authorizes four constituent-based organizations based on elected leadership. The Authorized Governance Organizations (AGO) are the Faculty Senate, Associated Students of Kapi‘olani Community College, ‘Aha Kalāualani, and Staff Council. The ‘Aha Kalāualani AGO (Native Hawaiian Council), whose membership is faculty and staff, illustrates the College’s commitment to including its indigenous culture of Hawai‘i as a formal aspect of its governance structure. AGOs are meeting regularly and actively functioning as part of the College’s governance system. The elected leadership of each AGO meets monthly with the Chancellor to directly relay concerns or issues related specifically to that constituent group, and participates in the Chancellor’s Advisory Council, a parallel governance structure based on assigned leadership where issues of broader impact to the College are vetted. In addition to the Chancellor’s Advisory Committee, other Advisory Councils provide faculty, staff, students, and management the opportunity to work together on a variety of college issues outlined in local college policy K1.201. (IV.A.2)

The University of Hawai‘i’s Integrated Long-Range Planning Framework clearly defines administrator and faculty roles in long-range planning (Executive Policy 4.201). The College’s planning and resource allocation process (PAIR) has a clearly defined role for each of the constituent groups, including faculty and administrators, in resource allocation and the prioritization of requests. The College has substantive and clearly defined roles for administrators and faculty, and appropriate roles for staff and students in policy development, planning, and budgetary matters. The College’s governance processes have a strong commitment to broad participation among constituents using robust, collegial and open dialogue. Faculty, staff, administration, and students who were participating in AGOs and Advisory Councils and those who were not, indicated a substantial shift in dialogue with the arrival of the new Chancellor. Although the College indicates it has evaluated its governance system with a survey, evidence examined by the team from the campus climate surveys and confirmed in interviews, suggest the majority of constituents, except for faculty, are not aware of the communication from their constituent group’s AGO and institutional decision making. (IV.A.3)

The University of Hawai‘i Board of Regents *Policy on Faculty Involvement in Academic Decision Making and Academic Policy Development* (RP 1.210) establishes that faculty have the primary responsibility for key academic areas. The policy outlines the role for the Board of Regents or delegated administrators to override faculty decision-making in these areas only under exceptional circumstances. Further, local college policy on curriculum review guidelines (K5.201) outlines the role of faculty and administrators in the review of curriculum. Outside of curriculum, the University of Hawai‘i Board of Regents have developed policy outlining faculty

and administrator roles in developing new programs (RP 5.201) and review of established programs (EP 5.202). Local college policy establishes the responsibility of faculty and staff to assess the effectiveness of their programs and services, and to use the results to make decisions on the improvement, modification, or termination of the program and services (K5.202). Additionally, the roles of faculty are further outlined in the Faculty Senate's Constitution, establishing the faculty role in policy-making in academic affairs and institutional planning. The College has policies and procedures outlining a clear, appropriate, and substantive role for administration and faculty in curriculum and student learning programs and services. (IV.A.4)

The College has defined board and college governance structures to ensure constituent roles are clearly defined, appropriate, and considered in the decision-making processes. The governance structure developed by the University of Hawai'i Board of Regents and local college policy illustrate an established college-level system for governance that considers relevant perspectives, and constituent roles in decision-making aligned with expertise and responsibility. The College's governance structure is the basis for documenting and sharing the results of institutional decision-making. (IV.A.5)

The College documents and communicates the results of its decision-making through a variety of mechanisms. Each AGO and Advisory Council has a public webpage which outlines their bylaws, membership, meeting schedule, agenda, and minutes. The College communicates its decision-making through internal memoranda, public posting meeting minutes, all user emails, forums, and daily news bulletins to communicate decision making. The Administrative Staff Council is actively engaged in increasing communications beyond constituent-based reporting and has recently implemented a daily bulletin distributed to the campus highlighting governance and decision-making. (IV.A.6)

The primary mechanism the College utilizes to evaluate the effectiveness of its leadership roles, institutional governance, and decision-making processes is a campus climate survey. The climate survey provides an opportunity to assess leadership roles, but the climate survey does not provide a method to evaluate the institution's governance and decision-making policies, procedures, and processes to assure their integrity and effectiveness. Evidence was not provided for how the results of the evaluation of effectiveness are widely communicated nor for how the results are used for making improvements related to leadership roles, governance, and decision-making. (IV.A.7)

Conclusion

The College meets Standard IV.A except for IV.A.7.

College Commendation 3

The Team commends the College for its design of the Kapi'olani Engagement, Learning, and Achievement (KELA) model, an exemplary structure that incorporates student engagement throughout the system of institutional effectiveness measures. (IV.A.1)

College Commendation 1

The Team commends the students and the employees of the College for their commitment to respecting and celebrating the indigenous culture of Hawai‘i and for ensuring that it is embedded in college life and practices. (II.B.2, IV.A.2)

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 the basis for making improvements. (I.B.7, I.B.8, IV.A.7)

IV.B. Chief Executive Officer

General Observations

The University of Hawai‘i System is led by a *president* who is the CEO of a system of seven community colleges and three four-year universities. The vice president for community colleges oversees the seven community colleges. Each community college is led by a *chancellor*, who serves as the chief executive officer (CEO) of the institution, providing leadership in a wide variety of areas including, but not limited to: planning and organizing; selecting and developing personnel; organizational structure; guiding teaching and learning improvement; assessing College effectiveness; ensuring compliance with accreditation requirements; assuring compliance with statutes policies, and regulations; assuring control of budget and expenditures; communicating effectively both internally and externally. The current Chancellor was appointed in June 2018 after serving as Interim Chancellor since June 2016.

Findings and Evidence

The Chancellor has provided leadership for institutional planning and organization through planning retreats and requiring alignment of strategies and goals with the 2015-21 strategic plan. As part of the College’s implementation of the UHCC Student Success Pathway initiative, a Student Success Coordinator position was established as a direct report to the Chancellor to ensure college-wide collaboration and coordination of activities, projects and strategies connected to the College’s Student Success Pathway Model. An evaluation of the Chancellor’s Advisory Council led to changes in the organization and function of the council’s charter and decision-making process culminating in a revised governance policy. The Chancellor has led efforts to strengthen college-wide assessment of outcomes in support of institutional effectiveness. The Chancellor directs the Office for Institutional Effectiveness (OFIE) which assesses student success, the health of programs, develops plans that align with the College’s strategic plans, and provides data to be used as the basis for administrators to determine the allocation of resources. Core effectiveness measures have been established to support the operationalization of institutional goals and objectives in the strategic plan and the results of the assessment of these measures are used to improve programs and services. The Chancellor has overall responsibility for developing the College budget and meets with the VCAS and budget

manager monthly to review income and expenditures as part of monitoring the College's financial health. The Chancellor has supported numerous initiatives that support professional development of employees including the reinstatement of sabbaticals and an increase in funding for professional development. The Chancellor has authority over all hiring decisions. (IV.B.1)

Through established policy and procedural guidelines and applicable statutes, the Chancellor plans, organizes, directs, and controls the institution's academic and support programs at the campus level and oversees the management and operations of the College in the following functional areas: Office for Academic Affairs, Office for Student Affairs, Office for Administrative Services, the Student Success Coordinator, Office for Community and Continuing Education, Office for International Affairs, and Office for Institutional Effectiveness. Review and evaluation have led to reorganization of some functional units. An annual review of organizational charts ensures that updates are completed to reflect the current organizational structure. Leadership and management responsibility for functional areas are delegated to the Vice Chancellors and the Vice Chancellors delegate responsibility to their administrative direct reports. All Vice Chancellors have responsibility for implementing UHCC policies, college policies, and college operational procedures that have a direct impact on their areas of responsibility. (IV.B.2)

The UH System created UH Strategic Directions, 2015-2021 and from these priorities the UHCC created its Strategic Directions, 2015-2021. In alignment with the UH System Strategic Directions and UHCC Strategic Directions, the College developed its own strategic plan. The Chancellor (as interim chancellor) sought feedback from the college community in finalizing the mission, vision, and values statements and worked with constituent groups to finalize these statements as well as the College's strategic plan. (IV.B.3)

The UHCC establishes baseline figures and percentage increases and these form the basis for the College's institution-set standards for student achievement, which are documented in the College's strategic plan. The Chancellor works with various college leaders, groups, and offices to ensure that the College's performance standards are aligned with UHCC expectations. The College reports progress on the goals to the UHCC and the UHCC reports on how the colleges achieved their goals and how they compare to their sister institutions. Other student achievement goals are set by the College independently of the System. Progress toward the College's goals are reflected, along with System goals, in the College's strategic plan Scorecard. The program review process includes a review of completion data and a review of student learning outcomes results. Based on this review action plans are updated where appropriate. (IV.B.3)

The Chancellor ensures that adequate resources are provided to support an Office of Institutional Effectiveness (OFIE) that provides research support regarding student engagement and achievement that is used for evaluation and planning efforts. Analysis of a number of external resources provided through the Hawai'i State Department of Education and the UHCC are utilized in evaluation and planning activities. (IV.B.3)

The state appropriated budget and tuition revenues are reviewed by the Chancellor and the VCAS to determine resource allocations to all departments, units, and programs to cover base

personnel and operational costs. Requests for funding beyond base allocations require alignment with the College strategic plan goals and the Student Success Pathway goals. Request for additional funding are supported by actions plans included in Comprehensive Program Reviews and the request includes a statement of how the additional funds will improve student learning. (IV.B.3)

The Chancellor implemented a schedule for regular review of institutional plans by the CAC. Each institutional plan is discussed, assessed for effectiveness, and modified if necessary. Additionally, UHCC Policy 5.202, Review of Established Programs, provides the process and procedures for annual and multi-year comprehensive program reviews. The policy is under review for possible revision. (IV.B.3)

Evidence of the Chancellor's leadership role in accreditation is demonstrated through a number of activities and actions. The Chancellor participates in the preparation and submission of all ACCJC annual and fiscal reports and actively participated in the drafting of the 2018 ISER. The Chancellor participated on a site evaluation team in Spring 2017. To ensure that leaders of the College have responsibility for assuring compliance with accreditation requirements, the Chancellor supported training and professional development related to accreditation. A team from the College attended the ACCJC conference in Spring 2017 and accreditation writing team members attended accreditation workshops in Guam, San Francisco, and Hawai'i. Additionally, a number of faculty and administrators have served on ACCJC site visit teams. The Chancellor has allocated resources to support assessment efforts designed to strengthen the College's ability to meet Accreditation Standards, Eligibility Requirements, and Commission Policies. (IV.B.4)

Where applicable, the UHCC develops policies that align with the UH System policies, state statutes, and regulations. The Chancellor is responsible for assuring that the College's practices are consistent with UHCC policies and college-specific policies and mission. This is accomplished through the College's governance structures and procedures for review of policies. The College developed its strategic plan in alignment with the UHCC strategic directions and the College's own mission. In compliance with State law, the Chancellor assures that the College adopts a balanced budget each year and maintains required cash reserves. Budget and expenditure reports are reviewed regularly to ensure accountability and oversight. (IV.B.5)

The Chancellor engages regularly with the internal and external communities through a variety of methods and strategies. She regularly attends meetings of business and industry sectors and CTE advisory boards to gain insights into the workforce training needs and future employment trends of the state's largest industries and future employers of the College's graduates. These insights are then used to inform the development and modification of curriculum to meet the workforce development needs of employers. The Chancellor also works directly with local communities and community service providers so that the College can respond to needs of special populations such as older adults and individuals who are incarcerated. Within the College the Chancellor has created numerous avenues to engage with and to hear directly from the employees of the College. During the team's visit employees from all employment classifications were consistent in sharing that the Chancellor has created an environment for

respectful, meaningful, and effective dialogue about the College's operations, goals, and plans. (IV.B.6)

Conclusion

The College meets Standard IV.B.

College Commendation 4

The Team commends the Chancellor for creating opportunities for employees to engage in meaningful, respectful, and effective dialogue regarding the College's operations, goals, and plans. (IV.B.6)

IV.C. Governing Board

General Observations

The College is part of the University of Hawaii system that is overseen by the Board of Regents (BOR), whose fifteen members are appointed to five-year terms by the governor of the state and confirmed by the state senate. Regents are expected to act as a whole and maintain appropriate communication between the BOR and the institution. The BOR has established and adheres to clear policies related to the selection, evaluation and authority of the CEO of the institution. They also have policies and procedures in place related to the Board's operation, professional development, self-evaluation and ethical requirements. Finally, the BOR has established clear delineation between the general oversight responsibilities of the board and the operational responsibilities of the CEO.

The governing board for the college is established in Hawaii State statute and is appointed by the governor and confirmed by the Senate. The Board's authority is also established in statute and the State constitution. Its policies assure its responsibility for academic quality, integrity, and effectiveness of the student learning programs and services

Findings and Evidence

The Board policy manual is organized under the UH System-Wide Policies and Procedures Information System (PPIS) using a standardized policy format. This format includes the designated policy number, the title, and a header including the chapter, Regents Policy number, effective date, prior dates amended, and a review date. Regents Policy RP 5.201 delineates the Board's accountability for academic quality, integrity, and the effectiveness of learning programs. Financial stability is addressed through RP 8.203 among others. The BOR executes those responsibilities through board and committee meetings, and at times, through the creation of special tasks groups to address specific issues. (IV.C.1)

RP 1.202 outlines the expected relationship of Regents with the administration and the university, and delineates the communication structure related to the flow of information to and from the BOR. In addition, the BOR handbook also details the expectation that Regents will serve the system as a whole and individuals have a responsibility to support the majority action. These responsibilities and adherence to them are reviewed via a board self-assessment instrument. (IV.C.2)

Policies state that "the authority of the board reposes in the board as a whole." The Board's minutes and self-evaluation show that they are working collectively. Board of Regents meeting minutes of October 31, 2017, indicate that "acting as a unit" was included on the Board Self Evaluation Survey. The summary of results reflects three survey items related to this criterion supports the assertion that the board acts as a unit. One Regent commented, "Regents have been very good at representing as an individual and not speaking on behalf of the full board." Regent Policy RP 1.202 states that "no member of the board can represent the board within the

university and no member shall interfere, engage in, or interact directly with the campuses without prior authorization from the chairperson.” (IV.C.2)

Selection of a CEO is governed by specific policies depending on the position. Recruitment and selection of the system CEO (Vice President for Community Colleges [VPCC]) is outlined in RP 9.212 and the selection of the College's chancellor is conducted in accordance with policy UHCCP 9.210. The BOR delegates the authority to evaluate the VPCC to the University of Hawaii president and the evaluation of the college chancellors is further delegated to the VPCC. Evaluations of the VPCC and the chancellors are governed by Executive Policies 9.203 and 9.212. The process primarily consists of a 360-degree assessment by those who work closely with the executive, a review of accomplishments and goals for the review year, and the setting of goals for the upcoming year. The evaluation system itself is also periodically reviewed and updated as necessary. (IV.C.3)

The UHCC office has a newly approved (spring 2018) policy UHCCP 9.210 for the recruitment, selection, and appointment of Community College Chancellors which is aligned with Regent Policy RP 9.212. Executive Policy EP 9.212 (in support of Regent Policy RP 9.212) which establishes an annual review that includes a 360-degree assessment by the HCC Chancellor, as well as his or her peers, subordinates, and constituents of the Chancellors' performance. This assessment also includes a review of accomplishments and goals for the review year and for the coming year. (IV.C.3)

Article X of the State Constitution outlines the independent authority of the BOR and the autonomy of the University of Hawaii. The Article establishes the power of the BOR to formulate policy and exercise control over the university through an executive officer appointed by the BOR. In exercising its responsibilities, the BOR leadership may communicate and/or meet with state legislators on matters relating to the university. (IV.C.4)

The autonomy of the University and related independent authority of the Board of Regents is embodied in Article X of the State Constitution, specifically Section 6 and RP 1.202: Relationship of the Board to Administration and University. (IV.C.4)

The BOR has established a number of policies to ensure the quality, integrity, and improvement of student learning programs and services, as well as provide for resources to support them. Board policies governing the system and college work are arranged into several tiers. The uppermost tier are the Board of Regents Policies (RP) and the UH Executive Policies (EP) that implement the RPs. Other policy tiers must exist in compliance with and/or not contradict policies at higher levels. Below the RPs and EPs are the UHCC policies and then those established by the individual colleges. The BOR has established a number of policies to ensure the quality, integrity, and improvement of student learning programs and services, as well as provide for resources to support them. These include RP 5.201, which states that instructional programs must be consistent with the institution's mission and undergo regular review and RP 4.205, which outlines the need for regular and systematic assessment and accountability of all programs, campuses, and the university as a whole with an eye toward effectiveness in meeting the mission and goals of the institution. (IV.C.5)

A review of the Board of Regents policy manual shows that the Board has established policies consistent with the system mission to ensure the quality, integrity, and improvement of student learning programs and services and the resources necessary to support them. (IV.C.5)

BOR policies related to the board size, responsibilities, structure and operating procedures are found on the Board of Regents' home webpage. In addition, the bylaws of the BOR includes sections defining the board and its organization, the duties of the BOR officers, committee structure, meeting requirements, general operating procedures, and conflict of interest requirements. (IV.C.6)

The board publishes its policies establishing its size, duties, responsibilities, structures, and operating procedures. Board Bylaws and the Board Policy Manual, under the UH System Policies and Procedures Information System, are readily available on the UH website. (IV.C.6)

The BOR reviews its policies on a staggered three-year cycle for 12 chapters of policy. The policies and related administrative procedures are all documented on a system-wide Policies and Procedures Information System (PPIS) that provides easy public access to all policies, information related to the effective date of each policy as well as prior amendment dates and automatic notifications to interested parties of any change to policy. Regular reports on policy review and revisions are made first to the Committee on Personnel Affairs and Board Governance and then to the BOR. (IV.C.7)

A review of samples of Board minutes shows that the actions of the Board are consistent with its policies and bylaws. There is a regular three-year cycle for policy review, and Chapters 9-12 will be reviewed in 2019-2020, after which the cycle begins again. Any policy may be reviewed at any time, as needed. The community colleges are not involved per se, but the VPCC provided leadership for the review of Chapters 1-4 at the request of the Board, and as a regular attendee at Board meetings, is fully informed of the process. The community colleges can provide input to the VPCC. For example, the Community College Council of Faculty Senate Chairs might provide input on matters pertaining to shared governance and decision-making. (IV.C.7)

The BOR has established strategic goals for the University of Hawaii in four key areas, the first of which is a graduation initiative focused on student success. The BOR strategic goals are also aligned with the strategic goals of the UHCC system and the individual colleges. Where possible, targeted incremental growth or improvement measures are associated with the goals and regular updates are provided to the BOR during board meetings or relevant committee meetings. (IV.C.8)

The board has established goals related to student success. It is kept informed of issues impacting student success through reports. The UH System, in keeping with its commitment to be an indigenous-service institution, tracks data on the various demographic constituents it seeks to serve. The UH and UHCC systems track the incremental changes in several factors. Data related to meeting campus-specific targets are also used in the allocation of performance-based supplemental funding, beyond base-budgeting. (IV.C.8)

The BOR has an ongoing training program that includes a number of professional development opportunities. New board members receive a full-day orientation that introduces them to University functions, governance and strategic directions, as well as to BOR governance, processes, ethics, and conduct. New members are also paired with an experienced board member who serves as a mentor to the incoming member. Members also attend relevant conferences such as the Association of Governing Boards and the Association of Community College Trustees. In addition, the BOR conducts retreats and specialized training sessions such as a recent session on financial audits. (IV.C.9)

Through a review of HRD394A – 104 (enabling legislation), it appears the Board has staggered terms. The Board Bylaws provide for a written method of providing for leadership continuity and orientation of new members. Article II, Section E, of the Bylaws (as of July 19, 2018), provides for an orientation for new members within one month of the beginning of their term. The orientation shall include, among other things, an overview of the University system, BOR responsibilities, accreditation standards for Board governance, and BOR policies and practices. New members also are to be provided with a Reference Guide covering these and other topics. (IV.C.9)

RP 2.204 provides a process for BOR self-evaluation and in 2017, the BOR committee structure was revised to provide oversight to the self-evaluation process. The BOR has conducted the self-evaluations annually since 2014 and uses the results for continuous improvement of board performance and institutional effectiveness. (IV.C.10)

The Board has been conducting annual self-evaluations. The commitment to this process is codified in RP 2.204: Policy on Board Self-Evaluation. While there is not a formal schedule per se, recent practice has been consistent in conducting the self-evaluation just prior to or at the beginning of the new academic year. (IV.C.10)

BOR bylaws and RP 2.206 contain conflict of interest policies and procedures and members are informed of the ethics requirements during their initial orientation. Regents who are also active employees of the University of Hawaii are also aware of the conditions under which they must recuse themselves from actions impacted by their employment status. All regents are required to file annual financial disclosure forms with the state ethics commission and those disclosures are made available to the public. (IV.C.11)

A review of Board minutes provided evidence that the Board upholds its code of conflict of interest policy as expressed in Article X of the bylaws. The Board is required to comply with Chapter 84 Part II Code of Ethics of the Hawaii Revised Statutes. The Board's Code of Ethics is combined with its (State) Conflict of Interest policy. (IV.C.11)

Through RP 2.202, the BOR clearly distinguishes between its responsibility for establishing overall strategic direction, university policy and fiduciary management and that of the UH System President. The President's authority is then delegated where appropriate to the VPCC and the individual college chancellor. Where specific situations may indicate board oversight, a task

force is established to explore and address the particular issue, but the BOR does not engage in direct management of the community colleges. (IV.C.12)

Board Policy RP 2.202, Duties of the President, delegates responsibility and authority to the President to implement and administer Board policies and delineates the President's authority to delegate to VPs and Chancellors. (IV.C.12)

The BOR is informed on a regular basis about the accreditation status of the College. A sub-set of Regents were actively engaged in dialog about board-related standards and participated in refinements of Standard IV.C. All actions of the smaller group were reported back to the entire BOR. (IV.C.13)

The February 23, 2017, Board meeting minutes show an item related to the Permitted Action Group's participation in the self-study process for the community colleges. The BOR, primarily through its Committee on Academic and Student Affairs, monitors the accredited status of all ten campuses in the UH system. For the six community colleges accredited by ACCJC, as they prepared for the current cycle, the Board authorized the formation of a permitted interaction group, as described in IV.C.13. This group provided input to the VPCC, who provided periodic reports to the BOR. All six campuses provided summaries of their ISERs and QFEs to the Committee on Academic and Student Affairs via the VPCC on May 18, 2018, which accepted them on behalf of the BOR. The Committee subsequently reported that to the full Board, which formally accepted the community college ISERs at its June 7, 2018 meeting. The permitted interaction group was formally dissolved at the July 19, 2018 BOR meeting. (IV.C.13)

Conclusion

The College meets Standard IV.C.

IV.D. Multi-College Districts or Systems

General Observations

The University of Hawaii System is the sole provider of public higher education in the state of Hawaii. The overall structure of the University of Hawaii System is established in the Board of Regents Policy 3.201: Major Organizational Units of the University of Hawaii. The ten-campus system as a whole includes the University of Hawaii Community Colleges (UHCC), which is comprised of seven community colleges. The UHCC is further established in the Board of Regents Policy 4.207: Community College System. University of Hawaii Maui College is accredited by the Western Association of Schools and Colleges (WASC), Senior Division. The other six community colleges are accredited by the Accrediting Commission of Community and Junior Colleges (ACCJC), and function as a multi-campus system.

The UH system is governed by a 15-member Board of Regents (BOR) and overseen by the UH system President. Overall leadership of the community colleges is provided by the Vice President of Community Colleges (VPCC) who reports directly to the UH system President. The VPCC delegates authority for each college to a community college chancellor. The VPCC ensures that system level leadership and support for the system and college missions are provided and coordinated through his office. The VPCC delegates the operations of each college to the chancellor. The operational structures at the system level are mirrored at each college and functions are delineated. The system has clearly articulated methods for budget preparation in a responsible manner, and adequate allocation and re-allocation of resources to support operations in a sustainable manner.

Findings and Evidence

The VPCC delegates full authority and responsibility to administer policies to each chancellor without interference and holds the chancellor accountable for the operations of the college. System planning and evaluation are integrated with college planning and evaluation to improve student learning and achievement and institutional effectiveness. Communication between colleges and the system is timely and accurate and ensures effective operations of the colleges. The process for evaluating system and college role delineation, governance and decision-making is described as “ongoing and organic.” (IV.D.1)

The delineation of functions and the differentiation of responsibilities between system and campus level is summarized in the UHCC Functional Map, most recently reviewed by the community colleges, and updated in fall 2017. The Functional Maps shows alignment with both the major accreditation topics as well as the detailed parts of Standards IV.D.1-9.

The system re-organization in 2005 created a new organizational chart that established the VPCC as a member of the senior administration of the UH System, reporting directly to the UH system president. The UHCC office then oversees the management of and provides support in areas such as academic support, planning, personnel, facilities, and fiscal resources. (IV.D.1)

The vice president for community colleges (VPCC, the system CEO) provides primary leadership in ensuring that the colleges function effectively in fulfilling their respective missions, and in supporting educational excellence and student success. The VPCC provides system-level support for campus operations through both a centralized system office and through several bodies comprised of campus representatives. (IV.D.2)

The operations of the Office of the Vice President for Community Colleges (OVPCC) are overseen by two associate vice presidents who coordinate centralized support services in the areas of Academic Affairs and Administrative Affairs. The associate vice president for academic affairs provides leadership in operational policy-making pertinent to the development and implementation of community college system-wide academic plans, goals and assessment. Specific areas of assistance and coordination include academic support services; academic planning, assessment and policy analysis; career and technical education; student affairs; and workforce development. The office also supplies the system with strategic data on a number of measures that contribute to a more refined assessment of the success of various programs and initiatives. (IV.D.2)

The VPCC also meets regularly and works with several councils comprised of representatives of specific leadership constituencies at the community colleges: Council of Community College Chancellors; Community College Council of Faculty Senate Chairs; and Community Council of Native Hawaiian Chairs. (IV.D.2)

Emerging initiatives that will require additional system-level coordination and effective interface with the individual colleges are a) Sustainability, and b) Distance Education. With reference to Sustainability, an Executive Policy 4.202 and a new Board of Regents Policy 4.208 signal a system-level commitment that will impact all campuses as they develop and share ideas and practices that best fit their individual needs and environmental conditions. Secondly, while the community colleges have utilized the modality of distance learning for quite some time, recent discussion has now focused on developing a coordinated and fully online Associate in Arts (Liberal Arts) degree at the community college system level, which will require renewed and proactive commitment from the community college system office and the individual campuses. (IV.D.2)

The delineation of functions and the differentiation of responsibilities between system and campus level is summarized in the UHCC-System Functional Map, most recently reviewed by the community colleges, and updated in fall 2017. The functional map shows alignment with accreditation standards. The VPCC provides system-level support for campus operations through both a centralized system office and through several bodies comprised of campus representatives. System-wide councils exist to facilitate planning and also allocation of resources among the campuses to ensure that the colleges have the flexibility and support to fulfill their mission. Two associate VPs coordinate efforts across the system in academic affairs and administrative services, respectively. Several councils operate at the system level and the campus level organizational structure mirrors the system level support. The Strategic Planning Council (SPC) ensures that CC system planning is aligned with UH system planning. (IV.D.2)

The UH System has Hawaii state law and board policies that provide the authority and the processes for allocating and reallocating resources in support of college/system operational effectiveness and sustainability. Board policy delegates responsibility for financial management and campus operations to the UH System President and College Chancellors. (IV.D.3)

Campuses have also had access to additional funds from the Office of the Vice President for Community Colleges, and more recently from the Office of the University of Hawaii President, providing additional incentive for meeting certain goals linked to performance measures focuses on student achievement. These are in turn associated with system and campus strategic objectives. Campuses have specific targets for incremental growth; meeting or exceeding them results in earning this additional funding. Unallocated funds are redistributed by the Office of the Vice President for Community Colleges for other campus or system initiatives, such as those associated with student success. (IV.D.3)

The district/system has established methods for allocation and reallocation of resources that are adequate to support the effective operations and sustainability of the colleges and the district/system. The district/system CEO ensures effective control of expenditures. The biennial mechanism for budget preparation is codified in law, policy, and procedure. System-wide the process is coordinated by the AVPAS for community colleges. Colleges have access to state authorized budget, tuition dollars, revenue funds and also other funds through the VPCC. Re-allocation of resources is most clearly demonstrated through the pool of vacant positions system-wide that can be used to support emerging needs among the colleges based upon documented need. (IV.D.3)

Board policies (UHCCP 8.201, 8.000, 8.200) have been established for developing budgets, managing funds, and controlling expenditures (general, grants, special, revolving, tuition and fees, revenue generating, self-sustaining programs, cash reserves). Additional funds have been made available to colleges through the OVPC for those that meet or exceed specific student achievement performance measures identified in the UH System and college strategic objectives. A UHCC policy was established for the colleges to more effectively manage vacant positions throughout the UHCC unit. Vacant positions are placed into a system pool from which colleges can request reallocation of a position based on documented need. (IV.D.3)

The University of Hawaii System has a president, a vice president for community colleges (among several vice presidents responsible for differentiated areas of UH System functions), and chancellors for each of the ten universities or colleges in the system. As noted, the VPCC is the CEO of the system of the seven UHCCs. Each college has a chancellor, the CEO of the institution. Board of Regents Policy 4.207 established the Community College System in 2002, although the colleges have been functioning since 1965 as part of the UH System. In 2005, the Board of Regents approved the reorganization of the Community Colleges System and created the new executive position of Vice President for Community Colleges. (IV.D.4)

The authority and responsibility of UHCC chancellors for the overall management and governance of their campuses is further affirmed in UH Executive Policy 1.102, Authority to Manage and Control the Operations of the Campus, which states, "*Primary authority for financial management has been delegated by the president to the chancellors. Chancellors may sub-delegate authority to qualified, responsible program heads.*" University of Hawaii

Community Colleges Policy UHCCP 8.000: General Fund and Tuition and Fees Special Fund Allocation, also specifies the chancellor’s responsibility “...to develop a methodology to allocate funds to the campus units consistent with budget planning and resource allocation standards of the accrediting commission.” Responsibility for a broad range of personnel actions has also been delegated to the chancellors in UH Executive Policy 9.112. In line with the need for accountability in the fulfillment of their duties, chancellors (and other executive managerial personnel) are subject to annual performance evaluation, with final assessment by the VPCC. This process is thoroughly codified in UHCCP 9.202: *Executive Employees Performance Evaluation*. (IV.D.4)

The community colleges in the Hawaii statewide system of public higher education operate within a three-tiered system: the University of Hawaii (UH) System as a whole (including seven community colleges, two baccalaureate institutions, and the flagship research university); the UH Community Colleges; and the individual community college campuses located on the four major islands in the state. Satellite Learning Centers, providing additional outreach across the state, are managed by the community colleges and UH-Maui College. A commitment to the parity of access for students and to the continuous improvement of conditions contributing to student learning and success, as well as a commitment to the equitable allocation of resources in support of that ultimate goal, require the effective planning of operations that are coordinated and integrated across the system. (IV.D.5)

As noted, there are multiple structures in place at the UH- and the CC-system level (e.g., committees of administrative counterparts from individual campuses, councils of campus governance representatives) that facilitate the dialogue and decision making essential to planning and implementation. In addition, each tier of the system is grounded in a comprehensive strategic plan that provides the conceptual guidance for mid-range planning. These currently include the UH Strategic Directions 2015-2021, the UHCC Strategic Directions 2015-2021 (intentionally developed to be aligned with the overall UH plan), and the individual campus strategic plans, also developed in alignment with the UHCC plan. (IV.D.5)

A crosswalk of these three levels of planning further corroborates the high degree of congruity and integration. In some cases, goals and objectives of strategic planning have been quantified or operationalized to provide a basis for evaluation of institutional effectiveness. Several of these measures are further linked to performance-based funding provided at both the UH- and the CC-system level, as seen in the Crosswalk of UH System and UHCC Performance Funding cited in IV.D.3.

Most recently, on April 20, 2017, the Board of Regents approved the Integrated Academic and Facilities Plan (IAFP) for the University of Hawaii System. Recognizing the critical interdependence between the academic missions of the ten campuses and the physical and other resources required to support those missions, the IAFP states that it is “...intended to provide a comprehensive plan for how the campuses will develop and work together to ensure that the entire mission of the UH System is addressed without undue duplication or inter-campus competition.” The IAFP provides an overview of current conditions and emerging needs and prospects for the four major units in the system (the three universities and the CC system) and

affirms the further integration of planning in noting that *“The principles of this plan will be incorporated into biennium budget planning, annual operating budgets, 6-year CIP plans and academic program approvals and reviews (p. 18).”* (IV.D.5)

System planning and evaluation are integrated with college planning and evaluation to improve student learning and achievement and institutional effectiveness. This is documented in the UH Strategic Directions 2015-2021, the UHCC Strategic Directions 2015-2021 (intentionally developed to be aligned with the overall UH plan), and the individual campus strategic plans, also developed in alignment with the UHCC plan. There is a high degree of congruity and integration between the three tiers of the public education system in Hawaii (UH, CC system and individual CC). In some cases, goals and objectives of strategic planning have been quantified or operationalized to provide a basis for evaluation of institutional effectiveness. Several of these measures are also linked to performance-based funding provided at both the UH- and the CC-system level, as seen in the Crosswalk of UH System and UHCC System Performance Funding. CC system-wide and individual colleges utilize council structures to align college goals with system goals and performance indicators. (IV.D.5)

The VPCC is a member of the UH president’s senior leadership team (Executive Council) as well as a member of the ten-campus Council of Chancellors. The VPCC serves as the Administrative Representative to the board of Regents Standing Committee on Academic and Student Affairs, and items forwarded from the colleges for Board of Regent approval (e.g. strategic plans, Institutional Self Evaluation Reports) are presented under the signature of the VPCC. In addition to publicly posted minutes of Board of Regents committee and board meetings, the VPCC is provided with memos summarizing Board of Regents approved actions. Campuses are also informed of updates to the policies and procedures that constitute the institutional infrastructure through notification from the Policies and Procedures Information System (PPIS). The VPCC also meets regularly with three Councils representing different aspects of college governance: The Council of Community College Chancellors, the Community College Council of Faculty Senate Chairs, and the Community College Council of Native Hawaiian Chairs. Meetings of these Councils are documented, and each Council completes an annual self-assessment. (IV.D.6)

Established mechanisms for communication exist between the three tiered system of public higher education in Hawaii. This occurs in a timely and accurate manner to ensure effective operations of the colleges. The VPCC is primarily responsible for advocating CC issues to the BOR and is notified of BOR decisions in a timely manner through direct communications from the UH president. The VPCC uses a system of councils and also semi-annual visits to each community college campus to ensure effective communication. Finally, at the campus level, policies, practices, and structures exist whereby stakeholders and those with particular expertise are able to contribute to governance.

While assessment of system-wide role delineation, governance and decision-making is “organic and ongoing”, a formalized structure for assessment does not exist. Recent improvements have been made to communication across the CC system through orientation provided to campus

representatives that serve on system committees and also a comprehensive update of the system website. (IV.D.7)

Conclusion

The College meets Standard IV.D.

System Commendation 1

The University of Hawai‘i Community College System is commended for its island-centered mission in identifying new programs, and for its successful system-wide implementation of technology across the system to support program planning and tracking in clarification of students’ academic pathways. (IV.D.5)

System Recommendation 1

In order to improve institutional effectiveness, the team recommends that the system develop and implement an assessment process to measure the effectiveness of role delineations, governance and decision-making processes to ensure their integrity. (IV.D.7)

Quality Focus Essay

The Quality Focus Essay (QFE) outlines two action projects that the College has determined will support continuous improvement in the area of student learning, achievement, and success. College faculty, staff, and administrators identified these projects through dialogue and by reflecting on data and evidence as the ISER was prepared. The approach to both projects reflects the vision (*Ne'epapa*) and mission (*No ke kauhale ke kuleana*) of the Student Success Council, where all members take responsibility, work together, and build a community that supports and celebrates students' success and engagement.

Action Project 1:

Foster and increase engagement in the assessment of Student Learning Outcomes (SLOs) and Service Area Outcomes (SAOs) to improve student learning

Action Project 1 includes the following thematic objectives, with work spread over three years:

- Update the assessment process under the guidance of an Assessment Coordinator;
- Review the Watermark adoption process and to create queries and reports in Watermark to inform SLO assessments;
- Update the general education outcomes and to map SLOs and SAOs to the revised institutional learning outcomes and general education outcomes; and
- Continue innovative workshops and programs to further engage faculty and staff and to explore impactful assessment activities across the College.

The Action Project outlines specific outcomes and tasks designed to reach these objectives over the next three years.

Action Project 2:

Increase engagement for student success

Action Project 2 includes the following goals, with work spread across three years:

- **Year 1 (2019):** Increase course completion for all students and fall-to-spring persistence;
- **Year 2 (2020):** Increase certificates and degrees for all students; increase student transfers within and outside of the UH System; increase certificates and degrees for Native Hawaiian students; increase certificates and degrees for Pell grant recipients; increase STEM certificates and degrees; and
- **Year 3 (2021):** Complete the College's 2022-2027 Strategic Plan with clear directions, goals, outcomes, and measures for student engagement, learning, achievement, and success.

The QFE outlines activities for college-wide improvement and reinvigoration in two related areas of institutional practice, student learning and student achievement, with the overarching goal of using the results of each project to improve student success. The projects flow clearly from the College's self-evaluation processes and reflection on three strategic questions focused

on student success. The focus of the work is practical, given the College's self-identified interests in (1) improving the documentation and use of learning outcomes assessment results, and (2) more intentionally aligning existing student success efforts with performance measures. Additionally, both projects share the general theme of engagement, which helps to provide a common direction and purpose for the many individual tasks.

Both Action Projects have clearly stated outcomes for each year of the project. However, the College may find it useful to express these outcomes in more specific and measurable terms. For example, Action Project 2 states its first goal as "increase course completion rates." It may be helpful to indicate a specific target for these goals. This may assist the College to evaluate its progress toward achieving the outcome and report on the impact of the QFE interventions on student learning, student achievement, and engagement.

The tasks for both Action Projects are clearly stated, and responsible parties have been identified for each strand of work. Timelines are also clearly stated. In contrast, the specific resources required are often stated in general terms (e.g., "time," "location," etc.). The College may find it useful to be more specific regarding the resources needed to accomplish the work, particularly in cases where specific expenses such as personnel may be necessary. Estimating the amount of time required for the work in order to complete the task may assist the College in evaluating whether the timelines for each step are realistic and achievable. It may also be helpful for coordinating work within tasks that involve multiple individuals or groups.

Finally, many tasks and objectives in Action Project 1 are specific to the College's Watermark Taskstream implementation. The Team encourages the College in this work, and suggests that it may be useful to reflect not only on the specific tool, but also on the effectiveness of the broader processes related to systematic documentation and analysis of learning outcomes assessment results.

During the Team's discussion with representatives of the College community during the visit, it was clear that there is existing momentum around both of these action areas. If the Action Projects are implemented as designed, the College should see demonstrated improvement related to student learning and student engagement.