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SUMMARY OF EVALUATION REPORT

INSTITUTION: Kaua‘i Community College

DATES OF VISIT: October 15 – 18, 2012

TEAM CHAIR: Dr. Mark J. Zacovic, President, Cuyamaca College

A twelve-member accreditation team visited Kaua‘i Community College (KCC) from October 15 – 18, 2012, for the purpose of evaluating how well the institution is achieving its stated purposes, analyzing how well the college is meeting the Commission standards for accreditation, providing recommendations for quality assurance and institutional improvement, and submitting recommendations to the Accrediting Commission for Community and Junior Colleges (ACCJC) regarding the status of the college.

On August 30, 2012, Dr. Zacovic attended the Western Association of Schools (WASC) and Colleges Team Chair Training in San Francisco, CA. Additionally, in preparation for the visit, team members, team chair, and team assistant attended an all-day training session on September 7, 2012, in Oakland, CA, conducted by the ACCJC, and studied Commission materials prepared for visiting teams. The team chair and assistant conducted pre-visit meetings with KCC Chancellor Helen Cox and Director Ramona Kincaid, Accreditation Liaison Officer, on September 5, 2012, to clarify expectations and assure that all arrangements for the visit were in good order.

Prior to the visit, team members reviewed the Self-Evaluation Report for Educational Quality and Institutional Effectiveness completed by the college and submitted to the Commission on May 31, 2012, as well as recommendations from the October 2006 Comprehensive Evaluation and Focused Midterm Report. They reviewed institutional policies and procedures, records, reports, board and committee meeting minutes, and other supporting documents. Team members completed written evaluations of the Self-Evaluation Report and identified areas for further review. All members of the team were asked to complete the online Accreditation Basics course developed by WASC for orientation of team members.

On Sunday afternoon, October 14, and Monday morning, October 15, 2012, the team chair and two members of the team, Dr. Melinda Niish and Ms. Barbara Davis-Lyman, participated in meetings in Honolulu with the representatives of the University of Hawaii System/Community College Division and University of Hawaii Regents as part of the evaluation team assigned to the System Office review. The community college chancellors and the Accreditation Liaison Officers participated in the meetings on Sunday.

On Monday afternoon, October 15, 2012, the team convened to discuss their views of the report and evidence provided by KCC and to finalize meetings and activities for the week. Prior to the visit, the initial findings and concerns of the team, as gleaned from the advance work of team members, were sorted and charted to more easily identify the frequency of the concerns. This document proved helpful in focusing and leading the team’s attention and discussions. Also, on
October 15, the team travelled to the college for a tour of the campus, received an orientation to the team room, and participated in a technology check to assure that the connections among the team members’ laptops, college printers, and college Wi-Fi were established and in good working order. The day concluded with a team dinner at a local restaurant.

On Tuesday, October 16, 2012, the visit began in earnest with a brief welcome reception in the college cafeteria with approximately 30 college employees in attendance. Immediately following the reception, the first of two public forums was held in the cafeteria. The forum was conducted by the team chair and included four team members. Approximately 30 individuals attended the forum and asked a variety of questions about the work of the team and about the accreditation standards and process in general. A second forum was held on Wednesday, October 17, 2012, in the late afternoon and was attended by three team members and approximately 7 employees of the college.

During the visit, the team attended 95 formal meetings with faculty, staff, administrators, and students. Team members viewed academic and student support facilities, observed 18 classroom and online instruction sessions, and sat in on two college faculty and staff meetings and two student organization meetings. More than 35 individuals attended two open forums, which allowed comment from any member of the campus or local community.

The three team members assigned to participate in the system office evaluation coordinated their observations and findings on college matters with the chair of the system office evaluation team and other system office team members via three teleconferences on Wednesday, October 17.

Overall, the team found the Institutional Self-Evaluation Report to be well-written and well-organized, with an active and accessible layout. The report appropriately addressed the 2006 evaluation recommendations, Eligibility Requirements, the 2009 Focused Midterm Report and findings, and current Accreditation Standards. College staff members were highly responsive to requests for additional information, interviews, and follow-up conversations. The team’s workroom was well-equipped with excellent technology support and workspaces. The college provided a team workroom at the hotel as well, and provided for Wi-Fi in each team member’s hotel room. Clearly, the college was ready and prepared for the visit.

The current KCC accreditation self-evaluation process was initiated with awareness building and planning activities September 2010 to May 2012. In September 2010, the accreditation liaison officer was appointed and the Self Study Steering Committee began meeting. More than 62 names are listed in the self-evaluation as having participated on various self-evaluation teams. That accounts for nearly every employee at the college. A comprehensive timeline listing all milestones in the self-evaluation process was developed.

The visiting team found the college enthusiastic and focused on building on its legacy of student-centered higher education. Clearly, the college has made great effort toward meeting student learning outcomes (SLOs), program review, and integrated planning standards, and in engaging the institution in dialogue regarding data-informed improvement.
The team greatly appreciates the cooperative support provided by college staff throughout the visit. Requests were met quickly, and employees were open and candid in their responses to team members' questions. Overall, the college and system offices were well-prepared for the team's visit and could not have been more welcoming and hospitable.
2012 Commendations

Members of the visiting team were impressed by Kaua‘i Community College and its earnest, broad-based engagement in the accreditation process, its cooperation with visiting team members, and its focus on students. The team identified several areas calling for special recognition:

1. The chancellor is to be commended for her leadership of the college, which in the spirit of *ohana* (a Hawaiian word meaning family in an extended sense of the term, nobody gets left behind or forgotten) has created an innovative, collaborative, and transparent teaching and learning environment. (Standard IV)

2. The facilities staff is to be commended for supporting an additional 41,000 square feet of new space with a 23 percent reduction in staff, and still garnering high marks for a well-maintained campus, cleanliness of buildings, and courteous service, in support of student learning. (Standard III)

3. The college is to be commended for its planned goal of attaining energy self-sufficiency, and for progress in pursuing this very positive, innovative, and environmentally responsible initiative. (Standard III)

4. The college is to be commended for its prudent fiscal management practices that have resulted in an ending fund balance that is trending positive, even during economically challenging times. (Standard III)

5. The college is to be commended for its Tutorial Center’s “critical care” group for its tutoring of students referred by instructors in developmental math and English courses. (Standard II)

6. The college is to be commended for the Wai‘ale‘ale project and for its positive impact on student success as measured by higher GPAs and greater persistence. (Standard II)

7. The college is to be commended for support of the success and achievement of all students with an emphasis on native Hawaiian students and the preservation and study of native Hawaiian culture. (Standard II)

8. The college community is to be commended for its widespread, high level, active participation, and robust dialogue in decision-making and in teaching and learning. (Standard I)
9. The college is to be commended for inspirational teaching and learning, positive student interactions, faculty and staff camaraderie, and institutional pride. (Standards I, II, III, and IV)

2012 Recommendations

Recommendation #1: Student Learning Outcomes
As was noted in the 2006 visiting team report and to meet standards, the team recommends that the college accelerate the development, implementation, and assessment of learning outcomes for all courses, programs, and student support services, with special emphases on the assessment of institutional learning outcomes and on the timeliness and completeness of comprehensive program review. (ER 10, Standards I.B.1, I.B.6, I.B.7, II.A.1.c, II.B.4, II.C.2)

Recommendation #2: Institutional Effectiveness
As was noted in the 2006 visiting team report and to meet the standards, the team recommends that the college:

(a) develop a timeline for, and method of measuring its success in accomplishing its goals and quality assurance processes;
(b) integrate the results of measurements of success in accomplishing goals and quality assurance processes into its overall planning and decision making processes on a more comprehensive basis;
(c) incorporate on a regular basis the results of such measurements into the process of reviewing the mission statement. (I.B.2, I.B.3)

Recommendation #3: Student Learning Programs and Services

See UHCC Recommendation #2

Recommendation #4: Academic and Non-Academic Grievance Procedures
Related to a recommendation from the 2006 visiting team, the team recommends that the college more fully disseminate the academic and non-academic grievance procedures in the schedule of classes, the college catalog, the college website, and the student and faculty handbooks. (II.A.6.c, II.A.7, II. B.2.c)

Recommendation #5: Resources

See UHCC Recommendation #3.
Recommendation #6: Leadership and Governance

In order to meet the standards, it is recommended that the college strengthen evaluation of the effectiveness of the governance and decision-making structures and processes on a regular basis, and use the outcomes of evaluations as a basis for continuous improvement. (IV. A. 5)

Recommendations from the UHCC Evaluation Report

(Appended to this report is the complete accreditation evaluation report for the University of Hawaii Community College System.)

UHCC Recommendation 1: Institutional Mission and Effectiveness

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

- The VPCC and the Chancellors develop broad-based, ongoing, collegial dialogue between and among the UHCC and the colleges to better assess the breadth, quality, and usefulness of UHCC analytical tools (e.g., UHCC Annual Report of Program Data (ARPD)) and planning processes through feedback from college stakeholders. In addition, the UHCC and Chancellors should provide training for the appropriate use of the tools to support on-going improvement and effectiveness.

- The Chancellors provide clear descriptions and training regarding the planning timeline and budgeting process. The information and training should be available to all college constituencies and reviewed regularly to ensure accuracy for resource allocation that leads to program and institutional improvement (Standards I.B.3, I.B.1, II.A.1.c, II.A.2.a, e, f, II.B.1, II.B.3.a, and II.b.4, I.B.1, I.B.4, I.B.6).

UHCC Recommendation 2: Student Learning Programs and Services

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

UHCC Recommendation 3: Student Learning Programs and Services and Resources

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

UH Recommendation 4: Resources

In order to meet the Standards, it is recommended that a comprehensive UH system wide technology plan that includes and supports distance education be developed and implemented and is integrated with institutional planning (Standards II.A.1.a, II.A.1.c, II.A.2.c, III.C.2, III.C.1, III.C.1.c, III.C.2).
UH Recommendation 5: Board and Administrative Organization
In order to meet the Standards, it is recommended that the UH BOR adopt a regular evaluation schedule of its policies and practices and revise them as necessary. In addition, the UH BOR must conduct its self evaluation as defined in its policy and as required by ACCJC Standards (Standards IV.B.1.e, IV.B.1.g).
ACCREDITATION EVALUATION REPORT FOR

KAUA‘I COMMUNITY COLLEGE

Introduction

Kaua‘i Community College evolved from Kalaheo Vocational School, which was established in 1928. It was part of the Hawai‘i Department of Public Instruction. In 1965, it became a comprehensive community college and was transferred to the University of Hawai‘i System as part of the University of Hawai‘i Community College System. It is the only public institution of higher education serving the county of Kauai, which includes the islands of Kaua‘i and Ni‘ihau.

Geographically, the college is isolated. Kaua‘i is the northernmost island of the major Hawaiian Islands and is separated from Honolulu, the capital, main population and business center of the state, by 100 miles of the Pacific Ocean. Travel to other islands is primarily by air. Ni‘ihau is a privately owned island, which is accessible only by barge and helicopter. Ni‘ihau is home to the state’s largest concentration of speakers with Native Hawaiian as their first language.

According to the 2010 Census, the county has a population of 67,091 with 22.7 percent of residents 18 years of age and under with a median age of 41.3. Of persons 25 and over, only 20.2 percent have a bachelor’s degree compared to a state average of 29.5 percent. There are 16 public K-12 schools, six public charter schools, each with a focus on Native Hawaiian language and culture, and seven private schools. The county also has the highest proportion (11.1 percent) in the state of persons aged 25 and older who do not have a high school education.

KCC is one of seven community colleges in the University of Hawai‘i System (UH). It provides access to two-year associate-level terminal and transfer degrees, as well as short-term certificate and non-credit training programs that enable the college to respond flexibly and quickly to changing workforce needs.

KCC offers 24 degrees and certificates of completion and competence that support the college’s core mission of basic skills, career preparation, lifelong learning, and transfer. KCC has added several new certificates in the past two years: Carpentry Technology, Digital Media Arts, Electrical Installation and Maintenance Technology, Marine Option Program, Massage Therapy, Medical Assisting, and Plant Bioscience Technology. The Construction Academy was created in 2007 as a partnership with UH Maui College, Honolulu Community College and the three Kaua‘i high schools, to establish a career pathway for high school students. The Culinary Arts Program has been accredited by the American Culinary Federation Education Foundation Accrediting Commission since 2007. The college is committed to sustainability and has created Ho‘ouluwehi, the Sustainable Living Institute of Kaua‘i. A new partnership with Toyama National College of Technology in Japan was established with the Office of Continuing Education and Training in 2010. This fall 2012, approximately 1,500 students are enrolled in day, evening, online, and face-to-face classes on the campus.
There have been significant improvements to KCC facilities and technology systems since the 2006 Self-Evaluation Report. The college has added two new buildings: the One Stop Center (which houses the administrative offices, Business Office, Financial Aid, Counseling and Advising, Admissions and Records, and the University Center) and the Office of Continuing Education and Training (OCET) building which provides offices and state-of-the-art classrooms for continuing education and which also includes the Bookstore. The first floor of the Library has undergone a renovation and is now known as the Learning Commons. Library services, computers, tutors, and other services have relocated to the first floor to provide student support. The former Bookstore has been renovated into a demonstration kitchen for the Culinary Arts Program.

Major trends affecting KCC since its last comprehensive accreditation evaluation include internal and external developments:

- The college’s enrollment has increased by 28 percent over the past six years due to economic downturn and more people returning to college for degrees, skills, and retraining
- The part-time and full-time enrollments grew in 2009 with a 30 percent increase in part-time enrollments and 24 percent increase in full-time enrollments
- The Native Hawaiian headcount has almost doubled since 2006 which mirrors the significant increase in the percentage of Native Hawaiian students who are now attending KCC
- The college has exceeded its performance benchmarks for 2011 in measures which were set at 1,178 for the total enrollment and 256 for enrollment of Native Hawaiian students
- FTE enrollment is also increasing, mirroring the headcount growth

In the face of these challenges and changes, KCC remains a strong, committed institution marked by faculty, staff, administrators, and a Board of Regents dedicated to fulfilling the college’s mission of serving its community and promoting student learning and success.
Responses to Recommendations of the 2006 Evaluation

There were six recommendations reflected in the 2006 comprehensive report and reiterated in the 2009 Focused Mid Term Report. The evaluation team found evidence of the institution's ongoing work to meet the 2006 recommendations. Below are overall comments and concerns of the 2012 team:

2006 Recommendation 1: The team recommends that the college continue its two-year cycle of reviewing the mission statement and in so doing ensure the statement's alignment with ongoing assessment results of collegewide planning and quality assurance processes. (Standard I.A.1.)

Findings and Evidence:

This recommendation has been met. The college continued its practice of a two-year cycle review of the mission statement, conducting a review in 2007. This was followed by an in-depth review which began in 2010. The 2010 mission statement review cycle initiated a college wide constituent dialog resulting in the adoption of a new mission statement that was formally approved in 2011. More importantly, the policy on the periodic review cycle of the mission statement is now linked to the processes for integrated planning and resource allocation.

2006 Recommendation 2: The team recommends that
(a) the college develop a timeline for, and method of measuring its success in accomplishing its goals and quality-assurance processes.
(b) the college integrate the results of such measurement into its overall planning and decision making processes.
(c) the college regularly incorporate the results of such measurements into the process of reviewing the mission statement. (I.B.2. and I.B)

Findings and Evidence:

The college has not fully met 2006 Recommendation 2. While the college has incorporated the UHCC performance measurement results into its planning and decision making processes (part b) the team could not determine that a timeline beyond the one that was expired in 2009 has been established for benchmarks (part a). Measurement methods to be used in the evaluation of goal attainment have been identified, but have not been fully vetted by the college. Assessment being the dynamic process that it is, takes time to do well. Every indication exists that the college will be successful once the process is fully developed and firmly established as part of the KCC culture. The self-evaluation discussion about the mission statement did not include any reference to using goal attainment measurement as a consideration of the college's work to revise and update the mission statement (part c); however, the timeline of the process of review clarified that the process began with the campus focus on performance measures.

2006 Recommendation 3: The team recommends that the college develop and institutionalize an integrated, coordinated, and comprehensive set of programs and services to effectively address the unique learning needs of underprepared students. This effort should open access to,
provide an inclusive environment for, and enhance the instructional and student support for basic skills students. (II.A.1.a)

Findings and Evidence:

This recommendation has been met. The college has made significant progress in addressing this prior team recommendation. Potential students are assessed with the COMPASS placement tests in reading, writing, and mathematics. Students are placed in courses based on the assessment test results. The college addressed the needs of underprepared students by: (1) expanding their offering of remedial offerings and hired faculty to teach the needed courses, (2) developing Interdisciplinary Studies 103, and (3) reached out to high school and middle school teachers in order to identify gaps in skills acquisition and develop strategies to successfully transition to college. The latter includes working with middle school teachers and with the Mathematics Science Partnership Grant, and partnering with National Tropical Botanical Gardens. In addition, classes were offered at the local high school and the development of career ladder for students in the Plant of Bioscience Technology program was explored. The college partnered with national and local initiatives. In 2007 the college launched Achieving the Dream. The college also sought support from the Office of Hawaiian Affairs and the Kamehameha Schools and created an initiative to address college success. Areas included financial aid, learning communities, Early Alert System, and project based learning. An evaluation instrument was designed “to measure the effects of the intervention strategies and training for faculty and staff on the data analysis.” The college was supported by the Wai’a’ale’ale Project, which assisted in the outreach, financial support, and student support services for high risk students. Interviews revealed that the college has continued the efforts of working with underprepared students. The offering of a mandatory college success (IS103) course is currently being piloted. Eight sections are currently offered, for a maximum of 160 students.

2006 Recommendation 4: The team recommends that the college continue its efforts to develop and implement college, program, and course level SLOs linked to assessment strategies in both instruction and student services that are sustainable over the long term and are integrated within program review and institutional effectiveness evaluations of student learning. (II.B.6, II.B.7, and III.A.1.c, III.A.2.c, III.A.2.f, III.B.3.b, III.B.4.)

Findings and Evidence:

This recommendation has been partially met. The college has continued its efforts in the development and implementation of program and course student learning outcomes; however, there is still much work to be done to reach the Continuous Sustainable Quality Improvement level. Faculty is responsible for the development and assessment of student learning outcomes. Processes are in place for the development and assessment of course and program student learning outcomes. Course student learning outcomes are assessed each semester term. The college compiles and analyzes outcomes assessment data to evaluate student achievement. Benchmarks for student attainment of course student learning outcomes are kept consistent across sections. Student performance results are recorded on course assessment report of data (CARD). The CARD contains: course student learning outcomes, individual student achievement data, performance benchmarks, instructor analysis of results, and instructor plan for
improvement. All programs undergo a five-year comprehensive program review, which serves as a commitment to continual improvement that ensures quality and excellence in education. Part of the program review is to evaluate the effectiveness of the program in meeting program student learning outcomes. Program student learning outcomes are assessed through aggregate course student learning outcome data and during the annual program review update and the comprehensive five year program review reports. Programs make changes and improvements based on assessments of student learning outcomes as well as other data to make decisions. Quality of instruction is assessed through the comprehensive program reviews, course curriculum, student learning outcomes assessments and their alignments. Programs have student learning outcomes benchmarks that are assessed to determine if they have been met. The campus community is aware of program review processes and is involved in assuring the quality and improvement of programs offered. The final step of program review links data analyses and decision making to resource allocations in the annual review of action plans and resource needs found in the Annual Program Review Update. During 2008-2011, the Student Service faculty, in collaboration with the Assessment Coordinator, developed and implemented measurable service outcomes. All programs began including outcomes assessment data in their Annual Program Review Updates submitted in December 2011. Upon review by team members, a number of program reviews included the assessment data, but there was no integration of the data, and thus, no influence from the data in the revised plans. The college would be well served to follow the rubric provided by ACCJC in regard to what “proficiency” in the assessment of SLOs for evaluating Institutional Effectiveness looks like. In spite of its inclusion in the program review process, the college has not yet reached the proficiency level expected for the assessment of SLOs. (Please see 2012 recommendation #1.)

2006 Recommendation 5: The team recommends that the college expand the Academic Grievance procedures to include the reporting and processing of non-academic related complaints and grievances. (II.B.2.c)

Findings and Evidence:

The college has partially met this recommendation. The college created a Non-academic grievance policy in 2011; however, both the academic and non-academic grievance policies are not disseminated adequately. The reference in the 2012 – 2013 college catalog listed under “Student Misconduct Grievances” on page 54, does not adequately satisfy the recommendation because the section does not mention the recourse for non-academic related complaints and grievances. Moreover, the summer and fall 2012 schedules of classes have no mention of academic or non-academic grievance policies or procedures. Thus, a student has no reference or recourse for addressing grievances. The policies and procedures need to be published in the schedule of classes, the catalog, on the website and in the student and faculty handbooks. The team found multiple instances where policies and procedures were presented inconsistently among various college publications. (Please see 2012 recommendation #3.)

2006 Focused Recommendation 6: The team recommends that the college establish a Kaua‘i Community College Governance Manual. The manual would be helpful in providing detail on governance policy, duties, and responsibilities of each unit, the schedule of deadlines, and flow charts that indicate chain of command and flow of information. (IV.A.3)
This recommendation has been met. The college has written and produced a Governance Manual. It contains all of the required and recommended components and prior to its publication, it was vetted widely in the college community. The visual impact of the organizational diagrams that were recommended and are included in the Manual is effective. The diagrams are a clear and accurate representation of how the team found governance to be organized at the college. Many employees commented to team members that the Manual made the concepts and relationships of college governance much more clear and understandable to them. Upon review of the Manual, the team encountered some inconsistencies in regard to the membership of the College Council. It is important that information presented in documents such as the Governance Manual be consistent. The college has plans to review and update the Governance Manual on a regular basis.
Eligibility Requirements

1. Authority: The evaluation team confirmed that KCC is authorized to operate as an institution of higher education and to award degrees by the Hawai‘i State Legislature and the UH System, and the Board of Regents. The college is accredited by the Accrediting Commission for Community and Junior Colleges of the Western Association of Schools and Colleges.

2. Mission: The team confirmed that the college’s mission is comprehensive and clearly defined. The Board of Regents adopted a revised mission statement for KCC on May 19, 2011. The mission statement is published in the college catalog, the schedule, on the college website, and various other publications. It defines the college’s commitment to achieving student learning.

3. Governing Board: The Governing Board is named the Board of Regents and the 15 members are appointed by the Governor of Hawai‘i. A five-member standing committee is charged with responsibility for overseeing community college affairs, with representatives from Kaua‘i, Maui, Hawai‘i and two from O‘ahu. The team verified that KCC is one of seven colleges governed by the Board of Regents. Appointed members of the Board serve staggered terms. The state of Hawaii’s policies and procedures establish the Board of Regents as an independent policy-making body responsible for ensuring the fiscal stability and fulfillment of the mission of each of the seven community colleges it governs, including KCC.

4. Chief Executive Officer: In the UH system, campus CEOs have the title of chancellor. KCC has a full-time chancellor who is appointed by the board of regents and has the requisite authority to administer board policies. The current chancellor has served since August 2008.

5. Administrative Capacity: The team confirmed that the college has sufficient staff to provide necessary administrative services. Administrative capacity is demonstrated through a five-unit structure, including Academic Affairs, Student Affairs, University Center and Academic Support, Office of Continuing Education and Training, and Administrative Services. There are adequate qualified management, faculty and staff to carry out college operations.

6. Operational Status: The team confirmed the operational status of the college is active, serving an average of over 1,500 students in each year actively enrolled in and pursuing a range of credit and noncredit, day, evening, distance, and on-site educational programs, majority of who are pursuing a certificate or degree.

7. Degrees: The team found that KCC offers 24 degrees and certificates that support the core mission of basic skills, career preparation, lifelong learning and transfer. The majority of the institution’s educational offerings apply to these degrees or certificates. Degrees and certificates meet all the academic requirements for the Associate Degree level.

8. Educational Programs: Educational programs currently include ten, two-year degree programs covering a transfer-level Associate of Arts in Liberal Arts degree, and a healthy variety of career and technical program areas. The team confirmed the institution’s principal degree programs to be congruent with its mission, based on recognized higher education fields of study, and sufficient in content and length.
9. Academic Credit: Academic credit is granted based on accepted practices in higher education in compliance with Board of Regents policies. The team found that the college awards academic credit based on generally accepted practices and state regulations. Units of credit are awarded per course consistent with the traditional Carnegie Unit and state regulations requiring community colleges on the quarter system to award one unit of credit for every 33 hours of student work. The college catalog and course schedule clearly specify the credits awarded for each course. The course outline of record for each course contains specific standards for awarding credit based on content, methods of instruction, and student learning outcomes.

10. Student Learning Achievement: The college nearly meets all of the accreditation standards for Student Learning and Achievement. Student Learning Outcomes exist for all courses and programs and are actively assessed. The team found that the college has defined expected learning and achievement outcomes for each of the programs and degrees it offers. The catalog lists requirements for every degree and certificate offered by the college. Student learning outcomes are defined for all courses, programs, and degrees (institutional level), and these outcomes align as they enter the assessment cycle. Course level learning outcomes are published on all course outlines. Assessment of student achievement at the institutional level was not demonstrated by the college.

11. General Education: The General Education requirements for all associate degrees are set in accordance with UHCC System Policy CCCM 6004. The team verified that all degree programs at the college, including the newer AA-T or AA-S transfer degrees, include both a General Education requirement and at least 27 units of study in a focused major.

12. Academic Freedom: The team certified that the college has clear policies that protect faculty members’ and students’ rights to free speech and intellectual freedom. Safeguarding Academic Freedom is established in Board of Regents Policy 9-15 (b) and in Article IX-A of the faculty contract with the Board of Regents.

13. Faculty: The team found that most faculty is full-time and all faculty meet the minimum qualifications set by UHCC System agreement. The Board of Regents Policy 9-2 states that development and review of curriculum and assessment of student learning are primary responsibilities of faculty.

The institution has a substantial and sufficient core of full-time faculty. Clear statements of faculty responsibilities regarding development and review of curriculum and assessment of learning are noted in Academic Senate Resolutions and the faculty collective bargaining agreement; however, faculty evaluations do not yet include a component on student attainment of intended student learning outcomes.

14. Student Services: Appropriate Student Services are made available for all students. The team confirmed that KCC provides a comprehensive array of services that support student learning and development and are consistent with the student population and mission of the college. Major student services areas include admissions and records, bookstore, financial aid, counseling, matriculation, career and transfer centers, health services, outreach and retention,
testing, tutoring, and student success services. The college also has numerous special programs, disability resources, student clubs, student government, service learning, intramural recreation, and support centers for veterans and for international students.

15. Admissions: The team confirms that the college conforms to the open-access admissions policy emphasizing access, which complies with the institutional mission. The admission policy is described in the college catalog and on the college website.

16. Information and Learning Resources: Adequate Information and Learning Resources are provided. The team found the college’s information and learning resources sufficient to support its mission and its instructional programs. These resources and services are provided through the Learning Resource Center, which includes the library, Media Center, and Tutorial Center, as well as through extensive electronic databases, reference materials, and eBooks available online. Recent budget constraints were noted to reduce the purchase of books and database subscriptions, but resources were found to be adequate.

17. Financial Resources: The team confirmed that the financial resources consist primarily of state general funds and tuition and special fees charged to students and are adequate for college operations. The System and college maintain an adequate funding base, financial resources, and plans for financial development adequate to support student learning programs and services despite recent state budgetary challenges. The college maintains the required five percent contingency reserves.

18. Financial Accountability: The team verified financial accountability is demonstrated by the University of Hawai‘i’s following of and adherence with Government Accounting Standards Board (GASB) principles and by an external, independent financial audit that includes the annual A-133 audit required by the federal government.

19. Institutional Planning: The team verified that a continuous cycle of Institutional Planning and Evaluation is in place, focused on its mission and goals and aligned with the UH System Strategic Plan. All instructional and non-instructional programs undergo a full program review every five years. All areas produce Annual Program Review Updates that are integrated into the college’s planning process.

20. Public Information: The team confirmed that the public information KCC catalog includes all required information, and is augmented by a comprehensive and functional college website. Class schedules are distributed in an adequate manner, both in print and electronically.

21. Relations with the Accrediting Commission: The team confirmed the college has demonstrated appropriate relations with the Accrediting Commission, responding to all Commission communications in a timely manner. Compliance with the Eligibility Requirements has been certified by the Chancellor of KCC, the Vice President for Community Colleges of the University of Hawaii, and the President of the University of Hawaii.
STANDARD I

Institutional Mission and Effectiveness

Standard I.A. Mission

General Observations

The KCC mission statement was adopted in 2011 and is linked to the University of Hawai‘i’s Community Colleges’ (UHCC) System mission. The college mission statement expresses the college’s educational purposes for the distinct community it serves and supports six broad goals in support of the students it serves:

   1) Access
   2) Learning and Teaching
   3) Workforce Development
   4) Personal Development
   5) Community Development
   6) Diversity

Institutional demographic data indicates that most of the college’s students are seeking certificates or degrees leading to a career or to transfer. As the only higher education institution on the island of Kaua‘i, the college’s mission statement demonstrates its commitment to serving a diverse student population of all ages, cultures, and backgrounds in meeting the higher education goals of students. (Standard I.A.)

To achieve the mission, as stated in the Self-Evaluation, the college responds to community needs based on “…workforce development data, community partners’ needs, student input…and student evaluations and information obtained from various advisory board meetings.” The following statement is incorporated into the KCC mission statement and makes explicit the purpose of the institution:

   Kaua‘i Community College provides open access education and training in an ethical and innovative student-centered and community-focused environment, nurturing life-long learners who appreciate diversity and lead responsible and fulfilling lives.

Faculty and staff interview responses were insightful and consistent in describing the college’s cycle of periodic review of the mission statement. Interviewees also described how campus-wide conversations and the processes for program review and the assessment of program level student learning outcomes demonstrate KCC’s commitment to student learning and institutional capacity in addressing the needs of its student population. Furthermore, the college administers the Noel-Levitz Student Satisfaction Survey and the Community College Survey of Student Engagement (CCSSE) to assess institutional practices and to document the effectiveness of college academic and student support services. (Standard I.A.1)
The college adheres to the formal process whereby any change in the mission statement must be approved by the Board of Regents. The Board of Regents approved the college's current mission statement at its regular meeting on May 19, 2011. (Standard I.A.2.)

The mission statement review process involves the in-depth participation of collegewide faculty, staff, students, and administrators. The College solicits community input on a five-year cycle, and there is a review by the College Council every two years. If a UOH System action or change in strategic directions suggests a potential change in the college’s mission statement, then a procedure is in place for the College Council to review the mission statement. The mission statement review policy also stipulates that the College Council may determine when a more comprehensive review and revision is necessary prior to the end of the five-year review cycle. (Standard I.A.3.)

The Self Evaluation Report describes how the mission of the college drives strategic planning and guides the program review and Annual Program Review Update processes. Requests for resources are also assessed and prioritized in accordance to their alignment with the six broad goals that are also linked to the mission of the college. (Standard I.A.4.)

Findings and Evidence

According to the demographic data outlining student majors at KCC fall 2006 to spring 2012, program offerings are meeting the educational purposes of the institution and serving the needs of the intended student population. In fall of 2011, 65.2% of students seeking an Associate Degree or Certificate of Achievement were declared as Liberal Arts majors. The liberal arts major prepares students for transfer or to declare in one of the CTE programs. The college has also expanded the number of certificate and degree offerings in response to community and workforce development needs. The Evaluation Team’s campus tour highlighted new program offerings that are aligned to the mission of the college and its new ILOs. (Standard I.A.)

Evidence of several processes are in place to assess institutional effectiveness and to ensure that student learning programs and services are aligned with the institution’s mission and intended student population. For example, the Curriculum Committee’s Course Action Form (CAF) and course evaluation review process for course deletions/additions, modifications, course review, and program changes shows how the mission statement is reflected upon in the development of Program Student Learning Outcomes (PSLOs), Institutional Student Learning Outcomes (ISLOs), and Course Student Learning Outcomes (CSLOs). Interviews further validated how the recent changes in the mission statement served as the driver for the college in re-framing its Institutional Learning Outcomes (ILOs)—the college moved from five ILOs to 10 distinct new ILOs.

In another instance, the results and findings of a recent Noel-Levitiz Student Satisfaction Survey and Community College Survey of Student Engagement (CCSSE) were used to assess institutional effectiveness and to identify ways in which the college could address gaps in services and specific needs its student population. Positively, the Noel-Levitiz Student Satisfaction Survey affirmed student satisfaction with more than 50 percent of the survey’s respondents describing their college experience as better or much better than expected, and 73
percent saying that they would enroll again. On the other hand, the findings of the Noel-Levitz Student Satisfaction Survey and the CCSSE revealed the lack of student satisfaction with a specific student service. The college responded to that finding by using that data as a justification in hiring an additional student services staff person to alleviate that gap in services which has resulted in the improved delivery of support services for students. (Standard I.A.1)

The April 26, 2011, College Council meeting notes provides evidence of the approval of a new and revised mission statement for KCC mission and indicates that the revision resulted from an inclusive process that involved students, staff, faculty, administrators, and the community. The college forwarded the new mission statement to the Board of Regents (BOR) for approval at its May 2011 meeting. The Board of Regents’ May 10, 2011, minutes show approval and identify the most significant changes to the college mission statement in aligning the KCC mission statement with changes made in the University mission statement. Each mission now emphasizes the importance of being an indigenous-serving institution and to reflect the institution’s purposes in serving the Native Hawaiian student population and Hawai‘i in general. The mission statement is published in the 2012-2013 KCC College Catalog and may be viewed by the public on the college’s website. The college’s mission is also prominently displayed on campus banners. (Standard I.A.2)

Interviews and college documents revealed that there is a clearly defined process for the review of the mission statement or to respond to any circumstances that would prompt changes to the mission. The college’s mission statement review cycle has been formalized since the last evaluation team visit as shown by the dates whereby actions were taken to review and revise the mission statement between the years of 2006 and 2011. Faculty and staff interviews during the visit revealed a consistent understanding and buy-in for the periodic review cycle of the mission that is currently in place at the college. The April 2011 KCC employee survey which was designed and administered to collect information on the perception of issues related to governance, policies, procedures, and communication shows that 54 percent of faculty, staff, and administrators strongly agree or agree that there is an effective mission statement review process in place at the college. (Standard I.A.3)

Strong evidence exists to demonstrate that the college’s mission is central to institutional planning and decision-making. Results of the 2011 Faculty and Staff Survey indicated that 24 percent of its respondents strongly agree and 49 percent agree that they understand how the college’s mission statement directs the strategic planning process. The Annual Program Report Updates, Program service units to demonstrate how all proposed projects and expenditures will support achievement of institutional strategic goals, improve student learning, or assist the college in achieving of its mission. For example, of the 31 Annual Program Review Updates in 2011, 23 of the requests (i.e. facilities/ equipment; faculty and staff; academic support, financial resources, and curriculum) focused on the college’s teaching and learning goals (Standard I.A.4).

Conclusions

The college meets Standard I.A.

Recommendations None
Standard I.B. Improving Institutional Effectiveness

General Observations

The team found evidence of broad employee participation and dialogue about student learning. However, the institution has not developed SLOs for all courses and no Institutional Learning Outcomes have been assessed yet. The college has completed several cycles of SLO assessments for many of its courses.

Findings and Evidence

The college promotes dialogue by providing a number of structured opportunities for faculty to discuss assessment results collected with the Assessment Coordinator and with each other, for example at the Annual Assessment Afternoon in March. (Standard 1.B.1)

Interviews with administrators, faculty, and staff indicate that the institution enjoys a collegial set of relationships that facilitate ongoing institutional planning, resource allocation, and assessment to improve institutional effectiveness. The college has a cohesive approach to promoting reflective dialogue about continuous improvement of student learning through its Assessment Committee and College Council. It is also worthy of note that Administrative Services has developed Service Outcomes that are in use to evaluate several administrative departmental areas. (Standard 1.B.2)

The college’s integrated planning process centers on its Annual Program Review Update. This planning process integrates strategic goals and priorities with SLO assessment and resource allocation in order to support the institutional mission and the achievement of student learning outcomes. The Annual Program Review Update process is widely understood and participated in by faculty, staff, and managers.

The Annual Program Review Update process is reviewed annually and there is evidence of this review resulting in improvements to the planning and resource allocation process. However, there is no regular, ongoing assessment of KCC’s primary shared governance body, the College Council. Neither is there regular, ongoing assessment of the subcommittee of the College Council that is responsible for overseeing the evaluation and assessment of student learning outcomes, the Assessment Committee. (Standard 1.B.4)

The college receives Annual Program Review Data reports on eleven of its degree and/or certificate granting programs from the University of Hawaii system office. Additionally, in the spring, each instructor receives a set of course-level assessment data for each course that was taught in the past year, the Course Assessment Report of Data (CARD). These data sources are routinely referenced and reflected upon in the Annual Program Review Update. (Standard 1.B.5)

Although there is a robust process for the Annual Program Review Update, the 2012 Governance manual indicates that there are numerous programs that have not had a comprehensive program review in over five years and that there are others that are not scheduled for review until well past the five year window. (Standard 1.B.6)
The college’s Assessment Coordinator has worked with individual faculty and groups of faculty to establish SLOs for most courses. According to the October 15, 2012, *College Status Report on Student Learning Outcomes Implementation* to the ACCJC, the college has developed SLOs for 79% of courses, and 52% of college courses are benefitting from ongoing assessment. The college has identified SLOs for 14 programs and has assessment in place for 9 of those programs. Eight of nine student learning and support departments have defined SLOs and six have ongoing assessment in place. The college has defined ten Institutional Learning Outcomes, although no ILOs have been assessed. (Standard 1.B.3)

The Assessment Committee is responsible for reviewing and approving course and program SLOs. It is a sub-Committee of the College Council, it reports annually to the College Council or more often, if requested. The Assessment Committee is chaired by the Assessment Coordinator. Membership is comprised of the Institutional Researcher, Chancellor, Vice-Chancellor of Academic Affairs, representatives from each Division, as well as a student and one representative each from Student Services, Academic Support and Administrative support. SLO CARD data and analysis is included in the Annual Program Review Updates that are reviewed by the College Council approximately mid-year. (Standard 1.B.2)

The College Council is the central body for planning and resource allocation at KCC. It includes representatives from instructional units, administrative units, student government, and administration. College Council makes recommendations to the chancellor on topics such as the college’s mission, strategic plans, priorities, budget allocation, and student learning. It conducts an annual evaluation of the Annual Program Review Update process, as evidenced by minutes from the College Council meetings and through interviews. The institution integrates resource requests and program review plans into a unified list that allows for prioritizing of action plans and resource allocation. The effectiveness of planning is diluted when, as noted above, comprehensive program reviews have not been examined in a number of years. The college community’s focus on annual planning is weakened when comprehensive program planning is in arrears. (Standard 1.B.7)

Discussion with administrators, faculty and staff, indicate a widespread understanding of the Annual Program Review Update process and the role that College Council plays in evaluating resource requests made through the Annual Program Review Update process. A 2011 survey of employees found that 82% of staff, faculty and administrators agreed that they actively participate in processes to discuss, plan and implement ideas for improvement and that 73% of employees felt that they understood how the college’s mission statement directs strategic planning. Finally, 60% of employees felt that they knew how to learn about decisions made or announced at College Council meetings. This last data point has spurred an initiative by the Chancellor to improve communication and transparency about outcomes of resource allocation rankings. (Standards 1.B.4, 1.B.5)

**Conclusions**

The team found that the college had an integrated planning process in place that was widely understood and widely participated in. The evidence of evaluation of the college’s planning
process was somewhat difficult to locate, but after extensive interviews and research, the Team
determined that regular evaluation of the planning processes was indeed ongoing and that
numerous improvements to the process had been made over the years through this continuous
quality improvement process.

Although the college has a number of courses and academic programs that are regularly
assessing SLOs and using the assessment results to improve student learning, there are numerous
gaps in the college’s course, program and institutional learning outcomes. Institutional Learning
Outcomes, in particular, had not been assessed at all because they have just undergone revision.
In addition, the team found that comprehensive program reviews throughout the college were out
of date.

The college partially meets the Standard.

Recommendations

**Recommendation #1: Student Learning Outcomes**
As was noted in the 2006 visiting team report and to meet standards, the team recommends that
the college accelerate the development, implementation, and assessment of learning outcomes
for all courses, programs, and student support services, with special emphases on the assessment
of institutional learning outcomes and on the timeliness and completeness of comprehensive
program review. (ER 10, Standards I.B.1, I.B.6, I.B.7, II.A.1.c, II.B.4, II.C.2)

**Recommendation #2: Institutional Effectiveness**
As was noted in the 2006 visiting team report and to meet the standards, the team recommends
that the college:

(a) develop a timeline for, and method of measuring its success in accomplishing its goals
and quality assurance processes;
(b) integrate the results of measurements of success in accomplishing goals and quality
assurance processes into its overall planning and decision making processes on a more
comprehensive basis;
(c) incorporate on a regular basis the results of such measurements into the process of
reviewing the mission statement. (I.B.2, I.B.3)
STANDARD II
Student Learning Programs and Service

Standard II.A. Instructional Programs

General Observations

Kaua‘i Community College is clearly a comprehensive, independent community college
committed to student achievement and success. The course of study is rigorous and fitting for an
institution of higher education. Faculty is well qualified and committed to the best practices in
pedagogy. Numerous options exist for students interested in career training, degree attainment,
transfer, or remedial education. The college and its programs are a source of pride for residents
of the entire island. The college promulgates a culture of planning that is linked to budgeting, of
participative governance, and of data informed decision making. Instructional and student
services administrators and managers demonstrate a particularly high level of professional
expertise and of caring for employees and students alike.

Findings and Evidence

The college demonstrates that all instructional programs align with the mission of the college and
upholds its integrity through a series of reviews. New proposals undergo a series of curriculum
reviews in which a statement of the alignment of the program with the college mission and goals
is needed. In addition, program review is designed to include a comprehensive five-year
program review process with annual program review updates. The college generally does an
excellent job with the annual program review process. (Standard I.A.1)

Potential students are assessed with the COMPASS placement test in reading, writing, and
mathematics. Students are placed in courses based on the assessment test results. In addition, an
analysis of the University of Hawaii Demographic Information and Achievement Data for the
college as well as the Kaua‘i Economic Development Plan’s Comprehensive Economic
Development Strategy Report was conducted to identify student needs. Student learning
outcomes assessment data are analyzed to evaluate the achievement of stated learning outcomes.
(Standard II.A.1.a)

Traditional face-to-face is the most popular mode of instruction. Technology is serving as
supplemental to this type of instruction. Technology has been adopted campus-wide. Smart
boards are being adopted and faculty is being trained. In addition, simulation labs, commercial
kitchens, hand-on shops, cooperative education, and online instruction modes are also used.
Faculty members discuss delivery systems and modes of instruction at division meetings. The
appropriateness of various modes of instruction is evaluated during the curriculum review
process. Delivery methods and modes of instruction are further evaluated for their effectiveness
in meeting students’ needs through instructor and course evaluations.

The Office of Continuing Education and Training (OCET) provides noncredit educational
opportunities. OCET courses emphasize workforce development as well as training for best
practice in business and industry. The OCET uses a variety of traditional, innovative and
distance education courses are available.

The college currently offers 14 online courses. Some of the online courses include support
services such as online tutoring while others did not. Furthermore, the online courses available
in the Laulima platform do not follow a uniform format of college resources and services
available to online learners. The online courses do not present features adaptable for students
with disabilities.

Interviews revealed the college plans to expand distance education course offerings in an effort
to reach prospective non-island residents. The college plans to begin offering online general
education courses in the near future, although further refinement of the college’s online program
is needed prior to expansion. (Standard II.A.1.b)

Processes have been established for the development and assessment of course student learning
outcomes, program student learning outcomes, and institutional (degree) student learning
outcomes. Faculty members are responsible for the development and assessment of student
learning outcomes. Benchmarks for student attainment of course student learning outcomes are
kept consistent across sections. Instructors assess student learning outcomes each semester.
Instructors record student performance results on a course assessment report of data (CARD)
form. The CARD contains course student learning outcomes; individual student achievement
data; performance benchmarks; instructor analysis of results; and instructor plans for
improvement. Data are aggregated across sections by the Assessment Coordinator and
Institutional Researcher and analytical reports are presented at the Annual Assessment afternoon
during Excellence in Education Day on the first Friday in March. During this time, faculty
members discuss reports and plans for instructional improvements. Program student learning
outcomes are assessed through aggregate course student learning outcomes assessment data as
well as through the comprehensive program review and annual update process. As indicated in
the Self-Evaluation Report, 70 percent of all course offerings use the Course Assessment Report
of Data as an assessment reporting instrument. According to the October 2012 College Status
Report on Student Learning Outcomes Implementation for the ACCJC, 79% of the courses have
defined course student learning outcomes and 52% of the courses are conducting assessment of
student learning outcomes. The college also reports that 100% of the programs have defined
student learning outcomes, and 64% of the college programs are conducting assessments.
Interviews revealed that 100 new courses have been added which have not been offered nor
assessed.

Interviews reveal that efforts are being made to increase participation in ongoing assessments of
course and program student learning outcomes. Campus-wide dialogue is held throughout the
semester. Assessment Coordinator offers workshops, conducts training in small and one-on-one
settings, attends division meetings, and conducts activities at the Excellence in Education Day in
March. The interviews also reveal that there isn’t a written timeline the college will follow in the
assessment of their CSLOs and PSLOs.

Further interviews revealed that in spring 2012, the college had five Institutional Student
Learning Outcomes (ISLOs). The initial 5 ISLOs did not go through the assessment process. At
the end of spring 2012, the ISLOs were revised to 10 and were approved by the College Council in May 2012. They will be implemented in January 2013. The college continues its efforts to reach proficiency in SLO assessment and has designed a homegrown system (Assessment Database) that will store SLO assessment data results which in turn will be used to conduct aggregated analysis of ISLOs each semester and link them to the Strategic goals. This Assessment Database has web-capability and will allow faculty to input assessment results. (Standard II.A.1.c)

The college has established procedures to ensure the high quality of all instructional courses and programs. These procedures include: the hiring of highly qualified faculty; a rigorous curriculum review process; a five-year comprehensive program review with annual program review updates process; collaboration with the University of Hawaii Community College System office; and consultations with appropriate discipline advisory committees. The college currently offers 14 online courses. Some of the online courses include support services such as online tutoring while others did not. Furthermore, the online courses available in the Lualima platform do not follow a uniform format of college resources and services available to online learners. The online courses do not present features adaptable for students with disabilities. Prior to teaching distance learning courses, faculty members receive training through one-on-one meetings and workshops by the Instructional Technology specialist. (Standard II.A.2)

Faculty members have primary roles in strengthening and developing instructional programs and courses including the development and assessment of student learning outcomes. The college curriculum and assessment committees have major responsibilities in these areas. Procedures in these areas are clearly outlined via appropriate handbooks, handouts, and college website. In addition, the program review process strengthens these policies and procedures. (Standard II.A.2.a)

Faculty members from the ten different campuses on the University of Hawaii System collaborate during the Program Coordinating Council. They attend state-wide meetings with counterparts from other campuses to establish program competencies and student learning outcomes across similar programs. Campus programs have advisory committees composed of vocational professionals who provide advice to help establish performance level student learning outcomes. Advisory committees in Career and Technical Education (CTE) Programs meet regularly; committees evaluate programs on instructional procedures, equipment, and the facility. The advisory committees also provide input on the general trends in the industry and advice on skills, knowledge, and abilities that should be included in the curriculum to prepare students to succeed in the field of work. Program student learning outcomes are reviewed and competencies set by the program are evaluated. Committees provide feedback to develop and restructure the program’s curriculum as necessary to meet current industry and national standards. (Standard II.A.2.b)

The quality of instruction is assured by hiring highly qualified instructor who meet or exceed the minimum qualification. Furthermore, professional development opportunities are provided to faculty and staff. The appropriate breadth, depth, rigor, and sequencing of courses are assured through a systematic five-year cycle of curriculum review and revision. Most programs conduct
course student learning outcomes assessment each semester. Programs are evaluated annually through the program review update process. (Standard II.A.2.c)

Various modes of delivery, including traditional face-to-face, distance learning, and cooperative learning are utilized at the college. Distance learning courses to reach students who are unable to participate in traditional face-to-face courses are provided. The college mentions an Actionable Improvement Plan (AIP) to increase the number of distance learning offerings. Prior to the implementation of this AIP, the college must develop comprehensive and equivalent support services for distance education students. COMPASS Placement Test is administered to identify prospective students' initial educational level. The college provides support services such as tutoring, the College Success Center, and an Introduction to college course to new students. Available resources are listed on website. A counselor for the Disabled Students Program assist self-identified students with special needs and provides assistance for instructors on teaching methodologies that are appropriate for this student population and advises the college on meeting American Disabilities Act compliance. Support services such as tutoring and sign language interpreters are provided for the identified students. Programs assess courses and teaching methodologies to determine if they are appropriate, effective, and reflective of student learning needs. Department faculty and program coordinators identify instructional need and develop distance courses when needed. Faculty members are responsible for making and implementing changes when needed. The college provides professional development opportunities such as workshops, seminars, and conversations that provide faculty with opportunities to discuss best practices. The college offers online courses. Faculty who are interested in teaching online are trained and certified through one-on-one training sessions and professional development workshops by the college Instructional Technologist. (Standard II.A.2.d)

The college has in place systematic review processes for evaluation of courses and programs. These include course assessment report of data (CARDS); annual program review updates, comprehensive program review, and course approval forms (CAF). Programs complete yearly program reviews to evaluate their relevancy and effectiveness with Annual Program Review Update which also assesses the appropriateness of courses and program goals to college and system wide goals. Programs are reviewed annually. Courses undergo a five year cycle of review of effectiveness, relevancy, and alignment with program student learning outcomes. CARDS, which include student learning outcomes, are completed each semester. The Annual Report of Instructional Program Data summarizes effectiveness, efficiency, demand, and student achievement. Some programs are undergoing changes including new curriculum changes. (Standard II.A.2.e)

Comprehensive program review process is based on the mission and goals in the College's Strategic Plan and is tied to the decision making at the college. Comprehensive Program Review is conducted in five year cycles and updates are submitted annually. Comprehensive Program Review and Course Approval Form (CAF) guidelines are aligned with University of Hawaii Community College System's Function Map to ensure integrated planning and improvement are in place for all course, certificates, and programs. An ongoing systematic evaluation of course and program student learning outcomes, and their alignment with institutional student learning outcomes and University of Hawaii System requirements are integrated in the college's planning cycle. The college has the 2008-2015 Strategic Plan Update that was developed parallel with the
University of Hawaii System Strategic Outcome and Performance Measures, 2008-2015, and the University of Hawaii Community College Strategic Outcomes and Performance Measures 2008-2015; resulting in the college's goals in the context of the system's strategic plans. Curriculum review process ensures that courses have clearly stated course student learning outcomes which align with programs and institution student learning outcomes. Summative data reports are provided to faculty on their reported courses. Annual Assessment Afternoons are scheduled; these serve as an opportunity for faculty to review the data and implement any systematic improvements or changes that can result in student learning. (Standard II.A.2.f)

The college doesn’t use departmental course and/or program examinations. Some vocational programs are required to meet national standards and pass licensure examinations. (Standard II.A.2.g)

Unit credit hours awarded by college are governed by University of Hawaii Policy which is reflective of the credit hours accepted by Department of Education. Credit is awarded based upon students’ successful demonstration of achievement on the course student learning outcomes. Course student learning outcomes are designed, established, and assessed. Course student learning outcomes and their assessment are elements of the Course Action Form. (Standard II.A.2.h)

There is an established process for the development and adoption of program student learning outcomes. All programs have developed, or are in the process of developing program student learning outcomes. Assessment of program student learning outcomes must be accelerated. Elective and required degree or certificate courses address program student learning outcomes. Satisfactory completion of these courses indicates mastery of program student learning outcomes. (Standard II.A.2.i)

The college catalog provides a chart outlining the General Skills/ED core options for A.S and A.A.S. Degrees. General education area categories and course options are included. The college catalog communicates its philosophy through statement of its mission, goals, and institutional student learning outcomes. As part of the curriculum review process in the area of general education requirements for the A.A.S. degree, special attention should be given to the rigor of math and English courses to ensure the curriculum is college level.

In 2011, Curriculum Committee approved new requirements for the Liberal Arts A.A. degree. Liberal Arts faculty revised the program’s SLOSs to more clearly describe their vision of the program and collaborated to ensure articulation requirements for general education curriculum.

Per evidence during the visit, the college recognizes that it doesn’t meet the standard in regard to the rigor of math and English being pre-collegiate and has generated a plan of action to begin to take place in fall 2013 and be reflected in the 2013-14 college catalog. These changes include the development of new college level courses and a recreation of the program matrix to reflect that the improvements will ensure collegiate level rigor. (Standard II.A.3)

A.A., A.S., and A.S.S. degree programs require a general education component which includes courses in the areas of humanities and fine arts; the natural sciences; and the social sciences. As
new courses are approved, courses in the humanities and fine arts, in the natural sciences, and in the social sciences are reviewed for the possibility of meeting general education requirements. There is a systematic process in place to specify and incorporate courses that fulfill the general education requirements. Faculty members take the lead and submit appropriate documents to division leaders and to the Curriculum Committee before the Vice Chancellor of Academic Affairs and the Chancellor review the documents. This review process has identified the inappropriate inclusion of pre-collegiate level courses as satisfying established general education curriculum standards, which the college is correcting. (Standard II.A.3.a)

Communication, information competency, and thinking/reasoning are embedded in the college mission statement. They also form part of their institutional student learning outcomes. The institutional student learning outcomes are linked to program student learning outcomes and to course student learning outcomes resulting in the intertwining of the institutional student learning outcomes into courses taught and programs offered. (Standard II.A.3.b)

The college recognized the importance of what it means to be an ethical human being and effective citizen. As a result, they adopted the principles and skills described in the standard. They are part of the institutional student learning outcomes which are mapped to program student learning outcomes and course student learning outcomes. Responsibility is practiced in and outside the classroom via multiple activities: service learning, interpersonal skills, student clubs, recycling events. Multiple projects have had participation by students of the college. (Standard II.A.3.c)

The college has instructional programs leading to the associate degree. Most of the programs have focused study in at least one area of inquiry. The other program has established an interdisciplinary core leading to an Associate of Arts degree. (Standard II.A.4)

Satisfactory achievement of program learning outcomes demonstrates technical and professional competencies for vocational and occupational certificates and degrees. Data was presented on the results of 2006-2010 Nursing exams for licensure: NCLEX-RN (pass rate 74-94 percent) and NCLEX-PN (pass rate 81-100 percent); Massage Therapy Program Hawaii State Exam for 2007-2011; and ASE Technician Certification Exam for 2009-2010. (Standard II.A.5)

Basic program information, descriptions of degrees and certificates, and degree and certificate requirements are included in brochures distributed at local high schools, fairs (college and career), and at the One Stop Center. Information is also available on the website and in the catalog (printed and digital versions). Students can self-monitor their progress towards degree completion. Online program advising sheets exists. STAR program from University of Hawaii System aids students in the self-monitor. Course syllabi contain course student learning outcomes and are provided digitally and printed at the beginning of the semester. Digital versions are also submitted to division and Vice Chancellor of Academic Affairs secretaries. (Standard II.A.6)

Information regarding credit for courses is presented in the college catalog and is available on the college website. Section 5-14 of Board of Regents Policy of University of Hawaii System describes that students can enroll in one campus and can complete (transfer) coursework at
another campus in the system. Courses developed by University of Hawaii- Manoa are accepted by the community college consortium of the system. Each college campus has a general education board that review proposed courses and determine if they fulfill transfer requirement. In 2011, the college adopted the University of Hawaii System’s Foundations and Diversifications hallmarks and modified the basic requirements for the Associate of Arts degree. (Standard II.A.6.a)

Board Bylaws and Policies indicate commitment to the students enrolled in programs. The college is committed to students completing the education in a timely manner. If a program is planned to be eliminated, no new students are admitted but sections are offered for those enrolled. Significant changes to programs have to go through the procedure established by the college. Significant changes need to express how student affected by the change will complete the program. Students are also responsible for self-monitoring their progress to their educational goal. The monitoring can be done via STAR or meetings with a counselor. (Standard II.A.6.b)

Each spring semester the catalog is reviewed and updated by the appropriate person or group who has oversight a particular portion. Efforts toward clarity, accuracy, and consistency are made. The revised catalog is printed and digitally available to the students. The schedule is available in printed and digital versions. Program brochures are revised and updated by academic divisions. The college website is monitored by webmaster and Information Technology Advisory Council. There are college wide contributions to the content of the website. The Self-Evaluation Report acknowledges that the college does not have coherent policies in regard to the assignment of marketing responsibilities for the various forms of media. A major step toward making appropriate assignments of marketing responsibilities was the hiring of a Marketing Director in summer 2012. (Standard II.A.6.c)

Board policies on academic freedom and responsibility as well as student academic honesty exist. The Faculty Advisory Committee on Academic Freedom is responsible for hearing academic freedom cases. The Faculty Senate also deals with faculty academic freedom issues. The college catalog presents the expectation of the principles of academic honesty and sanctions as a result of their violations. In addition, various other campus publications also include reference to academic honesty and to the sanctions for its violation. Course syllabi are required to include information regarding academic honesty. This is accomplished by including the actual policy or by referencing where the policy can be located. (Standard II.A.7)

Academic freedom and a list of procedures for dealing with alleged infringements of academic freedom are listed in Article IX of the 2009-2015 agreement which protects academic freedom for faculty and Article IV (Faculty Professional Responsibilities and Workload) which defines faculty professional standards. There is a grievance procedure in place. No formal grievance regarding faculty not distinguishing between personal conviction and professional accepted views in class has occurred. The college plans to distribute the policies to newly hired faculty and to include in college catalog and website and to include information on Student Academic Grievance Procedure. (Standard II.A.7.a)

Academic honesty policy and sanctions for its violation are stated. Expectations concerning student academic honesty are expressed in the catalog. Some instructors include it in syllabi.
Campus wide publications that contain this information are available. The team was found several instances where the policies stated in different publications were not the same. The team had difficulty locating a policy having to do with non-academic grievances and the procedures students were required to follow in order to file such a complaint. For absolute clarity for all parties, each policy should read the same in each publication. It will serve students best to have all of the policies involving grievances presented together in the various publications. (Standard II.A.7.b)

The college does not impose a particular set of beliefs or worldview to its employees. (Standard II.A.7.c)

The college does not operate or offer programs in locations outside of the USA. (Standard II.A.8)

Conclusions

The college addresses the diverse categories of student learning outcomes and systematically assesses them. Assessment results are analyzed, disseminated, and considered when improvements or changes are needed. Students are offered high-quality instructional programs that lead to certificates, employment, or transfer to higher education institutions. Changes are incorporated when needed. The college has not reached the SLO Proficiency level stipulated by the ACCJC. All programs have developed, or are in the process of developing program student learning outcomes. Assessment of program student learning outcomes must be accelerated.

The college partially meets this Standard.

Recommendations

Recommendation #1: Student Learning Outcomes
As was noted in the 2006 visiting team report and to meet standards, the team recommends that the college accelerate the development, implementation, and assessment of learning outcomes for all courses, programs, and student support services, with special emphases on the assessment of institutional learning outcomes and on the timeliness and completeness of comprehensive program review. (ER 10, Standards I.B.1, I.B.6, I.B.7, II.A.1.c, II.B.4, II.C.2)

Recommendation #3: Student Learning Programs and Services

See UHCC Recommendation 2
Standard II. B. Student Support Services

General Observations

KCC provides a variety of Student Support Services to recruit and assist its unique and diverse population of students. The college has committed structures, programs, staff, and resources to promote student success. The data submitted in support of student success reflects due diligence to tell the college’s story with numbers.

Findings and Evidence

The college provides quality support services and programs to address the unique needs of its students. The MyUH student portal provides students easy access to the registration process, class enrollment, fees, account information and payments, access to financial aid information and other tools for a successful matriculation to the college. The newly opened One Stop Center (2007) and Bookstore and Office of Continuing Education and Training (2010) provides students a centrally located support and service center. All student support services are within two-minute walking radius of each other.

The Waiʻaleʻale Project, since its inception in 2010, has grown to 155 students and has attained student success benchmarks in grade-point average and persistence that exceeds the general KCC general population. The project is to be commended for the positive impact the Waiʻaleʻale Project has made at the college.

Admissions and Records Office provides a secure environment for students' academic records from registration and enrollment to graduation and/or transfer. Veterans' Affairs is also housed in the admissions and records office to provide VA certification, transcript evaluations, and address other student-veteran issues.

Counseling and Advising Department has a student-centered philosophy, the counselors assist new students with the matriculation process and meet with all entering first time college students. During the second semester, these students are assigned to a department advisor in their field of study or major. In addition, the counselors are assigned to academic departments to serve as liaisons between student services and instruction. In a fall 2011 survey, Division Chairs and Program Coordinators strongly agreed that the counselors were effective in assisting the divisions developing course schedules and curriculum. Two counselors are assigned to three public high schools to administer the COMPASS placement test and to promote the Running Start and Early Admit programs.

New Student Orientation (NSO) is encouraged, but not required of new entering students. Orientation topics include: financial aid, tutoring services, classroom expectations along with many other topics to promote a successful transition to college. The data shows that students who participated in fall 2010 (40% of the entering class) and fall 2011 (39%) attained a 2.0 GPA or higher (fall 2010 70%; fall 2011 76%). As a result of the positive results, the college recognizes NSO as a standing committee and allocated a budget to assist new entering students.
Running Start and the Early Admit programs also are designed to foster student success. Each program enrolls students from the high schools who are academically or vocationally gifted to earn high school and college credit while in their junior and senior years of high school. As many as 61 students participated in fall 2011.

Career Center offers students the opportunity to explore careers, major, and occupations. Students can also take a career vocational aptitude inventory to gain a better knowledge of career paths or course of study. Currently, the Career Center is working through some staffing concerns to provide more services.

The college has a robust Financial Aid Department in support of students. For the academic year 2006-2007, 553 students applied for financial aid, a total of 190 students were awarded a Pell Grant, while 306 students received some type of financial aid. In the year 2009-2010, 1,144 students applied, 427 were awarded a Pell Grant, while 590 received some type of financial aid. The growth in student financial aid application has doubled in three years. Distance education students can also apply for financial aid via the web.

The college, through its Academic Support Services, promotes student success and access through their technical support of the library, tutoring, media services, computer services, digital media lab, and the testing center. The majority of these services are located in the Learning Commons for the convenience of the students. The team suggests that the learning commons staff continue the dialogue with student support staff on implementing the “Early Alert” system more effectively.

The COMPASS Brush-Up Program was first offered in the spring of 2005, when KCC offered a self-paced, six week tutorial to assist students in improving their math and/or writing skills. From spring 2005 through spring 2010, 237 students enrolled in math brush up. A total of 179 students (76%) completed the course. 71 students (30%) succeeded and 34 (14%) enrolled in a higher math. Participation in brush up also increased the persistence rate to the next semester from 74% for non-participants to 86% for those who participated.

Services are provided to students with disabilities. Students with disabilities are counseled by a certified disabilities counselor. From 2007-2011, the population of 257 students with a wide-range of disabilities have attained 62 certificates and/or associate degrees, and two bachelor degrees. Some students achieved multiple awards so there is some duplication in the numbers. As a result of their success, Disability Services received $421,262 in grant funding to assist disabled students persist and graduate. The college requires faculty and Distance Education faculty to inform students on their syllabus that there are support services on campus to accommodate their learning needs. The team feels the Disability Counselor needs to be a regular part of the convocation and faculty orientation agenda. Disabled students’ needs change (e.g. increase in Post-Traumatic Stress Disorder cases from returning veterans). Thereby, the college community can maintain currency on the challenges these students face in college.

The college is fortunate to have a well-established and well known Campus Wellness Center. From January 2009 to September 2011, the CWC provided health services for 1,219 registered students. This number reflects actual services and not just visits. The services rendered included:
Family Planning, Vaccines, Health Screenings, Urgent Care, Counseling, and Healing Touch. The CWC and Nursing Program both adhere to Health Insurance Portability and Accountability Act (HIPAA) regulations.

The active and lively Student Life Center is located in the college’s Campus Center. The Student Activities Council (SAC) and other student organizations meet here. The Campus Center offers students a lounge, game room, offices, meeting facilities, and also host community events. Student Life is funded by student fees collected by students enrolled credit courses. Currently there are 18 campus clubs which give students an opportunity for advocacy, global understanding, and involvement with the mission of the college.

In its efforts to assure quality in its student support areas, the well-known and well-utilized Noel-Levitz Student Satisfaction Survey is used. Most recently, the survey was administered in spring 2008 and spring 2010. Only 10% of the approximately 1400 KCC students completed the survey. The sample was small but garnered some very positive and constructive feedback for counseling and financial aid. The counseling department has responded with a goal of having each new student complete an educational plan by the end of the first year. Financial Aid responded by hiring two new financial aid officers to respond to the needs of the students. The team suggests that the college research methods to garner a larger sampling of the student satisfaction survey. (Standard II.B.1)

The current catalog (2012-2013) provides its constituencies with precise, accurate, and current information regarding the following topical areas: general information, requirements, and major policies affecting students, organized into three major sections. It contains all of the recommended information with the exception of the non-academic grievance procedures. It is a user friendly document. It is colorful and has an excellent table of contents and a very complete index. (Standard II.B.2)

The frontline Student Support Services e.g. Admissions and Records, Counseling, Financial Aid, Veterans’ Affairs, tutoring, are all available on site, on website, and by phone. The application process for admissions and financial aid can be performed in person, by mail, or online. A Frequently Asked Questions (FAQ) service is provided by the Academic Support Center through a link on the college website. (Standard II.B.3.a)

The college provides an environment which fosters growth, personal and civic responsibility. KCC offers a myriad of programs (e.g. Service Learning, Volunteers in Service to America, and 18 campus clubs) that address the special interests of students and promote student advocacy, involvement and personal growth. The Student Life section of the Self-Evaluation Report reflects increasing numbers of student participation. (Standard II.B.3.b)

The counseling staff is involved with all aspects of counseling and advising to ensure a successful transition of KCC’s students into the college system. The use of SARS to track and monitor student utilization for potential course offering and curriculum is positive. An effort should be made to revisit the Early Alert system and increase faculty usage and support. The effective use of this tool has proven to be dramatic, especially with “at risk” students and its
positive impact on student success is measurable. Group counseling could also be explored as it would bring a different dynamic to the counseling session. (Standard II.B.3.c)

The college clearly supports its students understanding and appreciation of diversity. From the Wai’ale’ale Project (a program for students of Native-Hawaiian ancestry), to the popular Culinary Arts Program which incorporates foods from different cultures, to the Cultural and Diversity Fair, this is an entire college community priority. (Standard II.B.3.d)

The college Admissions and Records Office administered the Noel-Levitz Student Satisfaction Survey over the internet for spring 2010 applicants. The feedback they received from the survey indicated the Admissions office has made notably improvement to the application process. The assessment and effectiveness of placement scores are reviewed by the Office of Planning, Assessment, and Policy Analysis for the entire UH system. They try to ensure cut-off scores are accurate and are checked for bias. (Standard II.B.3.e)

The college maintains student records, permanently, securely, and confidentially, with provision for secure back up of all files. The Registrar’s office is in compliance with state and federal regulations for FERPA and the release of Directory Information. Moreover, faculty, staff, and students have a secure site for correspondence/coursework protected with a password and P.I.N. (Standard II.B.3.f)

The college evaluates Student Support Services annually with their Program Review process and data gathered by the institutional research from SARS, Noel-Levitz Student Satisfaction Survey, and campus dialog. As a result, Student Support Services has added staff in Financial Aid, Admissions and Records, Counseling, and an Enrollment Management/Marketing Director and Career Counseling/Job Placement Counselor. Student Services programming reflects the college’s mission, goals, SLOs, and strategic plan. The team discovered a less than robust use in Student Service areas of program planning for resource allocation. In addition, the team feels there should be a more widely dispersed and widely known planning timeline among the student services areas. (Standard II.B.4)

Conclusions

The college has established structures, policies, and procedures to carry out best practices outlined in this standard. A greater emphasis should be placed on the role of Program Review in planning and budget allocation in Student Support Services as a whole. Moreover, a division Planning Cycle timeline needs to be developed and implemented in concert with workshops for the staff to complete the tasks assigned for the Program Review process. The Student Support Services Department has done an excellent job in the acquisition of physical space and specific staff to assist students in attending college through outreach and succeeding in college through counseling and financial aid opportunities.

The college meets this standard.
**Recommendations**

**Recommendation #4: Academic and Non-Academic Grievance Procedures**
Related to a recommendation from the 2006 visiting team, the team recommends that the college more fully disseminate the academic and non-academic grievance procedures in the schedule of classes, the college catalog, the college website, and the student and faculty handbooks.
(II.A.6.c, II.A.7, II. B.2.c)

Also see Recommendation #1.
Standard II.C. Library and Learning Support Services

General Observations

KCC provides a variety of Library and Learning Support Services to meet the diverse needs of its students on campus as well as distance learners. In addition to the library, learning support services include: tutoring services, instructional technology, computer services, media services, testing center, and cooperative education/internship/job placement.

Findings and Evidence

The college provides library and learning support services that are sufficient quantity, currency, depth and variety to support its instructional programs. The library maintains a book collection of 61,052 volumes reflective of the breadth of the curriculum. This is augmented by an e-book collection of over 80,000 titles. In addition, the library also maintains a collection of electronic databases which provide access to over 12,000 magazine and journal articles. Students and faculty may borrow books from the entire University of Hawaii library system via the intrasystem loan service.

Tutorial Services provides: in-class, small group, and individual tutoring; math and English brush up programs; and workshops in study skills. Tutoring is provided by faculty volunteers, community members and trained peer tutors. To expand its services to distance learners and off-campus students, Tutoring Services implemented such services as Elluminate for remote tutoring and Smarthinking for online tutoring.

Computer Services supports the college computer technology needs by establishing, maintaining, and updating hardware infrastructure and providing software support. There are approximately 600 computer systems on campus. Computer Services provides computer support to students, faculty, and staff by phone, online, and a HelpDesk service location.

Instructional Technology and Media Services facilitate the integration of technology and media into instructional programs including distance education.

The Testing Center provides free academic testing services for University of Hawaii system classes. The center also provides testing services for other universities and colleges for a fee.

The college relies upon the professional expertise of faculty, including librarians and other learning support services professionals in the selection and maintenance of materials and equipment to support student learning. Faculty participation in the selection of library and media materials is encouraged. A professional librarian is assigned to each academic division to obtain information on division information resource needs. In addition, a faculty and student focus groups were used as part of the library comprehensive program review to address the quality, quantity and depth of its collection. A Library Advisory Committee was also established. (Standard II.C.1.a)
Instruction in the effective use of library and other learning support services is a key function of each area. Moreover, information competency has been identified as an institutional learning outcome. The Instruction Librarian provides library instruction to classes as requested by instructors. Each division liaison librarian is responsible for notifying their division about library instruction and other library services. During 2010-2011, 557 students in 40 classes participated in library instruction and/or library tours of the facility. As evidenced by the library website, library research tutorials and guides are provided. In addition, a link to the University of Hawaii system LILO (Learning Information Literacy Online) is also available. Furthermore, interviews revealed that the librarians are exploring additional means of developing students' information literacy skills in support of the college's information competency institutional student learning outcome. (II.C.1.b)

Media services, tutoring services and instructional technology also provide instruction in the effective use of their equipment, materials and services. Faculty and student workshops, orientations, and online tutorials are provided on a regular basis. As indicated in the Self-Evaluation Report, learning support services have identified the need to have more instructional materials available online. (Standard II.C.1.b)

The library is open 54.5 hours per week with evening hours until 7p.m. Monday through Thursday. There are no weekend hours. Additionally, students have 24/7 access to the University of Hawaii Voyager online catalog, the library's electronic databases and ebook collection via the library website. Students' ID numbers provide remote access to these resources.

Tutorial services provide services 54.4 hours per week with evening hours until 7p.m. Monday through Thursday. There are no weekend hours. In addition, Tutorial services implemented Smarthinking which allows students to access tutoring via the internet from any place with internet access. Smarthinking offers tutoring in a variety of subjects and students can elect to communicate directly with a tutor.

In general, instructional technology, media services, and computer services have daytime hours with some units providing evening services as needed. In addition, remote or online access to some services is also provided. The testing center is open approximately 40 hours per week with evening hours until 7:00 p.m. two days per week. (Standard II.C.1.c)

In general the library and learning support services security and maintenance needs are addressed in the context of overall college security and maintenance. For additionally collection security, the library utilizes a security gate theft detection system. Due to the tropical climate, dehumidifiers are essential for the preservation of the book collection. (Standard II.C.1.d)

The library maintains consortium agreements with the Hawaii Library Consortium and the University of Hawaii Consortium. These agreements enable the library to purchase electronic information resources at lower prices than as an individual institution. There are working agreements among the University of Hawaii libraries for the intrasystem loan services as well as the shared Voyager online catalog. Utilization data are maintained and resources are evaluated on a regular basis.
Tutoring services utilizes a system agreement between the University of Hawaii Community College system and Smarthinking for online tutoring services. The Testing Center has recently entered into a formal agreement with Prometric to provide proctoring for Automotive Services Excellence Credential Exams. The Self-Evaluation Report indicates that there is a need to encourage specific and regular evaluation of contracts to ensure high quality and/or improved performance of services. (Standard II.C.1.e)

Program review documents evidence the systematic evaluation of library and learning support services. Library and learning support services undergo comprehensive program reviews every five years which are augmented by Annual Program Review Updates. The annual program review process requires a unit to analyze data, examine key performance indicators, and develop plans based on those indicators. The library and learning support services are at various stages of developing, clarifying and refining specific student learning outcomes or service outcomes. Each academic support unit developed its outcomes and assessment methods. Because of their direct relation to student learning, the Library, Tutoring Services, and Instructional Technology have identified Student Learning Outcomes. Media Services and Computer Services have identified Service Outcomes. However, it should be noted that the Testing Center has not yet developed outcomes. The Library and Tutoring Services adopted common University of Hawaii Community College system wide student learning outcomes and has conducted assessments of those outcomes. Assessment methods were primarily user satisfaction surveys, focus groups, advisory committee input, utilization data, pre and post-tests results, and achievement data. Analysis of outcomes assessment data, as well as performance indicator data resulted in the identification of areas in need of change or improvement. Improvements have been made as a result of outcomes assessment and program review. However, continuous evaluation and refinement of the program review and outcomes assessment processes is paramount. Additional training in the processes should be provided on an ongoing basis as new outcomes and data are introduced. (Standards II.C.1, II.C.2)

Conclusions
The library is truly the center of the campus at KCC. As such, it is an active area and attracts much student traffic. The breadth and depth of learning support services that are available to the students is impressive. This division uses program review as a way to link planning to resource allocation in nearly every area. The tutoring center has plans to do so as well. The college is moving toward a plan to provide satisfactory and effective learning support services for the limited number of distance education and realizes that any expansion of distance education must wait until this issue is addressed. There are a number of well-equipped and well used computer labs on campus. The labs are accessible throughout the academic day, serving both daytime and night time students. The staffing levels in all areas of student support services, seems to be quite adequate. Faculty expressed to the team an appreciation of the services that support them to support student success.

The college meets this Standard.

Recommendations  None
STANDARD III
Resources

Standard III.A. Human Resources

General Observations

The Self-Evaluation Report for Standard III.A is clearly written and addresses all of the sections of the standard. Good, compelling evidence is presented in a logical and organized fashion. There are no major recent changes that affect the discussion of this standard.

Findings and Evidence

In spite of several years of economic downturn, KCC has a quality workforce that rallies around the support of student success. Staff members are highly visible at the college. There is a great deal of staff/student interaction. Student workers are well trained and very hospitable. The team heard stories of many employees who began their association with KCC as students. The ohana spirit is readily evident throughout the staff and faculty. (Standard III.A.1)

A variety of well-articulated policies and procedures are followed to plan, recruit, select, support and evaluate management, faculty and staff. These include UH System policies and procedures, collective bargaining agreements, and local procedures. A detailed checklist of recruitment and hiring tasks and responsibilities direct all hiring processes. The Equal Employment Opportunities and Affirmative Action (EEO/AA) liaison assists and monitors hiring committee work. The college mission guides decisions to fill a position and is considered in the writing of minimum and desired qualifications. (Standard III.A.1.a)

The minimum qualifications for faculty positions are set at the system-level and require a master’s degree or combination of another type of degree and work experience in trade and technical fields. Tenured faculty is involved in the selection of new faculty, serving on Division Personnel Committees (DPCs) in each instructional division. Faculty provides input for job announcements and descriptions; and frequently sits on hiring committees outside of their divisions especially if the position relates to their field of expertise. The clerical and custodial recruitment process is governed by the rules and regulations of the state Department of Human Resource Development (DHRD) that involve significant recruitment of candidates across state agencies and the UH System before advertising to the outside. (Standard III.A.1.a)

All employees are evaluated regularly. Faculty evaluation is governed by the University of Hawai‘i Professional Assembly (UHPA) contract. Faculty contract renewal occurs on the second and fourth year of the tenure track. Divisions may choose to do review in the first and third years. Tenured faculty has a post-tenure review every five years. Civil service staff is evaluated by supervisors using the Employee Performance Appraisal form. Administrative, Professional and Technical (APT) positions personnel are evaluated by their supervisors using the UH APT Broadband online system. All other employees, including administrators, have annual performance reviews conducted by supervisors. Executive staff are evaluated annually in compliance with the BOR Policy Section 9-12 and UHCC Policy #9.202, which includes self-
evaluation and evaluations by peers, constituents, and subordinates using the 360° Executive Assessment. The Chancellor is evaluated by the UH System President and the VP for Community Colleges. (Standard III.A.1.b)

Faculty creates and assesses student learning outcomes (SLOs) at the course, program, and institutional levels. This responsibility is included in their job descriptions. The UHCC Faculty Classification Plan states faculty should, “...design measurable or observable learning outcomes and assess and provide evidence of student learning.” DPC guidelines, which are approved by UHPA, do not specifically mention student progress toward achieving SLOs as a component of faculty evaluation. There is an expectation from peers and administration that faculty include a discussion of the student progress towards SLOs in contract renewal, tenure, and promotion documents. An Actionable Improvement Plan calls for a recommendation that the UH System enter into negotiations with UHPA to include achievement of SLOs as a component of faculty evaluations. (Standard III.A.1.c)

The college mission commits to providing “education and training in an ethical and innovative student-centered and community-focused environment.” Standards for ethical behavior are stated for state employees in the Constitution of the State of Hawai‘i Article XIV, Code of Ethics and codified in the Hawai‘i Revised Statute Chapter 84. Faculty has a professional ethics policy (UHCC Policy 5.211). The UHPA contract (Article IX.D, page 18) addresses aspects of ethical behavior for employees. (Standard III.A.1.d)

A 2006 Planning Agenda was to assess the need for a specific code of ethics. Since the UHCC System established policy UHCCP 5.211 for ethical standards which applies to all UHCC campuses, a separate KCC policy was unnecessary. There is an Actionable Improvement Plan to revise the Faculty and Staff Handbook to improve citations for ethics policies. (Standard III.A.1.d)

Annual Program Review Updates are used to evaluate program staffing needs and the College Council ranks staffing requests according to the program’s evaluation and ranking criteria. Staffing levels for non-instructional areas have remained fairly constant over the past several years with the exception of the loss of several positions in both maintenance and support/service. Part-time instructor have increased from 33 in 2009 to 42 in 2010, and reaching 45 in 2011, which is linked to enrollment growth (1,104 students in fall 2008 to 1,345 in fall 2009; reaching 1,433 in fall 2011), coupled with a hiring freeze. The result has been a small increase in the average size of a credit class section. However, KCC maintains the lowest such average in the UH System. (Standard III.A.2)

System-level by BOR policies are implemented through UH Administrative Procedures to ensure fairness in employment practices. The policies and procedures are reviewed and updated periodically working with university and college representatives. The EEO/AA Coordinator works to insure these policies are followed. Collective bargaining units negotiate wages, benefits, and working conditions, which include performance evaluations and grievance procedures. (Standard III.A.3.a)
Personnel records are managed under BOR policies and implemented through UH Administrative Procedures. The UH System HR Office is responsible for initiating and recommending the development and revision of system-wide procedures. These policies are reviewed and updated periodically by representatives from various campuses and offices. Personnel records are stored in a secure database system run by the UH System Information Technology Services Office and confidential printed records are kept in a locked location with restricted access. (Standard III.A.3.b)

Administrative Procedure A9.075 Personnel Records provides instruction for the maintenance of the official personnel records for BOR appointees. Official executive/managerial and civil service employee records are maintained at the UH System Human Resources Office. Faculty and APT files are maintained at each institution’s Human Resources Office. All employee collective bargaining agreements include language addressing personnel files and files are maintained in accordance with these provisions. (Standard III.A.3.b)

Personnel files are stored securely in locked file cabinets in the HR Office and electronic employee records exist in the PeopleSoft, Banner, and the new Kuali Financial System. The systems are secured with passwords administered by the UH System. Employees may access their records in the HR Office and some personnel information is available online through the UH Profiler System (view position title, position number, and supervisory hierarchy) and the Kuali HR Management System (view vacation/leave information). HR staff is trained to maintain, protect and ensure confidentiality of records. (Standard III.A.3.b)

The UH System and KCC mission statements identify diversity as an important value, and policies are in place to create a culture that appreciates and supports diversity. This commitment is demonstrated by programs such as the Hawaiian Studies Programs, the Achieving the Dream Initiative, and Wai‘ale‘ale Project. Two Counselors support the transition of Native Hawaiian students and students with disabilities. Data on employment equity and diversity are tracked and integrated in an affirmative action plan.

BOR and UH System policies direct fair treatment of all personnel, including policies on unlawful discrimination (Executive Policy E1.202), anti-harassment (Executive Policy E1.203), persons with disabilities, EEO (UH Administrative Procedure A9.890), drug-free workplace and campus (Executive Policy E11.201), violence in the workplace (Executive Policy E9.210), and gender equity. The policies are available on the UH System website. The UH System mission recognizes a responsibility to the indigenous people of Hawaii through programs to support Hawaiian language, history, and culture. (Standard III.A.4.a)

KCC’s mission and goals uphold the institution’s commitment to equity and diversity. An Institutional SLO on social responsibility includes a subsection: “Respect for Diversity: Display an understanding of and respect for other people and cultures.” Each program has a corresponding program SLOs and many of the courses have a course student learning outcomes that addresses this as well. The Hawaiian Studies program focuses on the Native Hawaiian culture. College courses in anthropology, sociology, ethnobotany, Culinary Arts, literature, history, religion, and various language courses provide also support awareness and appreciation of diverse groups. An A.A. degree in Hawaiian Studies is being developed with the other UHCC
The college has a Disabilities Services Counselor and a Counselor for Native Hawaiian students. KCC has a local Hawaiian council, Makaloa, that interacts with P\'ko\'a and advocates for Hawaiian initiatives on the campus. (Standard III.A.4.a)

The UH System Director of EEO and associate vice president for community colleges are responsible for the overall implementation of EEO/AA policies by the colleges. As stated above, KCC's EEO/AA Coordinator implements the affirmative action plan at the campus and has the lead role in administering hiring procedures. The Coordinator oversees recruitment of personnel and ensuring the adherence to all policies. The college advocates, supports, and ensures the fair treatment of students as well. The KCC College Catalog is available on the college website and in print includes policies and grievance procedures on sexual harassment, and Nondiscrimination and EEO/AA. (Standard III.A.4.a)

BOR Policy Section 9 requires all UH institutions provide professional development opportunities for faculty and staff. KCC provides professional development workshops for faculty and staff on diversity including those focusing on Native Hawaiian values and practices; and on learning and teaching strategies for students with disabilities. A lecture series coordinated by the Library has also provided opportunities for students, faculty, and staff to increase their awareness of diverse cultures. (Standard III.A.4.a)

Employment equity data is gathered to assess employee gender and ethnicity against the service population. Additionally, an online self-identification process automatically solicits gender and ethnicity information of all applicants. The data are used to create an affirmative action plan that determines employment equity priorities, and guides efforts to maintain a diverse group of employees at the college. This plan is available in the HR Office. (Standard III.A.4.b)

Effective this fall, a full time faculty member has been granted 5/9 reassigned time to serve as Professional Development Coordinator for the college. It is a three-year assignment to allow the Coordinator more time to become more familiar and effective in managing professional development activities. The new Coordinator is actively working on the two Actionable Improvement Plans to: 1) institute a more robust system for tracking and advertising its professional development activities; and 2) to use the results of professional development assessments to plan future professional development events and activities. The Coordinator is working with the Institutional Researcher to develop a database that includes all professional development activities and to conduct and an annual professional development survey to document the activities of each employee. (Standard III.A.5.a)

The Professional Development Committee has been renamed the "Ohana Family Committee." The Coordinator is working on a vision and three-year plan and is conducting focus group interviews with instructional, student services, and administrative services departments to gain input into the planning. The Coordinator has created an informative website for Professional Development to promote participation in activities and is building a good inventory of resources; and is encouraging the college community to share ideas. (Standard III.A.5.a)

Faculty sabbaticals are provided for faculty. There are also discipline-specific opportunities that are available to faculty to support travel to conferences when funding is available. Faculty and
certain staff may also avail themselves of a waiver to attend UH classes. Other Professional
development events include: Convocation, Excellence in Education Day, the Hawai‘i National
Great Teachers Seminar, an interactive online learning system (Scenarios). College personnel
attend training sessions for applications that are system wide such as fiscal systems, human
resources systems, Banner, Laulima, and other systems needed for campus operations.
Continuing education on workplace violence, sexual harassment, health and safety, and crisis
management is provided. (Standard III.A.5.a)

OCET allows faculty and staff to take most of their courses for free if there is adequate space
subsidized by the Professional Development Fund established by the UH Foundation account.
Faculty and staff may apply for funds to support their professional development activities. Each
year the UH Foundation conducts a donation campaign to replenish this account. (Standards
III.A.5.a and III.A.5.b)

The Annual Program Review Update process and five-year program review cycle are used to
integrate program and department human resource needs with the institutional planning process.
Instructional programs use data on overall program health, number of course sections, section fill
rate, student-to-faculty ratio, graduation rates, and other measures. Non-instructional areas use
measures of the number of students utilizing a service, number of applications filed, number and
type of work orders, number of buildings. (Standard III.A.6)

Recent Annual Program Review Update requests from the Science and Mathematics Division
has resulted in several positions that were filled. The Culinary Arts Department recently hired an
APT for their program and the Business Education Division replaced several faculty members
who retired. 2012 Annual Program Review Update ranking results show that the campus is still
trying to recover from losses incurred during the hiring freeze as there were nine requests for
positions in Mathematics, Nursing, Culinary Arts, and Hawaiian Studies. (Standard III.A.5.d)

Conclusions

The college has a well-organized system for identifying human resource needs through a five-
year cycle of comprehensive program reviews and Annual Program Review Updates. There are
sufficient faculty and staff to meet the college mission and goals. There are a variety of UH
system and college policies and procedures for the hiring processes of all new positions. Hiring
processes are conducted in a fair and equitable manner. The process ensures that those hired have
the required education and experience. The student to faculty ratio is one of the lowest of the
community colleges. All employees are evaluated in accordance with state, system, and college
policies and procedures, as well as collective bargaining agreement requirements.

State, system and college policies and procedure for all aspects of human resources are available
for information and review and are carried out equitably and consistently. State, system and
college policies and procedures are followed to protect the security and confidentiality of
personnel records. The college values equity and diversity and there are numerous state, system,
and college policies, practices and programs to support this value. The college assesses its record
on employment equity and diversity in an open and honest manner; and demonstrates integrity in
the treatment of its employees and students.
There is an expectation from peers and administration that faculty include a discussion of the student progress towards SLOs in contract renewal, tenure, and promotion documents. An Actionable Improvement Plan calls for a recommendation that “the UH System enter into negotiations with UHPA to include achievement of SLOs as a component of faculty evaluations.”

The college meets Standard III.A, with the exception of Standard III.A.1.c.

Recommendations

Recommendation #5: Resources

See UHCC Recommendation 3.
Standard III.B. Physical Resources

General Observations

The Self-Evaluation Report for Standard III.B is clearly written and addresses all sections of the standard. Good evidence is presented in an organized and readable fashion. Recent changes that affect the discussion of this standard are the construction of two new buildings and the renovation of a number of other facilities.

Findings and Evidence

KCC opened in 1965 and moved to the present campus in 1976; the majority of the buildings are from that era. Forty-four buildings totaling approximately 335,000 square feet are set on 200 acres with approximately 70 percent being maintained. The campus was built to accommodate 1,500 FTE (fall semester), based on its 1973 Facilities Master Plan/Long Range Development Plan (LRDP). In 1999, the LRDP was updated and projected enrollment to grow to 3,000 FTE (fall semester). While the FTE enrollment has been rising over the past several years, enrollment has yet to exceed 900 FTE (fall semester) so there is currently adequate space to grow. The current square footage is still at a 1500 FTE (fall semester) capacity. A few credit courses are offered at Waimea High School and Kapa’ a High School and band classes at Chiefess Kamakahelel Middle School. In addition, some non-credit courses are being offered in various communities on a limited basis through OCET, the Rural Development Project, and the US Department of Agriculture Food and Agriculture Careers Pathway Program. (Standard III.B.1)

Need for physical resources are determined from Annual Program Review Updates and five-year comprehensive reviews as part of the institutional process. Program present needs to the College Council, which ranks the requests on six criteria: alignment with college goals, outcome expected, evidence, need, collaboration, and impact. A Campus Safety and Operations Committee works to review safety issues, new building construction, maintenance of existing facilities, space utilization, and landscaping. Issues may be brought to the Committee from any individual or unit on campus. Recommendations are forwarded to College Council for final review and then submitted to the Chancellor. The VCAS and the Facilities Manager meet to prioritize projects that can be accomplished in-house. For facilities improvements projects that are beyond available funding, the VCAS, with input from the Campus Safety and Operations Committee and College Council, has prioritized funding requests for facilities improvement projects. (Standard III.B.1.a)

Major deferred maintenance funding is appropriated through the UHCC System which operates under a formula (Facilities Renewal Resource Model (FRRM)). The VCAS and the Auxiliary Services Officer (Facilities Manager) meet with representatives of UHCC to prioritize these projects. Capital Improvement Projects from the fiscal years 2007-2009 totaled approximately $21 million at KCC. In the past six years two buildings were built as a result of Capital Improvement Projects that were initiated more than 12 years ago: 1) the One Stop Center (OSC), containing Student Services, the Business Office, Academic Support, and Administration; and the OSC Phase II which houses OCET offices and classrooms and the Bookstore. A major goal of the new buildings was centralize services for students. (Standard III.B.1.a)
The Annual Program Review Update process led to renovating the former administration offices into the Learning Commons (Library’s first floor, Tutoring Services, College Success Center, computers, Digital Media Lab, Math/Science Lab, a large conference room, and a café). The former Bookstore into a Culinary Demonstration Kitchen; the Social Science classroom into a Marine Science Lab; and the former Student Services offices into meeting and study spaces for students. College Council also approved the purchase of Smart Boards and other educational equipment. The former Trade Technology portable is being renovated into a STEM Cognition building. (Standard III.B.1.a)

The Facilities Department attempts to reduce water and electrical costs using the Banner system to work with the Academic Affairs to schedule the HVAC and lighting for times and locations of classes Scheduling of the energy maintenance system is done on a semester or as-needed basis. There currently is no maintenance contract for the Energy Maintenance Program; this is part of the Energy Performance Agreement with Chevron Energy Solutions describe below. There is an Actionable Improvement Plan to develop a facilities use study to better utilize existing facilities. (Standard III.B.1.a)

The Facilities Department work is prioritized in a variety of ways. Grounds and Maintenance provides landscape, rubbish, and clean-up services on a predetermined schedule. Daily custodial services include cleaning restrooms, classrooms, common areas, entrances, and offices. KCC has recently installed a computerized work order system (AiM). There is an Actionable Improvement Plan to study the work order process to assess timeliness of responses and completion. (Standard III.B.1.a)

Facilities are ADA compliant and the EEO/AA Officer insures compliance on a continuing basis. Buildings, facilities, walkways, and parking lots have previously been upgraded to meet safety standards. Included are modifications for the physically challenged such as improving access to restrooms and building entrances. The campus has upgraded its fire safety by retrofitting the fire hydrant system and fire alarm system. There are two parking lots available for students, employees, and the public. The main lot is located at the college entrance with four handicapped stalls and two stalls reserved for brief visits. Four handicapped stalls are near the Performing Arts Center. A secondary lot is located near the tennis courts and Campus Center building and has four handicapped stalls. Parking is free and available on a first-come, first-served basis. The parking lots do not fill completely at any time of the academic year. (Standard III.B.1.b)

The UHCC’s Environmental Health and Safety Officer provide semi-annual training and inspections on hazardous materials safety and injury prevention. Service contracts are in place for elevator maintenance, fire alarm systems, automatic door maintenance, fire protection systems, air compressors, and vehicle maintenance. The Kaau‘i Fire Department does an annual inspection for potential fire hazards and the Kaau‘i Fire Protection Company inspects all fire extinguishers once a year. (Standard III.B.1.b)

As evidenced by the Campus Crime Report, major crimes have not occurred on campus. Nevertheless, in response to concerns for safety, contract security guard services were increased to provide daily 24 hour security coverage. Seven emergency phones with public address
capability, five Automated External Defibrillators kits, and eleven surveillance cameras were installed. The college partnered with the Charter School that is located on college grounds, to install a chain link fence around the perimeter of a nearby reservoir. Campus access has been improved by cost sharing with Island School, also located on college property, to complete the perimeter road which created a secondary entry and exit point to the campus. (Standard III.B.1.b)

The Facilities Department has been understaffed for several years but has been able to replace retired personnel in the past year and has been approved for two more positions via the Annual Program Review Update process. Overall staffing has not changed, even with the addition of nearly 41,000 square feet of classrooms and office space in the last two years. Currently, the Department is 23% percent understaffed (from 10 positions to 8) due to budget constraints and retirements. When vacation, sick leave, and furloughs are included, the total manpower hours drop substantially. Although the Department is understaffed, in recent Noel-Levitz Student Satisfaction Surveys (2008 and 2010) students gave high marks for a well-maintained campus, cleanliness of buildings, and courteous service. (Standard III.B.1.b)

The UHCC System will be rekeying the campus for lockdown capability (completion in the 2012-2013). KCC is also working with the County of Kaua‘i Civil Defense to evaluate and improve procedures for emergency situations, and create a crisis management team to implement the emergency procedures plan. The Campus Wellness Center responds to students, faculty, and staff requiring first aid. Nursing faculty has provided first responder training and use of AEDs. (Standard III.B.1.b)

As mentioned above, facilities are evaluated on an annual basis through the Annual Program Review Update process that provides input for the planning of Capital Improvement Projects. These recommendations were forwarded to the Campus Operations and Safety Committee of College Council. Also mentioned above, the Facilities Master Plan/LRDP was redesigned in 1999 for a maximum enrollment of 3,000 FTE students. The Performing Arts Center, Electronic Technology building, Culinary Arts and ceramics classroom expansions resulted from the LRDP process. The OSC was included in the LRDP and became a top priority for additional funding in response to the recommendation from the 2000 Self-Study. (Standard III.B.2.a)

As mention above, the VCAS attends an annual system meeting to prioritize proposals for legislative appropriation. KCC’s current prioritization process offers its VCAS more comprehensive view of the campus priorities. There is an Actionable Improvement Plan for the Chancellor, VCAS, and College Council to continue to evaluate the Annual Program Review Update process and develop plans to prepare for the next revision of the Facilities Master Plan/LRDP and to make total costs of ownership part of the planning. (Standard III.B.2.b)

The deferred maintenance list has been reduced by reroofing, repainting, installing Photovoltaic (PV) lights, installing air conditioning and chiller units, and more. The self-evaluation provides a comprehensive description of these projects. A Performance Contract has been approved with Chevron Energy Solutions to reduce consumption of electricity, propane gas, and water; and includes the following projects: lighting retrofit, plumbing retrofit, solar terminal water heating, and a computerized energy management system. An agreement is being pursued with the Kaua‘i Island Utility Cooperative to use college land to generate energy through ground array solar
system (and possibly a carport solar plan). The ultimate goal is for the college to be at "net zero" on energy consumption. (Standard III.B.2.b)

As mention above, physical resource planning is integrated with institutional planning through the Annual Program Review Update and five-year comprehensive program review process. Each program and department analyzes the needs and submits to the College Council for prioritization. (Standard III.B.2.b)

Conclusions

The college has adequate facilities for its programs and services. Current facilities are built for 1500 FTE (fall semester) but the college has yet to exceed 900 FTE (fall semester). The current long range plan calls for serving 3000 FTE (fall semester).

Despite an increase in square footage from two new buildings, and a reduction in staffing, the college facilities are well maintained, safe and healthy. All programs and departments conduct five-year comprehensive program review and Annual Program Review Updates that involve assessing facilities and equipment with requests made to the College Council as part of the institutional planning process. The college operates within a capital planning and deferred maintenance process directed by the BOR and UH System.

The college is encouraged to actively pursue the Actionable Improvement Plan to continue to evaluate the Annual Program Review Update process and develop plans to prepare for the next revision of the Facilities Master Plan/LRDP, which special emphasis on making total costs of ownership (TCO) a part of the planning and the budget.

The college meets all sections of Standard III.B.

Recommendations  None
Standard III.C. Technology Resources

General Observations

The college’s technology resources support the college’s strategic goal of Learning and Teaching and, by extension, the UH system goal of Educational Effectiveness and Student Success. The college directly supports institutional and student needs as identified through regular program reviews, the assessment of student learning outcomes, a College Council stocktaking process, as well as via student and staff surveys. In support of the college and UH system mission, goals and strategic planning, the Information Technology Advisory Council (ITAC) then produces a Technology Vision Plan that provides overall direction for the college’s technology resources as well as a means of integrating technology planning with overall college planning.

Additionally, in support of institutional effectiveness and student learning, the college provides not only extensive technology training opportunities for students and staff, but also responsive and highly-rated support for technology.

Finally, on the basis of program review data and assessment results, the college acquires, maintains, and upgrades/replaces its technological infrastructure in a systematic fashion designed to enhance student learning.

Findings and Evidence

The college provided clear evidence that hardware, software, and technology support are designed to increase institutional effectiveness. Minimum standards for desktop computers and software, upgrades to wired and wireless networks, robust and redundant virtualized servers as well as support for specialized software (e.g., SAS for institutional research, Kuali for finance, etc.) all reflect a commitment to enhancing the effectiveness and operation of the college in support of its mission. To validate the fruits of this commitment, in fall 2011 the college surveyed faculty and staff regarding information technology needs. The results of this Academic Support Survey indicated that a majority of faculty and staff was satisfied with both the current state of technology and the level of support in installation, operation and maintenance of technology. In addition, students are surveyed routinely regarding their satisfaction with technology; results, in general, indicate that students are equally satisfied with the college’s technology resources. (Standard III.C.1.a)

The college provides extensive technology training opportunities for both students and staff. New Student Orientations (NSO) provides training for students in the use of Banner, email, etc. Faculty and staff receive ongoing training for Banner and other information systems through participation in conferences or on-site training. With respect to instructional technology training and support, the college has a full-time instructional technologist who assists faculty in the use of technology in the classroom as well as in courses delivered via distance education. Again, the college assesses the needs for and efficacy of technology training through various surveys as well as through the program review process. For example, based on the results of the 2011 ITAC fall survey and a Professional Development survey (AtDPD), ITAC offered specialized
technology training workshops to meet the needs identified in the survey results. (Standard III.C.1.b)

The college’s Computer Services department systematically acquires and upgrades its technology to meet institutional needs. Network connections have been upgraded from one gigabit to ten gigabits, all CRT computer monitors have been replaced by LCD monitors, CPUs have been upgraded, and wireless range has been extended to cover nearly 85 percent of the campus. The Self-Evaluation Report provided several examples, along with verifiable evidence, where technology needs were assessed and resources allocated based upon the results of those assessments. For example, on the basis of Student Learning Outcomes assessment results, the college digitized library holdings for a distance education course, developed a math/science lab, and implemented computer-aided instruction in an Electronics course. Additionally, the college has a four-year hardware replacement cycle that is on schedule.

However, due to reduced funding and to support the college’s goal of Sustainability, Computer Services in conjunction with the ITAC is in the process of completing a new replacement cycle plan that is “as needed” rather than on a predetermined schedule. To continue to meet standards, it will be important for the college to complete this new plan and subsequently assess its effect on the college’s progress toward meeting its mission and goals. Without a systematic replacement or upgrade schedule for technology, this resource may be overlooked—especially in 2014 when faculty salary increases may reduce local operating budgets. (Standards III.C.1, III.C.1.d)

Technology planning is integrated with broader institutional planning through the Annual Program Review Update ranking system, which awards higher points for projects that explicitly address college goals and strategic objectives. Several salient examples of the allocation of technology resources on the basis of this process were provided in the Self-Evaluation Report and verified on the site visit. Finally, once technology resources are allocated, the college then assesses student and staff satisfaction through annual program review surveys and nationally normed surveys such as the CCSSE and the Noel Levitz Student Satisfaction Survey. While the results from the most recent administration of the CCSSE indicate that student satisfaction with computer labs has decreased slightly over time, results from the 2010 Noel-Levitz student satisfaction survey continue to show that KCC student satisfaction levels with technology exceed the national average. It is not clear at this point whether this decrease in satisfaction is attributable to system-imposed furloughs or other factors. In any case, to address the slight decrease in satisfaction identified by the Noel Levitz survey, the college cited an actionable improvement plan to further monitor satisfaction with computer labs and support. (Standard III.C.2)

Conclusions

The college’s technology resources provide strong support to student learning programs and services as evidenced by regular assessments of student, faculty and staff satisfaction. Technology resources are allocated on the basis of regular program reviews, the assessment of student learning outcomes and the results of various local and national surveys. Through the centralized, representative ITAC committee and its Technology Vision Plan, the college assures
that technology is designed to meet the needs of students, faculty and staff in achieving the college’s mission. Current hardware and software are maintained at or above industry standards. Technological support for operational and pedagogical purposes is available and receives high marks from users. Of special note, the college has a full-time instructional technologist who supports teaching and learning both in the physical and virtual classroom.

On the basis of assessment data, the college provides focused technology training opportunities for students and staff and has an actionable improvement plan to systematically evaluate the efficacy of these training opportunities.

The college systematically plans, acquires and upgrades its technology infrastructure. For example, the college recently performed significant upgrades to desktops, monitors, servers, wired and wireless networks, etc. A four-year replacement cycle exists and is currently on schedule. However, as mentioned above, Computer Services is in the process of completing a new software and hardware replacement referred to as an “as needed” replacement schedule rather than a set schedule of upgrades. Again, the team suggests that the college complete and assess this plan, particularly in light of the potential decline in funding that may occur in 2014.

Technology planning is integrated with institutional planning through the program review process, which awards greater points to requests that contribute to college goals and objectives. The Technology Vision Plan further codifies technology actions and plans that support the broader goals and objectives of the college and UH system.

The college meets all parts of Standard III.C.

Recommendations None
Standard III.D. Financial Resources

General Observations

Within its overall mission KCC has recognized six wide ranging institutional goals. Consistent with KCC’s mission, it has developed five college level Institutional Student Learning Outcomes (ISLO’s). More broadly, the KCC strategic plan reflects a matrix demonstrating alignment of its college based goals with those of the UH system. More specifically, financial planning at KCC is linked to institutional mission and goals. Resource allocation for Program improvement is driven by a Program Review process. Annual Program Review Updates are reviewed and evaluated based, in part, on alignment with the college’s mission and strategic goals.

Findings and Evidence

The college has developed a rubric to tie financial planning to its mission through a series of six goals that align with the UH system including Access, Learning and Teaching, Workforce Development, Personal Development, Community Development and Diversity. Annual Program Review Updates are conducted to assure quality across college programs. This process is capped with a comprehensive five year review. Programs are assessed and modifications made using data drawn from demographic information and achievement data, placement test results and other inputs in order to best serve the KCC student community. (Standard III.D.1.)

KCC operating revenue is derived from two primary sources; the first is state aid which comprises approximately 80% of KCC’s general fund operating budget; and, the second is Tuition and Special Fees which comprise the balance of KCC’s operating budget. Funding from both sources increased from $10.8 million in FY 2008 to $13.1 million in FY 2012. These local increases were driven by growth in enrollments. In addition to UH system office funding, other sources of revenue from the college’s Special Funds and Tuition along with miscellaneous federal funds and those of private sources (donations) have also served to support the operations of KCC.

Integration of Financial Planning with Institutional planning is evidenced through meeting minutes from college council going back to 2007. Program Review provides a basis for financial planning. The college has a mechanism to tie planning to resource allocation.

KCC has developed a process through KCC Policy 1-6 Review of Provisional and Established Program, to connect program resource allocation and planning. This policy also prompts discussion of reallocation given the ebb and flow of program demand.

Current levels of enrollment and recent increases in local revenue associated with enrollment growth suggest strong demand for the services offered by KCC and that their offerings are consistent with the needs of the community. From a longer term perspective however, a sustainable enrollment management framework faces several barriers. Demographic trends and the socio-economic cross section of the county point to several long term challenges; first, a dearth of traditional college age adults and suggests a challenge for a sustained enrollment
management plan; second, the small ratio of jobs paying a living wage coupled with a relatively high cost of home ownership beg the question of how stable middle class and college bound population can be developed and maintained. Although trend data indicates robust growth in recent years, Kaua’i has an island population of 67,000, where only one-fifth are under age 18, more than 11% lack a high school diploma, high school graduation rates are declining, and the median age is over 41- all suggesting that growth will not come through the traditional age group. It should be noted however that unlike the locally determined Tuition and Special Fees revenues, the UH System determined funding is not directly tied to enrollment. Thus, while the aforementioned socio-economic factors present a challenge for the community, it does not represent an imminent fiscal threat to the college. (Standard III.D.1.a)

KCC has taken steps to adjust to the state’s economic challenges. Part of the college’s response to the economic downturn has been to seek compensation reductions from its bargaining units. Bargaining unit members took reductions in prior years and a civil service hiring freeze was imposed in August 2009 and lifted in September 2011. There are signs that Hawai’i’s economy is improving and negotiations are underway with Bargaining Units 2, 3 & 4 to address restoration. The faculty collective bargaining agreement currently includes the restoration of pay reductions. The June 2009-June 2015 agreement between the UH Professional Assembly and the UH Board of Regents calls for a raise for its faculty as follows (Article XXI):

- Three percent effective July 1, 2013
- Three percent effective July 1, 2014

KCC will have to rely on locally driven funds including Tuition and Special Fees rather than state aid as has been the case in the past to fund these increases. Bargaining unit 1 is subject to Directed Leave without Pay (DLWOP) through June 30, 2013, which presumably provides the college with some discretion in terms of cost containment strategies. While a definitive plan to fund these raises has not been prepared, it is expected that a combination of enrollment growth, increased tuition and fees, system-wide leveling, and a draw on reserves will fund the increase.

Institutional Planning at KCC reflects reliance on several key sources of data including budget worksheets that are in alignment with the UH system budget, a comparison of budget to actual for the Tuition and Fees Special Fund, and the Community College Special Fund. KCC implemented a planning process in 2005 that examines the impact of short term financial plans/obligations and their potential long-term impact.

KCC has sufficient physical plant capacity to serve approximately 1,500 FTES; however, the college has not served more than 900 FTES to date. Further, the most recent iteration of the Master Plan (Exhibit III-11: Facilities Master Plan/LRDP) calls for a maximum student enrollment of 3,000 FTE.

In order to fund capital improvements, the State of Hawaii issues general obligation bonds on behalf of the UH. These bonds are carried as liabilities of the state. Revenue bonds have also been used to fund capital projects. KCC does not in and of itself carry long term liabilities such as bonded indebtedness. Rather, KCC and all other campuses in the system, have an annual assessment by the system to fund such activities as the Banner Student Registration system.
operations, Risk Management and the Foundation. (Standard III.D.1.b)

Institutional Planning at KCC reflects reliance on several key sources of data including budget worksheets that are in alignment with the UH system budget, a comparison of budget to actual for the Tuition and Fees Special Fund, and the Community College Special Fund. KCC implemented a planning process in 2005 that examines the impact of short term financial plans/obligations and their potential long-term impact. (Standard III.D.1.c)

KCC has created a planning model to facilitate departmental and programmatic planning for equipment for classrooms and labs, facility space based on the results of the Annual Program Review Update process. This is tied to the college’s strategic planning process and reflects a model where all stakeholders have an opportunity for their voice to be heard. This is reflected also in KCC policy I-8, Integrated Planning. (Standard III.D.1.d)

KCC is included each year in the UH Consolidated Financial Audit, which is conducted by Acuity, LLP, Certified Public Accountants. The college/district audit (UH Consolidated Financial Audit) did not note any adverse findings.

The Federal Financial Aid Audit included three deficiencies:

1. The timing of “Return to Title-IV” funds was outside established parameters for 3 of 15 students.
2. Four of these 15 students, an incorrect calculation was performed regarding the institutional share of these funds.
3. Un-timely program exit counseling was noted.

The Financial Aid office has developed a Corrective Action Plan for each of these findings. (Standard III.D.2.a)

Convocation is used as an opportunity to share data with as broad an audience as possible in areas including Budget, Maintenance and Operations and Capital Improvements. The chancellor also shares other related data such as relevant actions taken by the legislature and UH system level activities. (Standard III.D.2.b)

Reserves are targeted at 5% by the system. Total fund balance over the last three years has ranged from approximately 12% to 19%. This represents a somewhat startling upward trend in fund balance during a seemingly difficult economic climate.

a. Fiscal year 2009 $1,668,036 ($644,752 = 5% Reserve)
b. Fiscal year 2010 $2,007,743 ($810,883 = 5% Reserve)
c. Fiscal year 2011 $2,351,242 ($607,197 = 5% Reserve)

Further liquidity uncertainty arises as approximately 80% of General Fund Operating resources are state determined leaving only the remaining 20% of locally determined funds to provide basis for any cash balance(s). These cash balances are derived from local funds driven largely by Tuition and Fees and Special Funds but may also include other local functions such as non-credit
courses, the culinary program and Early Childhood educational services. Unspent General Funds, instead of being carried over by the college, are swept by the system. This prompts the college to spend its general funds down early in the year to avoid fund reversion to the state. Allowing the college to retain such balances might prompt more strategic fiscal planning and provide an incentive to conserve.

Insurance coverage is generally covered under the self-insurance program sponsored by the state of Hawaii. Local institutions are free to use their own discretion to manage special risk that may emerge in their programs or community through securing additional insurance. Presently, there are no programs requiring excess coverage. (Standard III.D.2.c)

Under the Board of Regents established policy (BOR Bylaws and Policies, Section 2-2, b (5), the UH system President delegates operational authority to the campus based chancellors. At KCC the Chancellor further delegates authority to program heads. These managers are responsible for managing and controlling the resources each is delegated. The college has designated fiscal officers who assist the balance of the management team in executing appropriate fiscal oversight. (Standard III.D.2.d)

There exists two component unit organizations, the UH Foundation and the Research Corporation of the UH. The UH Foundation exists to solicit and manage funds for the benefit of the University. The Foundation also holds and administers the UH endowment. The Research Corporation provides administrative support services for various training and research programs for the UH system. Both entities prepare stand-alone financial reports and are audited independently of the UH. (Standard III.D.2.e)

Procurement policies and procedures are promulgated by the UH system office. KCC enters into a variety of contracts with external providers of goods and services. Contracts above $25,000 are required to go through a bidding process. Contractual agreements for real property or long term leases are coordinated through the UH system office of the General Counsel. Such activities may also require Board of Regents approval/action. Similarly, contracts for Capital Improvements are generally administered at the system office level. (Standard III.D.2.f)

Much of the college’s financial management processes are driven by FMIS. A feedback mechanism exists to allow fiscal leaders to elicit responses from the college’s system users. A Business Process Council (BPC) exists to evaluate the feedback. It was feedback from system users that ultimately prompted the acquisition of the Kuali Financial System (KFS). KFS is an open source financial system originated by Indiana University. KFS has an array of base system functionality (Standard III.D.2.g). Since the Self Study was published the Kuali system has gone live. (Standard III.D.2.g)

Established policy and procedure provides a means to assure the appropriate use of financial resources. State appropriated funds provide the primary funding basis for the five major programmatic areas of the college including Instruction, Public Services, Academic support, Student Support and Institutional Support as well as other fixed costs including utilities. Central to this process is a Position Request form that triggers review of base allocations. (Standard III.D.3)
There is an extremely positive correlation between the supplemental guidelines provided by ACCJC to be used in the analysis of the college’s fiscal health and the solid practices that are evident in the college’s fiscal matters. Annual audits are preformed and contain no adverse opinions. The college is in good stead with the federal government with its professional and regulatory based handling of federal funds, including the student financial aid programs. The college has little debt, a more than adequate reserve, a thorough and complete insurance portfolio. KCC’s collective bargaining agreements are current and in good order. The college has a widely vetted plan to comply with the provisions of the various employee agreements. Employees enjoy the benefit of a comprehensive health insurance program. Foundation operations provide support for student scholarship and student programs. Total cost of ownership (TCO) is used and respected in the planning of college expansion and improvement. The college meets the requirements of the supplemental guidelines. (III.D.3 Supplemental Guidelines

Conclusions

KCC has a mechanism to tie planning to resource allocation. The college has demonstrated prudent financial management practices best evidenced by the positive trending ending fund balance.

The college meets the standard.

Recommendations None
STANDARD IV

Leadership and Governance

Standard IV.A. Decision-Making Roles and Processes

General Observations

The college community has been immersed on many levels relating to decision making through participation in numerous governance and planning committees, as well as the accreditation process. KCC show evidence that it is evolving into a collaborative governing body permeated by a degree of goodwill. There was University of Hawaii Community College system reorganization in 2005, a new chancellor in 2008, a new Governance Manual in 2009, and a Faculty and Staff Survey in 2011 showing that participation in decision making has significantly improved since 2006.

KCC is truly involved with and “in” their community with meaningful ties to various island leaders and initiatives. As a result of these connections, new efforts such as the Sustainable Living Institute and the Plant Bioscience Technology certificate have been developed.

Findings and Evidence

KCC has clearly invested significant effort in promoting a solid participatory governance system and developing a Governance Manual that has contributed to an environment with broad based involvement in institutional decision making. KCC provides for and implements systematic participative processes for effective discussion, planning, implementation and evaluation of college actions. The roles for each group and methods for involving non-committee member faculty and staff in the dissemination and examination of plans are stated in the College Governance Manual as well as in KCCs Policies 1-7. Interviews revealed that the evaluation of these processes needs to be completed in a systematic manner.

The College Council is the advisory body to the chancellor that meets on a regular basis and focuses on KCC’s mission, strategic planning, priority setting, and policy and budget development. It also is the forum for the Annual Program Review Update process that is engrained in the KCC culture. College Council is the primary campus participatory group and assures regular, in-depth and rigorous dialogue among all stakeholders.

With respect to SLO assessment, there are an array of tools being used on campus to assess courses and programs.

The report states and interviews confirm that the comprehensive program review process facilitates dialogue and contributes to change. (Standards IV.A, IV.A.1)

The KCC Governance Manual contains policy that provides for faculty, staff, administrator, and student participation in decision making processes. College Council has 17 members (KCC Policy 1-7) and helps to make possible in-depth dialogue among all stakeholders concerning institutional policies, planning and budget. These actions are shared at Convocations and forums as well as at the department level.
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There are numerous standing committees at KCC that provide opportunities for constituents to work together informally and formally on planning. Interviews with various staff revealed that there is an environment that supports improvement and the 2011 Faculty and Staff Survey results are cited as evidence of satisfactory perceptions of participation, innovation, and improvement in decision making. (Standard IV.A.2.a)

Board of Regents’ Bylaws and Policies Section 1, Faculty Senate Charter, Article 1, and Curriculum Committee Guidelines support that KCC relies on faculty, Assessment Committee, Curriculum Committee, Faculty Senate and academic administrators for recommendations concerning student learning programs and services. (Standard IV.A.2.b)

Evidence supports that KCC has the infrastructure in place to meet the standard through its governance structures and processes that allow for collaboration and communication among all constituencies. However, these practices need to be reviewed, evaluated and communicated in a systematic manner to determine their effectiveness. The timeliness and the flow of communication between each campus governance body and the College Council must be included in this evaluation process. The recent hiring of a researcher may allow these processes to be strengthened and to become more fully developed. The chancellor champions the shared governance philosophy through strong leadership with an emphasis on open dialogue and transparency. (Standard IV.A.3)

KCC engaged in a thoughtful, timely, and inclusive process to create the Self-Evaluation Report for Educational Quality and Institutional Effectiveness. Meetings were regularly scheduled and included resource speakers that addressed various components of the standard. Interviews confirmed that faculty, staff and administrators had the opportunity to participate in the development of the self-evaluation and the college community was informed about revisions by way of meeting minutes that are posted in Campus Docs and by attending campus forums. KCC maintains appropriate relations with the Accrediting Commission and other certifying bodies (Nursing, Automotive Technology American Culinary Federation). (Standard IV.A.4)

KCC has strengthened and developed its formal and informal evaluation processes and made public the results of these evaluations. The UHCC Strategic Planning Council performs an annual review and update of the UHCC Strategic Outcome and Performance Measures and these results are shared during Convocation and at other forums, as well as on-line. In 2011, the UHCC System commenced on a project to review policies and since 2011, the college has reviewed and updated Administrative Policies 1-7, 1-8, 4-01, 4-02, 4-04, 4-05, 4-07, 4-08, 4-09, 4-14, and 4-16. Administrators are evaluated annually. Conversations are taking place concerning the evaluation of Program Directors, Supervisors, Division Chairs, and Campus Executives. Faculty and Administrators indicated concerns that “decision making structures and processes should be regularly evaluated and the results widely communicated”. The recent hiring of a researcher will play a major role in continuing to develop an environment of evidence-based culture providing vital information needed by groups to make solid, wide-reaching and data influenced decisions. (Standard IV.A.5)
Conclusions

The college has provided a quality report of its leadership and governance structures and practices and works effectively within a multi-college and university system. The college has established and follows an effective governance process that is inclusive and embraced by the college community. The college developed a Governance Manual in 2009 and has successfully used and revised it (2012) suggesting sustainability in terms of the effectiveness of the manual. The governance process supports a planning process that has integrated program review with overall college planning that is designed to facilitate continuous quality improvement. There is no systematic evaluation process of the governance structure cited in the self-evaluation report or in the KCC Governance Manual. The college community should be commended on the high level of active participation by faculty and staff in decision-making as evidenced in the 2011 Faculty and Staff Survey. All groups have the best interests of students as a priority that keeps the college focused on the community college mission.


Recommendations

Recommendation #6: Leadership and Governance

In order to meet the standards, it is recommended that the college strengthen evaluation of the effectiveness of the governance and decision-making structures and processes on a regular basis, and use the outcomes of evaluations as a basis for continuous improvement. (IV. A. 5)
Standard IV.B. Board and Administrative Organization

Standard IV.B.1.

General Observations

The UH system is an integrated higher education system consisting of a research university at Manoa, two baccalaureate granting institutions at Hilo and West O'ahu and seven community colleges (including Maui), with KCC belonging to the latter group. The community colleges are referred to as the University of Hawaii Community College (UHCC) system and are led by Vice President for Community Colleges (VPCC) whose offices are located at the UH Manoa campus on O'ahu.

Community college chancellors report to both the VPCC and the President of the University of Hawai'i. The system is governed by a fifteen member Board of Regents appointed by the Governor and confirmed by the State Senate.

The six community colleges (excluding Maui) worked together with assistance from the VPCC’s office to draft a common response to Standards IV.B.1 and IV.B.3. This collaboration appears to have been effective and allowed a diverse group of primarily faculty members from the six colleges to research and to understand together how governance structures operate within this rather complex, integrated, higher education system. However, this group effort resulted in a common response that did not provide any self-evaluation comments other than a simple declaration of “meeting the standard.” As reported by the Office of the VPCC, colleges were to create their own self-evaluation, while agreeing to the common responses for the descriptive summary and actionable improvement plans. However, this was apparently not the understanding of the individual colleges as none of the six provided any self-evaluations in Standards IV.B.1 and IV.B.3. The process would have been greatly improved if an analysis would have been provided in the self-evaluation sections.

Findings and Evidence

The UHCC is governed by the UH Board of Regents who are responsible for establishing policies that assure quality, integrity, and effectiveness of student learning as well as establishing and adhering to policy for selecting and evaluating the chief administrator.

The Board of Regents is responsible for establishing policies that assure the quality and effectiveness of student learning and services as provided for by state law. Bylaws and policies define roles and responsibilities of the board, as well as the appointment and evaluation of the President and are readily available on the UH website. (Standard IV.B.1.a)

The regents meet regularly following agendas and producing meeting minutes that clearly indicate that the regents have ultimate responsibility for education, legal, and financial matters for the UH and UHCC system. The regents work directly with the State Legislature that determines the appropriation to the system once the board of regents submits its budget. Community college allocations are determined in a process that is overseen by the VPCC. (Standard IV.B.1.c)
The BOR policies include a code of ethics and self-evaluation processes. Additionally, a Reference Guide has been developed in 2011 which may serve as an effective orientation guide and general reference manual for new and existing members. The Reference Guide includes information about accreditation.

Additionally, the board of regents delegates authority for the operation of Hawaii's system of higher education to the chief administrator, the president of the integrated UH/UHCC system.

Conclusions

Evidence indicates that the college/system meets many components within Standard IV.B.1.1, although there are several areas where there is need for improvement. The BOR establishes policies consistent with the mission of the UHCC system as is evidenced by the BOR's adoption of the UHCC System Strategic Plan in 2002, and the appendices to the strategic plan that were updated in 2008. (Standard IV.B.1.b)

BOR bylaws, policies, and meeting minutes are all available online. (Standard IV.B.1.d) The BOR has staggered five year terms. The "best practices" workshops are cited as a means of orientation for new members. Additionally, a "BOR Reference Guide" has been developed, but systematic orientation for new regents has not been established. (Standard IV.B.1.f)

Board members are informed about accreditation. The BOR CC Subcommittee reviewed the self-evaluations of each of the six community colleges. Additionally, the whole Board of Regents approves the self-evaluations. The evaluations were submitted prior to this approval. The BOR CC subcommittee minutes of June 15, 2012, confirm that all six UHCC chancellors along with the VPCC presented the highlights of their self-evaluations and the subcommittee unanimously approved recommending approval of the evaluations to the full board. The BOR supported the recommendation and approved the self-evaluation reports at the July 19, 2012, board meeting. (Standard IV.B.1.i)

The BOR delegates operational authority to the President of the UH who in turn delegates authority to the VPCC and to the six community college chancellors. The BOR Policy Chapter 2 Section 2 provides a detailed description of the duties of the president as well as the method of evaluation which is conducted annually. BOR agendas indicate that the president's annual goal review takes place each January. BOR policy does not detail the evaluation process for the VPCC or for the six UHCC chancellors but interviews indicated that these administrators are evaluated annually. The president is responsible for the VPCC evaluation and both the VPCC and the president evaluate each chancellor. (Standard IV.B.1.j)

The self-evaluation report did not address the independence of the BOR, nor the standard that the board act as a whole once a decision is reached, or the manner in which the BOR as a whole, advocates and defends the system. However, this is addressed in the BOR Reference Guide, May 2011, Section II.A.7, page 11. (Standard IV.B.1.a)
The BOR has been working on revisions of policies. Part of this process is “policy conversion” which is detailed in the UHCC Policy Conversion Analysis chart, dated 10/15/08. No update to this chart was provided, although interviews indicated that general policy review and revision is taking place. However, there is no evidence that there is a regular manner in which this evaluation takes place. (Standard IV.B.1.c) There have been annual workshops since 2010 in which “best practices” in general have been reviewed, but during interviews with the VPCC and staff there was no suggestion of a mechanism to provide for and to assure a regular, consistent means of reviewing and revising Board of Regent policies as appropriate.

The BOR Policy Section 2-4 details the BOR self-evaluation process. However, the team found in meeting with BOR members that not all members were aware of the self-evaluation process. Policy Section 2-4 dictates a self-evaluation workshop every two years which must be announced at least three months in advance and must be dedicated solely to review of the regents’ work as a board. The next workshop scheduled for this purpose is October 18, 2012. Additionally, explicit actions as an outcome of the workshop must be provided to all regents, in writing, within a reasonable time following the workshop. Board policy also defines the process for dealing with unethical behavior. (Standards IV.B.1.g and IV.B.1.h)

Conclusion

The college/system partially meets the standard.

Recommendations

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

In order to meet the Standard, it is recommended that the BOR adopt a regular evaluation schedule of its policies and practices and revise them as necessary. In addition, the BOR must conduct its self-evaluation as defined in its policy and as required by ACCJC Standards (IV.B.1.e, IV.B.1.g)
Standard IV.B.2

General Observations

The chancellor has primary responsibility for the quality of the institution and provides effective leadership in planning, organizing, budgeting, selecting and developing personnel, and assessing institutional effectiveness.

The KCC chancellor began her current duties in 2008 and has established herself as a successful and effective leader of the college. The chancellor oversees the College Council, the committee which serves as the shared governance recommending body to the chancellor. The chancellor delegates duties to three Vice Chancellors and two Directors, all members of the Executive Cabinet.

The College Council, led by the chancellor and the executive cabinet, created and has updated a KCC Governance Manual which describes the governance policies and duties, responsibilities of each unit, and a flow chart of processes. Participatory governance committees have recently had their missions and responsibilities defined which has led to a better general understanding of what each committee does.

The Chancellor sets an example of transparency and has established an environment of collegial processes in accordance with the goals and planning priorities of KCC in alignment with the UHCC and UH system.

Findings and Evidence

The evidence strongly supports that the KCC chancellor has primary responsibility of the college and completely satisfies the standard.

The previous recommendation to establish a governance manual has been achieved, in 2009, and was recently updated in 2012 with a three year formal review and revision cycle in place.

The chancellor serves as an effective conduit from the college to the UHCC/UH level by participating in monthly meetings of the Council of Community College Chancellors, bi-annual meetings of the Strategic Planning Council, and regular meetings of the Council of Chancellors. As an outcome, the chancellor has assured alignment of the KCC goals to those of the larger UH/UHCC system. At each semester’s convocation, the chancellor presents KCC’s progress towards meeting campus goals and system goals.

The chancellor effectively controls the college budget and expenditures. She adheres to BOR bylaws and policies concerning budgetary practices, delegates appropriate to the Vice Chancellor for Administrative Affairs, and uses the College Council to prioritize and fund college requests that follow the Annual Program Review Update process.

The chancellor communicates effectively with the college using many different forms of communication. These include Chancellor Corner newsletters, regular meetings, convocation
presentations, college conversation meetings, informal open-door meetings, and annual retreats for cabinet members.

The Chancellor also works with community groups directly and assigns staff to represent the college as well.

**Conclusion**

The college meets standard IV.B.2.

**Recommendations**  None
Standard IV.B.3.

General Observations

In multi-college districts or systems the district/system provides primary leadership and clearly defines roles of authority and responsibility between the colleges and the district/system.

The UH/UHCC system was restructured in 2005 and established a VPCC, reporting directly to the President. All UHCC Chancellors report to both the VPCC and the President. This dual reporting structure has been working since 2006 with the appointment of a new VPCC. In practice, the VPCC works most closely with the UHCC Chancellors and serves as an appropriate liaison to the President and the BOR. The President meets regularly with all chancellors and assists with the VPCC in the annual evaluation of the UHCC Chancellors.

The UHCC Campus-System Function Map was developed in 2006 and most recently revised in January of 2012. The map distinguishes the locus of responsibility of functions between each UHCC campus, the UHCC system, the UH system, the BOR, and the State.

The UH/UHCC system provides services, fair distribution of resources, and effectively controls its own expenditures. The system also effectively delegates authority to the UHCC Chancellors to implement and administer BOR policies at their respective colleges. Additionally, the System acts as an effective liaison to and between the colleges as well as regularly evaluating itself and its system-specific processes.

Findings and Evidence

The evidence indicates that the system largely meets the standard and functions effectively and appropriately, particularly given the fact that this is not just a multi-community college system, but rather an integrated system of higher education. The VPCC has been particularly effective in making the reorganization of 2005 work for the UHCC's in particular and the UH system in general. Colleges report that they are represented and evidence from meeting agendas and minutes of the BOR corroborates this.

The budget is developed for the UHCC system as a whole following state statute and then coordinated by the UHCC system office. The VPCC in consultation with the Council of Community College Chancellors differentially allocate funds between the six community colleges in accordance with strategic goals of each college. Interviews with the KCC Chancellor confirm this in practice.

The VPCC assures that the UHCC Chancellors have full authority and responsibility to implement and administer BOR policies at their colleges, with UHCC Chancellors reporting that this delegation is in fact working in practice. Additionally, the VPCC visits each UHCC college twice per year to discuss system goals, individual college performance and to provide a comparison of the six colleges. Faculty and staff are invited to engage in dialogue with the VPCC. These visits are well-received at the colleges with faculty and staff reporting that they
feel they are receiving necessary information from a system level as well as being heard by the VPCC.

The system is working to update and revise policies. This is an ongoing process with no specifically defined cycle. The last “conversion” table is dated 2008. There is no document that gives an update of where the system is in terms of revision/new and/or converted policies. It is reported that a significant revision process began in 2011 which in part resulted in an update in January 2012 of the functional map.

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

**Conclusion**

The college/system meets the standard.

**Recommendations** None
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SUMMARY OF THE EVALUATION REPORT

Institution: UHCC System Office
Date of Visit: October 14-18, 2012
Team Chair: Dr. Helen Benjamin
            Chancellor, Contra Costa Community College

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Recommendations

UHCC Recommendation 1: Institutional Mission and Effectiveness
In order to meet the Standards for institutional effectiveness and integration of planning and resource allocation processes, including program review, it is recommended that:

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

UHCC Recommendation 2: Student Learning Programs and Services
In order to meet the Standards, degrees offered by the colleges must be consistent with the general education philosophy as outlined in the college catalog and the rigor of the English and math courses needed to fulfill the degree requirements must be appropriate to higher education (ER 11, Standards II.A.3, II.A.3.b).

UHCC Recommendation 3: Student Learning Programs and Services and Resources
In order to meet the Standard, the UHCC and the colleges shall take appropriate actions to ensure that regular evaluations of all faculty members and others directly responsible
for student progress toward achieving stated student learning outcomes include, as a component of the evaluation, effectiveness in producing student learning outcomes (Standard III.A.1.c).

**UH Recommendation 4: Resources**
In order to meet the Standards, it is recommended that a comprehensive UH system wide technology plan that includes and supports distance education be developed and implemented and is integrated with institutional planning (Standards II.A.1.b, II.A.1.c, II.A.2.c, III.C.2, III.C.1, III.C.1.c, III.C.2).

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

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

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

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

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

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

2012 Self Evaluation Document

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

The effort resulted in a common response that did not provide any self evaluation comments, other than a simple declaration of “meeting the Standard.” The descriptive summary, self evaluation and actionable improvement plans should have been more focused and precisely supported with appropriate evidence and documentation. More analysis would have improved the overall quality of the responses. In addition, some of the descriptive summaries provided a statement with a link to a board policy or some other reference without any description or explanatory response to the query. As a result, it was difficult to evaluate the appropriateness of the evidence referenced when reading. The document appeared to have been developed without the opportunity for dialogue that would have allowed for self reflection with an understanding of the UHCC, thereby yielding more cohesive and thoughtful responses. The development of thoughtful self evaluation responses might have resulted in actionable improvement plans where needed. The collaborative work on the report does appear to have been somewhat effective in providing college staff an opportunity to more fully understand the board and administrative structures that affect the UHCC.
Despite the weaknesses in the report and the accompanying evidence, the team was able to verify the degree to which the colleges and the UHCC meet the requirements for accreditation by the Commission. In addition, the SET was able to validate progress since the 2009 Midterm Report on the three previous recommendations based on a verbal report given on the first day of the visit.
RESPONSE TO RECOMMENDATIONS OF THE PREVIOUS VISITING TEAM
OCTOBER 22-28, 2006

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

2006 Recommendation 1

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

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

d. Facilities management, including deferred maintenance (Standards III.B.1.a,b, III.B.2.b)
e. Board and administrative leadership (Standard IV.B.3.a)

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

2012 Visiting Team Response

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

a. Strategic Planning processes

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

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

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

This portion of the recommendation is partially satisfied.

b. Program review and assessment practices

The templates used for program review were developed by the UHCC, with input from the colleges, and are common across the colleges. The templates continue to be refined with additional benchmarks and further aligned with budget requests in the colleges. The most developed area of program review is instruction, which is overseen by the Instructional Program Review Council (IPRC). The council has developed Standard data, benchmarks and scoring rubrics to assess the health of instructional programs. The UHCC requires annual program reviews every year along with comprehensive reviews at least every five years. As of the Midterm Report, there was evidence of evaluation of the program review process. Evidence gained through interviews and review of minutes suggests that within and across colleges there is not a universal understanding of how to use the data or how results of the data are to be integrated into planning and resource allocation.
The assessment aspect within the program review process has lagged in development. The colleges have not uniformly assessed student learning and used the data on learning to make improvements at the appropriate level to meet Accreditation Standards. In addition, the results of Student Learning Outcomes (SLOs) assessment have not been integrated into the program review process on a systematic basis. The UHCC role in providing assessment templates is noted, but the UHCC should explore other means by which the colleges can be supported in meeting Accreditation Standards in assessment.

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

c. **Allocation of Resources**

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

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

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

By basing the allocation of resources on strategic goals and on measurable outcomes established and understood system wide, the allocation is equitable and fair and based on measurable, assessed data. Competing needs of the UHCC and the three universities are discussed and prioritized through meetings with the UH vice president, the UHCC president, and the Council of Community College Chancellors. Priorities campus wide are vetted and the group agrees to what will be funded based on the resources available.
The UH-level reorganization of the community colleges in 2005 accomplishes the need to retain the integrity of the individually accredited colleges with a VPCC to coordinate the community colleges. In addition, the Council of Community College Chancellors has a direct reporting line to the UH president for system wide policymaking and decisions impacting their colleges. The reorganization has provided the colleges a structure to collaborate and communicate in a transparent manner with each other and with the president and administrative staff at the UH level. In the reorganization, the SPC serves as the mechanism for setting benchmarks and goals for the colleges, and then the individual colleges establish individual goals and budgets to meet the overall goals set by the SPC.

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

This portion of the recommendation continues to be satisfied.

d. **Facilities management (including deferred maintenance)**

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

This portion of the recommendation continues to be satisfied.

e. **Board and Administrative Leadership**

The 2005 reorganization reestablished the UHCC within the UH under a new position of VPCC. The new organizational structure retained the dual reporting structure of the chancellors to both the UH president and the VPCC. In addition, to provide clear direction and communication, the BOR
established its Committee on Community Colleges. All evidence has shown that these board and administrative structures continue to provide the appropriate level of focused attention to community college issues and serve to further the goals of the community colleges.

This recommendation required that the delineation of functions of the new organization should be described and communicated. Such a chart has been posted on the website and widely distributed. In addition, the University of Hawaiʻi Board of Regents Reference Guide describes the administrative structure in detail and is posted on the website as well.

This recommendation continues to be satisfied.

2006 Recommendation 2

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

2012 Visiting Team Response

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

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

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

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

The recommendation has been met.

**2006 Recommendation 3**

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

**2012 Visiting Team Response**

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

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

A. Mission

General Observations

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

Findings and Evidence

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

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

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

Conclusion

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

The UHCC meets Standard I.A.

Recommendation

None
B. **Improving Institutional Effectiveness**

**General Observations**

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

**Findings and Evidence**

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

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

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

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

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

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

Conclusion

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

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

**UHCC Recommendation 1: Institutional Mission and Effectiveness**

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

- The VPCC and the Chancellors develop broad-based, ongoing, collegial dialogue between and among the UHCC and the colleges to better assess the breadth, quality, and usefulness of UHCC analytical tools (e.g., UHCC Annual Report of Program Data (ARPD)) and planning processes through feedback from college stakeholders. In addition, the UHCC and Chancellors should provide training for the appropriate use of the tools to support on-going improvement and effectiveness.

- The Chancellors provide clear descriptions and training regarding the planning timeline and budgeting process. The information and training should be available to all college constituencies and reviewed regularly to ensure accuracy for resource allocation that leads to program and institutional improvement (Standards I.B.3, I.B.1, II.A.1.c, II.A.2.a, e, f, II.B.1, II.B.3.a, and II.b.4, I.B.1, I.B.4, I.B.6).
STANDARD II
Student Learning Programs and Services

General Observations

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

A. Instructional Programs

Findings and Evidence

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

The UHCC has promoted, through its strategic plan: the inclusion of the goals and outcomes of the Achieving the Dream Initiative, including a turn to data-driven, outcome-based decision-making; a focus on enhanced recruitment, retention and success of Native Hawaiian students; improved remedial and developmental course outcomes; and increased transfer success. Measurement of the colleges’ participation and success in meeting these objectives has been codified in an annual program review process. The colleges are using student achievement data/outcomes but are not using learning outcomes data in program reviews. Within this process, the UHCC Office provides the colleges with data about student achievement outcomes which fuels campus planning and is the foundation of an outcomes-based funding initiative. This funding, along with that available through support of innovative projects, is tied to meeting benchmarks established by the UHCC in five primary categories: number of graduates, number of Native Hawaiian graduates, STEM-related field graduates, Pell grant recipients, and baccalaureate transfers to UH campuses (II.A.2, II.A.2.a, II.A.2.b).
In an effort to ensure uniformity, the UHCC Office has established processes and
guidance for proper implementation and assessment of SLOs for all colleges
based on a standard meant to promote continuous quality improvement in the area
of SLOs development and assessment. In addition, the UHCC has promoted the
development of a process in which campus annual program reviews are analyzed
and scored. The UHCC has also established general education requirements that
serve to define program requirements for the Associate of Arts, the Associate of
Science, the Associate of Applied Science (AAS), and the General Education
degrees. The colleges have all effectively aligned their curriculum and degrees
with these criteria in an effort to provide students with a uniformly accessible
academic experience. In an effort to promote direct and relevant career training,
the UHCC has aided four of the colleges in developing the Associate of Applied
Science degrees. The desire to offer students more narrowly targeted career
training through this degree is a creative alternative that is clearly both appealing
and relevant to students. However, the visiting team is concerned that the rigor of
this curriculum may be undermined by the fact that the math and English degree
requirements are below college level and not consistent with the general
education requirements as outlined by the UHCC itself (ER 11, Standards II.A.1,
II.A.2.c, II.A.2.f-h, II.A.2.1, II.A.3, II.A.3.a-c, II.A.4).

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

Conclusion

The UHCC partially meets Standard II.A.

Recommendation

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

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

Findings and Evidence

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

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

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

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

Conclusion

The UHCC meets Standard II.B.

Recommendation

None
C. **Library and Learning Support Services**

**Findings and Evidence**

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

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

**Conclusion**

The UHCC meets Standard II.C.

**Recommendations**

None
STANDARD III
Resources

A. Human Resources

General Observations

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Conclusion

The UHCC is strong in the area of human resources and in using its employees to meet its broad educational program. In the case of the faculty evaluation procedure serving to improve effectiveness, the UHCC utilizes a process which contains two different evaluation methods. The process of faculty tenure and promotion includes analysis of SLOs as part of the evaluation which can occur up to three times during a faculty member’s career. Evaluations for promotion occur post-tenure and include student learning outcome analysis. Once the faculty member has completed the promotion activities or elects not to submit a promotion application, that faculty member is then subject to a different evaluation procedure not requiring a detailed analysis of student learning outcomes and occurring every five years. Thus, a tenured faculty member who does not request promotion, or a faculty member who has completed all requirements of tenure and promotion, does not have the same requirement to analyze student learning outcomes for improvement of effectiveness.
While UHCC meets Standard III.A.C.1 for some faculty, it does not hold the same standard for all faculty members to analyze SLOs for effectiveness and improvement.

While the UHCC meets other portions of Standard III.A, it does not meet Standard III.A.C.1. For that reason, the UHCC partially meets Standard III.A.

**Recommendation**

**UHCC Recommendation 3: Student Learning Programs and Services and Resources**
In order to meet the Standard, the UHCC and the colleges shall take appropriate actions to ensure that regular evaluations of all faculty members and others directly responsible for student progress toward achieving stated student learning outcomes include, as a component of the evaluation, effectiveness in producing student learning outcomes (Standard III.A.1.c).
B. Physical Resources

General Observations

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

Findings and Evidence

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

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

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

The UHCC meets Standard III.B.

Recommendations

None
C. Technology Resources

General Observations

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

Findings and Evidence

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

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

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

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

Conclusion

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

The UHCC partially meets Standard III.C.

Recommendation

**UH Recommendation 4: Resources**

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

General Observations

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

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

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

Through the strategic planning processes, annual program review, college inventory comparisons, and college efficiency reports, the UHCC is provided data and assessment information to establish funding priorities. General fund allocations, including requests for new funds from the State Legislature, are reviewed at multiple levels within the UH system. The Office of the VPCC also works with the Community College Council of Chancellors to review the allocations and make adjustments as appropriate, particularly during times of budget reductions. Budget decisions are carried out by the Board of Regents Finance Committee and the Board of Regents as a whole.
Findings and Evidence
Evidence exists to validate that the financial resources of the UHCC are sufficient to support student learning programs and services and to improve institutional effectiveness. The UH and the UHCC have made much progress in this area since the 2006 accreditation visit. The UH final reorganization approved by the BOR in 2005 provides a clear line of authority within the UH and between the UH and the UHCC. The Council of Chancellors provides continuous opportunities for discussion, program prioritization and funding prioritization. The UHCC Strategic Plan and the UH strategic outcomes and performance measures outlined with each fiscal biennium budget, provide clear direction to the UHCC to follow as they create their college budgets and program and staffing priorities.

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

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

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

Conclusion

The UHCC meets Standard III.D.

Recommendation

None
STANDARD IV
Leadership and Governance

B. Board and Administration Organization

General Observations

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

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

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

B. 1: Governing Boards

Findings and Evidence

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

B.3: Multi-college Systems

Findings and Evidence

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

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

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

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

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

Conclusion

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

The UHCC partially meets Standard IV.B.

Recommendation

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

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