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Report Preparation

The faculty and staff provided course learning outcomes, service outcomes, and program learning outcomes in preparation for this report. The assessment committee chair and institutional researcher compiled the assessment data and provided input on the assessment process. The College Council reviewed and approved College policies and processes. The University of Hawai‘i Community College recommendations concerning student learning programs and services and resources were addressed by the UHCC System administrators, the vice chancellors for academic affairs, and pertinent faculty groups. A draft of the report was emailed to the entire campus (including student government) for comment and input. The accreditation liaison officer compiled and edited the report.
Response to the Commission Action Letter

Recommendation 1: Student Learning Outcomes

As 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)

In keeping with the ACCJC Eligibility Requirement 10 and Standards I and II, the College has completed the assessment of the Institutional Student Learning Outcomes, completed the assessment of program learning outcomes, updated the comprehensive program review calendar to clarify timelines, and incorporated the assessment of the comprehensive program review more fully into the College processes.

Course Student Learning Outcomes

All courses offered regularly at the College have defined and assessed course-level student learning outcomes (CSLOs) (Appendix I). The College also has several courses which are offered infrequently or on a rotating schedule, and most of these courses now have defined CSLOs. Those that do not are in the process of being deleted or having their CSLOs approved through the Assessment and Curriculum Committee processes.

All courses undergo a rigorous evaluation process before being entered in the College’s catalog of offerings. All new course proposals must have their CSLOs reviewed and approved by the Assessment Committee before the proposal can move forward through the division approval process and being reviewed by the Curriculum Committee. All extant courses must also undergo the same process on a five-year review schedule. The Assessment Committee reviews each course’s student learning outcomes in relation to its description, purpose, and credit weight. In addition, CSLOs are evaluated by the committee for measurability, appropriateness, and completeness, and the assessment coordinator provides feedback, suggestions, and assistance to faculty who submit courses for approval.

Faculty are required to regularly assess student learning in their courses and to report on these assessments at the end of each semester. Faculty compliance with this requirement has been increasing with each passing semester (Appendix II):

Fall 2011 [151/255 sections (59 percent) and 112/179 courses (63 percent)]
Spring 2012 [145/243 sections (60 percent) and 114/178 courses (64 percent)]
Fall 2012 [196/276 sections (71 percent) and 138/184 courses (75 percent)]
Spring 2013 [(235/263 sections (89 percent) and 171/191 courses (90 percent)]
In response to faculty complaints about the limitations of the existing assessment system, the Assessment Committee developed a new policy which clearly outlined what information was required and provided faculty with alternative options for the reporting method (Appendix III). This new policy provides faculty with more flexibility in meeting their reporting requirements and the frequency of reporting for each CSLO, while still maintaining a standard for the minimum acceptable data. Most importantly, the policy specifies that any assessment must include quantitative information about overall student accomplishment of CSLOs, and faculty’s written interpretation and analysis of assessment findings, identifying areas of strength and weakness in student learning and including specific plans for implementing identified changes necessary to improve student learning. To facilitate random representative sampling for larger classes and for courses with multiple sections, the institutional researcher developed the sample size calculator tool (which calculates an appropriate statistically valid representative sample for any given class size) and a student random selection tool (which generates a random list of students in a given course to be assessed).

Finally, the College embarked upon an intensive, high-touch campaign to encourage full-time and part-time faculty to complete and submit their course-level assessment reports. This approach yielded the best results to date for completed assessments—89.5 percent of all courses taught in the Spring 2013 semester were assessed and documented (Appendix II). This, coupled with the College’s push to ensure that all courses have defined CSLOs, has ensured that Kaua’i Community College meets the ACCJC Standard.

**Program Learning Outcomes**

The College has also greatly accelerated the implementation and assessment of program-level student learning outcomes (PSLOs). As in the past, all programs are still required to report on their students’ PSLO achievement in their comprehensive program reviews and in their annual program review updates (APRUs). The template used for reporting this information has been revised and clarified.

Programs have been reporting on their PSLOs in the APRU process. Until now, this was left up to individual program coordinators but the data collection process lacked standardization. It was recognized as a piece that could be expedited by integrating it into the institutional student learning outcomes (ISLO) assessment process. Therefore, the institutional researcher and assessment coordinator took on the task of reorganizing program-level assessment. This involved reactivating and updating the experimental assessment database they had constructed as a pilot project in 2011-2012. All PSLOs for all instructional programs and almost 2,000 CSLOs from across the College’s curriculum were inputted to the database. These outcomes were then cross-matrixed as identified by faculty in professional development activities conducted in Fall 2012 and Spring 2013. Required courses and courses fulfilling general education requirements for all CTE programs were included. In addition, the Liberal Arts faculty were tasked with identifying their program’s crossroad points wherein CSLOs for clusters of required courses could be used to assess the program’s outcomes. This entire matrix was also inputted. In short, the assessment database now contains a means of connecting all PSLOs for instructional programs with individual CSLOs.
for courses within each program. As an example, the table below shows the PSLOs for the Liberal Arts AA program. Tables such as these are being generated for each of the programs (Appendix IV) for inclusion in program reviews.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PSLO #</th>
<th>PSLO Title</th>
<th># of Assessments</th>
<th>Percentage Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1a</td>
<td>Writing</td>
<td>304</td>
<td>80%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1b</td>
<td>Oral Communication</td>
<td>249</td>
<td>85%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1c</td>
<td>Alternative Communication</td>
<td>446</td>
<td>89%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2a</td>
<td>Information Literacy</td>
<td>319</td>
<td>90%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2b</td>
<td>Critical Thinking</td>
<td>233</td>
<td>91%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2c</td>
<td>Formal Reasoning</td>
<td>122</td>
<td>81%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3a</td>
<td>Quantitative Methods</td>
<td>142</td>
<td>77%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3b</td>
<td>Quantitative Analysis</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>69%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3c</td>
<td>Mathematics Appreciation</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>68%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4a</td>
<td>Social Science Perspectives</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>89%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4b</td>
<td>Social Science Implications</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>55%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5a</td>
<td>Scientific Understanding</td>
<td>504</td>
<td>88%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5b</td>
<td>Scientific Method</td>
<td>309</td>
<td>87%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6a</td>
<td>Multiculturalism</td>
<td>721</td>
<td>59%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6b</td>
<td>Historical Awareness</td>
<td>784</td>
<td>53%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6c</td>
<td>Contemporary Analysis</td>
<td>584</td>
<td>55%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6d</td>
<td>Civic Responsibility</td>
<td>116</td>
<td>84%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7a</td>
<td>Aesthetic Appreciation</td>
<td>146</td>
<td>95%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7b</td>
<td>Creativity</td>
<td>296</td>
<td>80%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9a</td>
<td>Healthful Lifestyle</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>93%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9b</td>
<td>Cognitive Wellness</td>
<td>192</td>
<td>90%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9c</td>
<td>Teamwork</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>97%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9d</td>
<td>Physical Wellness</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>88%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Institutional Student Learning Outcomes (ISLOs)

The College completed its review and updating of its ISLOs in May 2013, and therefore had not yet completed any assessments of them by the time of the last accreditation team visit in October 2013. Now, with the completion of the assessment database, the College is able to obtain institutional-level student learning information.

At the same time that the CSLO and PSLO input was being completed in the assessment database, the assessment coordinator and institutional researcher also included information obtained from all teaching faculty regarding the relationships between their individual programs’ PSLOs and the new ISLOs. This information was matrixed with the CSLOs and
PSLOs, allowing the College to draw from a variety of resources when assessing ISLOs. For example, when assessing the College’s written communication ISLO, one is able to draw on student learning data from not only the general education-required English course embedded in all programs, but also from any other course-level assessments directly relevant to continuing to develop students’ written communication skills, regardless of the course alpha. This provides a much more robust picture of how students continue to develop their skills across the curriculum throughout their college careers. In addition, because the assessment information is anchored by student ID numbers, the College can filter ISLO assessments by program, stage of program completion, and student demographics.

The ISLO data that were generated this past summer are depicted in the table below. Faculty and staff will meet in September to discuss the ISLOs and progress towards college goals in general. Some initial observations are that students are achieving the ISLOs at a rate of 70 percent or more for each outcome and that seven of the outcomes are above 80 percent. The lowest scores are in respect for diversity, integrative thinking, and ethics while the highest are in information literacy, teamwork, and reading. Interestingly, the Community College Survey of Student Engagement (discussed below) reveals a higher “grade” for the respect for diversity and the ethics ISLOs. It would appear that students feel that they are engaged in these areas (according to the particular questions of the survey) but are not achieving the learning outcomes. This exemplifies the kind of questioning that will take place during the College Conversation and that will be used to modify strategic goals.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ISLO #</th>
<th>ISLO Title</th>
<th>Met Assessment Benchmark</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Written Communication</td>
<td>85%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Oral Communication</td>
<td>85%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Reading</td>
<td>91%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Symbolic Reasoning</td>
<td>82%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Integrative Thinking</td>
<td>74%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Information Literacy</td>
<td>97%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Technological Competency</td>
<td>88%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Teamwork</td>
<td>96%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Respect for Diversity</td>
<td>73%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Ethics</td>
<td>77%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

CCSSE Contributions to Assessing Institutional Learning Outcomes

Kaua‘i Community College offers the Community College Survey on Student Engagement (CCSSE) once every two years. This survey provides the College with information about students’ perceptions of its academic, professional, and social environments. As all of these aspects contribute to student learning, data from the CCSSE is highly appropriate for one dimension of assessment of the College’s institutional student learning outcomes (ISLOs).

Applicable questions from the CCSSE were chosen for each ISLO to contribute to assessment of that ISLO (Appendix V). Results are analyzed in two ways: improvement
from previous CCSSE offering and comparison against other small colleges in the CCSSE cohort. A percentage grade is assigned for each ISLO in both categories of analysis. The grades determined by averaging the mean scores from each CCSSE question and finding the percentile rank on a normally distributed curve where the comparison score is the mean and the standard deviation is 0.25. For example, the average of the CCSSE question means for the written communication set of questions was 3.01 (on a 4 point scale) for Kaua‘i Community College and 2.74 for the cohort of small colleges. On a normal curve with mean 2.74 and standard deviation 0.25, 86 percent of the area lies to the left of 3.01. Therefore, a grade of 86 percent was assigned for written communication in comparison with other small colleges.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ISLO #</th>
<th>ISLO</th>
<th>2010</th>
<th>2012</th>
<th>Grade</th>
<th>Small Colleges</th>
<th>Kaua‘i CC</th>
<th>Grade</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Written Communication</td>
<td>2.69</td>
<td>3.01</td>
<td>90%</td>
<td>2.74</td>
<td>3.01</td>
<td>86%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Oral Communication</td>
<td>2.39</td>
<td>2.60</td>
<td>81%</td>
<td>2.41</td>
<td>2.60</td>
<td>78%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Reading</td>
<td>2.51</td>
<td>2.66</td>
<td>73%</td>
<td>2.51</td>
<td>2.66</td>
<td>73%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Symbolic Reasoning</td>
<td>2.69</td>
<td>2.80</td>
<td>67%</td>
<td>2.70</td>
<td>2.80</td>
<td>66%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Integrative Thinking</td>
<td>2.86</td>
<td>2.98</td>
<td>67%</td>
<td>2.81</td>
<td>2.98</td>
<td>74%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Information Literacy</td>
<td>2.69</td>
<td>2.88</td>
<td>78%</td>
<td>2.73</td>
<td>2.88</td>
<td>73%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Technological Competency</td>
<td>2.63</td>
<td>2.80</td>
<td>74%</td>
<td>2.74</td>
<td>2.80</td>
<td>59%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Teamwork</td>
<td>2.51</td>
<td>2.70</td>
<td>78%</td>
<td>2.44</td>
<td>2.70</td>
<td>85%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Respect for Diversity</td>
<td>2.60</td>
<td>2.88</td>
<td>86%</td>
<td>2.47</td>
<td>2.88</td>
<td>95%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Ethics</td>
<td>2.56</td>
<td>2.78</td>
<td>81%</td>
<td>2.46</td>
<td>2.78</td>
<td>90%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The results of the 2012 CCSSE showed improvements across the board in student perceptions of key areas affecting student learning outcomes. The largest improvements were in written communication, respect for diversity, oral communication, and ethics. Kaua‘i
Community College stands out among small colleges across the nation in several areas, most notably respect for diversity, ethics, written communication, and teamwork.

**Academic Support**

At the time of the self-evaluation, all of the academic support units had student or service learning outcomes except the Testing Center. Since that time, the Testing Center has developed three service outcomes. Given that this is the first year that program outcomes have been collected, the data will be used to set benchmarks for future improvements. The first outcome relates to supporting instructional faculty and academic advising faculty by providing ADA-compliant access to course-related and placement testing. Measurements will include the number of tests administered to students with documented accommodations forms per year per student FTE, contrasted with number of overall tests per student FTE. During FY 2012, 40 students with accommodations took an exam at the Testing Center but only 19 could be identified, with confidence, to have used their accommodation for their exam. These 19 students took 55 exams which granted an accommodation during FY 2012. The number of tests with accommodations per FTE was .07 in 2012 compared to the overall tests per FTE which was 1.5.

The second service outcome relates to supporting profession and workforce development by providing professional certification examination facilities that meet test vendors’ requirements. Measurements for this will include the number of professional tests administered per year for students and community members. In FY 2012, 97 exams were administered.

The third service outcome relates to providing a secure testing environment in the highest compliance with academic and professional testing standards. Measurements include student and faculty satisfaction survey results and inspection reports by external testing agencies. On a five-point Likert scale, the student satisfaction survey showed an average 4.79 and the faculty and staff satisfaction showed a 4.86. There have been no external inspection reports as of this writing.

**Student Services**

Student Services at Kaua‘i Community College has five major units: Counseling and Advising, Financial Aid, Admissions and Records, Student Life, and Marketing and Enrollment Management. Each unit has developed and is assessing one to two service outcomes.

Counseling and Advising Service Outcome 1
Prior to the Banner Student Information System and implementation of the STAR Academic Journey program, the counseling department required mandatory advising for all new and continuing students. During this process, counselors utilized a triplicate Academic Planner to assist students in developing a strategic plan to reach their academic and career goals. Once Banner and STAR were instituted in the early to mid 2000’s, self-advising and self-registration became the norm. Although highly encouraged, continuing students were no
longer required to obtain academic advising prior to registering. The intent of the STAR Academic Journey program is to provide an electronic snapshot of student progress towards completion of their particular degree or certificate program. While this is a valuable tool which details graduation requirements, it does not sequence courses towards timely program completion. Counseling and Advising applies a strategy of an education plan that sequences courses.

The Counseling and Advising unit’s first service outcome is Student Services guides and supports students in developing an educational plan (Academic Planner) and pursuing that plan. This service outcome is being assessed by collecting data on student persistence, completion rates, and student educational plan completion. This outcome impacts retention and persistence and is in alignment with University of Hawai‘i Goal 1 on Educational Effectiveness and Student Success and KCC Goals 1: Access and 2: Learning and Teaching.

In 2013, a web-based data collecting system was created. Counseling and Advising has collected academic planners for new and continuing students (see table on Education Plans Completed by Semester). The academic planner data will provide a better understanding of student persistence and goal completion which are performance indicators for the College’s goals.

**Education Plans Completed by Semester (2007-2013)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Term</th>
<th># of Students</th>
<th>Percentage Completed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fall 2007</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spring/Summer 2008</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall 2008</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spring/Summer 2009</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall 2009</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spring/Summer 2010</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall 2010</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spring/Summer 2011</td>
<td>127</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall 2011</td>
<td>184</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spring/Summer 2012</td>
<td>260</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall 2012</td>
<td>308</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spring/Summer 2013</td>
<td>319</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall 2013</td>
<td>812</td>
<td>37%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The first chart below reflects the fall to fall persistence rate of those students who have academic planners compared to those students without planners. The data (Appendix VI) shows that the persistence rate is consistently higher for those students who use planners. The collection of data on the planners in the earlier years was admittedly low with 1 percent-4 percent of students with planners but in 2011 it rose to 15 percent and in 2012, 24 percent.

The chart below compares the attrition rates of those students who have academic planners to those students who do not have academic planners. Students who do not have academic planners drop out at a higher rate than those with planners.
The use of planners is an effective way to keep students on track to graduate or achieve their other goals. The data shows that there appears to be a positive relationship between the planners and attrition and retention. The staff will continue to implement this strategy to measure their service outcome in the next years. Consistent collection of the planner information should reveal significant numbers in the future. Other directions under discussion are measurements of actual student goals such as transfer, work goals, or professional development.

Counseling and Advising Service Outcome 2
The second Counseling and Advising SO addresses the retention of probationary students, utilizing the Contract for Academic Success Strategy. The SO states, “Kaua‘i Community College Student Services academic advisors collaborate with all students, with an emphasis on academic probationary students, to develop an academic plan and/or contract for academic success.” Academic success contracts will be completed, then counseling and advising will measure the amount of students who gets off probation and continued on to the next semester.

In Spring 2012, the counselors committed to a formal implementation of the CAS intervention and began collecting CAS data. Counselors aim to have contracts for at least 50 percent of the students on probation every semester. Since this is a new initiative, the benchmark for success for this service outcome is that students on contract will retain at a 10 percent higher rate than students with no contracts.

In Summer 2013, counselors further developed the Contract for Academic Success process (Appendix VII) to include a timeline (Appendix VIII). The counselors developed the new timeline to reflect follow-up visits with the students during the semester. This timeline will take into consideration the student’s academic progress and recommended remediation if any. Currently registration holds have been placed on the academic records of probationary students who are identified as registered and classified. The registrar will keep these holds in place through late registration meaning the students will have to see a counselor to approve any curricular actions (including dropping and adding).

Financial Aid Office
The Financial Aid Office’s outcome is that Kaua‘i Community College Student Services assists students to receive all financial aid for which they are eligible in a timely manner and to understand the processes and procedures of the financial aid system. To assess this outcome, Financial Aid Office is tracking the number of Free Application for Federal Student Aid (FAFSA) forms submitted by the priority deadline, the amount of disbursements, and the number of Kaua‘i Community College scholarship applications. In addition to these measures, students are surveyed for information about their awareness of deadlines and their satisfaction with financial aid services.

The Financial Aid Office has seen a dramatic increase in the number of FAFSA applications processed, the number of Pell Grant recipients, the number of scholarships awarded, and many other key markers for success. The number of FAFSA applications that were completed on time (by April 1) has increased substantially in the past four years, from 382 in
AY 2009-2010 to 782 in the past year. Between Fall 2010 and Fall 2012, the disbursements increased 134 percent from $569,334 to $1,332,331. The number of scholarship and tuition waiver applications that were completed doubled in AY2011-2012, reaching 220, well above the 110 applications recorded in 2009-2010.

| FAFSA Applications Completed on or Before April 1 (Priority Deadline) |
|--------------------------|-----------------|
| 09-10                    | 382             |
| 10-11                    | 478             |
| 11-12                    | 636             |
| 12-13                    | 782             |

A survey was sent to 404 students who submitted their FAFSA after the April 1 priority deadline. There were 55 students who completed the survey for a response rate of 13.6 percent. The survey indicated that the top reasons for lateness were indecision about attending Kaua‘i Community College and not knowing or understanding the financial aid process and deadlines. About 75 percent of the students surveyed filled out the FAFSA on their own (37) as compared to coming into the Financial Aid Office for assistance (13). The survey suggests that the Financial Aid Office could do more to increase visibility and access to financial aid. The results of the survey are contained in Appendix IX.

The Financial Aid Office has used its service outcomes assessment results to plan future outreach activities for students, such as workshops on financial literacy topics, scholarship searches, debt management, and other topics related to financial aid. To increase the number of scholarships, Kaua‘i Community College has established an online Common Scholarship Application, making the scholarship application process faster and more convenient for our students. The office will also focus on areas that include default prevention and management and the conversion of incomplete FAFSA applications to completed. In the most recent annual program review update process, a new financial aid assistant position was approved. With the additional staffing, the office will be better able to offer many of these additional services.

Admissions and Records
The service outcome for Admissions and Records is that Kaua‘i Community College Student Services provides a clear, systematic process by which students may apply for admission, receive credits for accredited and/or articulated prior learning, and register for Kaua‘i Community College classes. The assessments that will be used to judge the progress on this outcome are measurements of enrollment process completion, timeliness, availability and convenience, student satisfaction, and the number of transcripts that are processed.

The average percentage of students completing the Kaua‘i Community College enrollment process for the past six semesters is 68.5 percent, with the exception of Spring 2011 when it dropped to 63.6 percent. In the Spring 2013 semester, the yield rate was 61.1 percent, the highest among the seven Hawai‘i community colleges. The average yield for the system is 53.9 percent. Contributing to the high yield rate is prompt follow up on all incomplete
applications and prompt processing of the applications. Although it is a time-consuming process, the follow-up with the incomplete applications is crucial for enrolling students in a timely manner.

Timeliness is measured by looking at the turnaround time for student applications. The application form is now online and a log for each application indicates the date when the application is submitted and when it is approved. In the Fall 2013 semester, the department will retrieve and use the data to measure against a two-day turnaround benchmark which was set as a goal. On the average, 200 transcripts are processed per year. Typically transcripts are analyzed once the student has attended College for a full semester which removes the immediate turnover time element. Availability and convenience is measured through CCSSE questions specifically about Admissions and Records. Results from the most recent CCSSE survey indicates that students found the services somewhat or very useful (89 percent), but 78 percent of the students sometimes or rarely used the service. Office hours, website instructions, and the new online application form (available 24x7) seem to meet student needs given the usage pattern.

Satisfaction was measured by two different surveys: the CCSSE and the ASUH-KCC Student Survey. Of the students who participated in the CCSSE survey, 81 percent rated themselves as very or somewhat satisfied with services provided by Admissions and Records, including its processes and customer service. Students who took the student government survey showed a 67 percent satisfaction rate. Both of these ratings have some room for improvement in customer service and response time, which are current Admissions and Records’ goals. The recent addition of a student hire has assisted realizing these goals.

Student Life
The Student Life outcome is that *Kaua‘i Community College Student Services works to enhance the student experience at the College by actively supporting Kaua‘i Community College student government and by encouraging student participation in the campus’ extra-curricular activities and clubs*. To measure this outcome, student life uses surveys, numbers of events, and attendance at events.

Student Government
One of the goals of Student Government is to promote leadership within the College, in the community, and beyond. ASUH-KCC Student Government leaders are given opportunities to participate in a number of state and national conferences that focus on leadership training and development. The three primary venues are: 1) HASLA - Ho‘opili Hou Statewide Leadership Conference held each semester at a UH community college or university; 2) Association of College Unions International (ACUI) held at a mainland institution each spring semester; and 3) The American Student Association of Community Colleges (ASACC) Student Advocacy Conference which focuses on legislative advocacy and pertinent information relating to community college concerns. In addition, leadership training at the local level is provided during Club Social events held each semester or whenever needed. Each year 19 students participate in student government and typically all of them attend HASLA. Recruiting students for student government and other co-curricular activities is a challenge every fall. Student Life instituted new strategies to enlist students
such as advertising at new student orientations and after school get-togethers every two weeks to discuss issues and careers. The get-togethers provide interested students with educational guidance and career exploration in the student life arena. In addition, students are given the opportunity to work in Student Life through the Bridge to Hope Program that supports single parents with employment on campus and the Students in Service Program that gives students a stipend for completed volunteer services. Other opportunities to develop leadership skills, build personal confidence, improve planning and communication skills, and create long-term relationships with community groups are available through the Student Life Office and its various committees.

The UHCC System’s student life coordinators are on the verge of adapting a new tool to measure the student learning outcome for leadership. The new tool chosen is based on a model developed by Kathy M. Collins and Darby M. Roberts and detailed in a book, *Accessing and Documenting Student Leader Learning in Co-curricular Involvement*. It is a model currently in use at Texas A&M. The intent is to implement the tool within the next year and use it to measure student learning outcomes for students involved in co-curricular clubs as well as student government.

Co-Curricular Activities
Since Student Life is responsible for creating programs that meet the broad interests and needs of all students, it was decided to separate student life activities from student government. Activities sponsored from 2007 to 2009 were completely sponsored by Student Government. In Fall 2010, the Student Activity Council (SAC) was formed specifically to focus on co-curricular activities. SAC was chartered to plan and implement activities for the campus community. This allowed for greater flexibility and inclusion of all students whose primary interest is co-curricular activities rather than governance or advocacy. To gain a better understanding of student needs, SAC explored the interests of students through informal student interviews and focus groups. In addition, survey results collected in 2010 provided leaders with a better understanding of the kinds of activities and events the committee should focus on in successive semesters. The results of the survey (*Appendix X*) guided student leaders to organize and implement a number of activities during the 2010-2011 academic year including such events as Weekly Coffee Breaks, County of Kaua‘i Candidate Forum, College Night, etc. (*see Appendix X* for a more complete list). In addition, student leaders supported Kaua‘i Community College institutional goals such as sustainability and zero waste initiatives and the establishment of the Board of Publications to help the College realize these priorities.

Aside from these activities, *Appendix X* shows a collective list of popular and reoccurring events and activities recorded from Fall 2007 to Spring 2012. The data includes an approximate number of student participation documented from mandatory sign-in sheets for each event. The data shows participation in student life sponsored activities over the past six years. After the survey and implementation of different activities, the number of participants went up to 2,576 in 2010 and 2,658 in 2011; however, it has since dropped down to 2,314 attendees in 2012 (see graph below).
In addition to the activities and events survey previously mentioned, Student Life also uses the Community College Survey of Student Engagement (CCSSE) to gauge student involvement and interest in student organizations by measuring satisfaction, usage, and importance. The table below shows that students in 2012 placed more importance on student organizations and felt more satisfied with the College's student organizations than in 2010, with the aggregate response landing just above "somewhat satisfied" and "somewhat important." Participation increased slightly, but is still low -- closer to "rarely/never" than "sometimes."

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CCSSE Question</th>
<th>2010 KCC</th>
<th>All Colleges</th>
<th>2010 KCC</th>
<th>All Colleges</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>How often do you use student</td>
<td>1.36</td>
<td>1.35</td>
<td>1.40</td>
<td>1.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>organizations?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How satisfied are you with student</td>
<td>2.03</td>
<td>1.98</td>
<td>2.12</td>
<td>2.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>organizations?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How important are student</td>
<td>1.97</td>
<td>1.84</td>
<td>2.07</td>
<td>1.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>organizations?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Given both survey results and the ongoing need to recruit students for Student Government, Student Life will continue to use the SAC to implement activities according to the input received from students and the recruitment strategies. Though the numbers of students participating in activities have decreased, it had no negative impact on the CCSSE scores for 2012. Participation in campus events is an important aspect of Student Life as it increases student engagement and provides access to leadership opportunities. The staff will set a benchmark of 2,700 attendees for annual co-curricular activities.

Marketing and Enrollment Management
The service outcome for Marketing and Enrollment Management is that Kaua’i Community College Student Services strengthens the College’s presence in the community through outreach and marketing efforts.
In Fall 2012, the College hired our first marketing and enrollment management director. During the year that the marketing director worked at the College, the emphasis was to develop publicity materials for credit and non-credit programs and to begin developing a marketing strategy. The marketing director vacated the position in the summer of 2013 and the College is currently filling the position and will look for input from the new director to develop service outcome measurements.

Comprehensive Program Review

The College strategic planning process takes place within the context of the UH and UHCC System mission and goals and informed by the needs of the Kaua‘i community. Each year in September, the College reviews its progress towards its goals and determines the need to prioritize certain goals; these are termed strategic priorities. The UHCC System sets performance measures and tracks the goal data for each community college within the UH System. The College also has goals that address the Kaua‘i community specifically. The College assesses its effectiveness using the comprehensive program review process and the annual program review process as well as other institution wide data. Additional legislative funding that comes to the UHCC System is then allocated to each college according to how successful they have been in attaining their goals. The three parts of this integrated planning process are well connected and cyclical, providing a strongly supported structure throughout the entire UHCC System. The College has improved this process by updating the program review and planning timeline and including policy language that strengthens the integration of assessment and improvement.

Kaua‘i Community College Policy (KCCP) 1-6 was updated to include the new calendar and to more explicitly state the feedback process for the comprehensive program reviews (CPRs) for programs and the College Council. The revised KCCP 1-6 (Appendix XI) provides for an additional review of CPRs for College goal alignment and measurements by an administrative team who will report recommendations to the appropriate program representatives and the College Council. The program will discuss the recommendations with the division and any changes made as a result of the discussion will be delineated in a revised CPR. The 2012 CPRs have been reviewed by the administrative team and recommendations (Appendix XII) have been forwarded to program representatives for further discussion in September. These CPRs were submitted in December according to a previous timeline; the new deadline is October 31. This new deadline will provide more time for the College Council to review the annual program review updates (APRUs) and CPRs well in advance of the UH System’s budget process with the legislature that begins in February. The CPR review and the other processes and events linked to integrated planning are included in both the KCCP 1-6 on Program Review (Appendix XI) and KCCP 1-8 on Integrated Planning (Appendix XIII).

The College updated the comprehensive program review (CPR) calendar (Appendix A of KCCP 1-6) so that the submission deadlines are clear and reasons for non-receipt of reviews are indicated. CPRs are submitted annually in batches of four to eight programs at a time. In 2009, the Program Review Committee rearranged the calendar so that program submissions were more evenly distributed over a five-year period. This caused some programs to go for a
longer period of time before submitting a CPR (as much as seven years for two programs). As of October 2013, all programs will be on the five-year schedule again. Some programs had not submitted CPRs for other reasons that were not made clear at the time of the team visit. Generally, a CPR is not submitted by the deadline for one of three reasons: one reason is its being a new program or service (“NA” entries are made on the calendar until the first submittal date); the second reason is there being no faculty or staff in the program or service; and the last reason is the program’s being accredited by another agency (programs accredited by external agencies are not required to submit CPRs). In the latter occurrence, the programs involved continue to submit APRUs. If there are no program faculty when the CPR is due, the CPR deadline is moved to an appropriate point in the future (usually three years), once the position is filled.

**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. (Standards I.B.2, I.B.3)

The current Kaua‘i Community College goals are Access, Learning and Teaching, Workforce Development, Personal Development, Community Development, and Diversity. These goals are measured annually and some of the data is reported to UHCC System campuses by the Vice President of Community Colleges (VPCC) in the spring with an update in the fall. The VPCC reports on goals using the UHCC annual program review data; this was discussed in detail in the 2012 Self-Evaluation Report, Standard I.B.2 (pp. I-33 to I-43). Moreover, the College has embarked on the actionable improvement plan for I.B.2 to “re-evaluate the performance measures for Community Development, Diversity, and Personal Development.” The institutional researcher together with the College Council suggested several CCSSE measurements as well as other data (Appendix XIV) that can measure progress towards these three goals in addition to the efforts described in the 2012 Self-Evaluation Report. These CCSSE measurement will be provided at the College Conversation (on achieving college goals) that will be held in September.

**Timeline and Integration**

The timeline for integrating the mission statement, goal measurement, dialogue, learning outcomes, and quality assurance processes has been updated and included in **KCCP 1-6**. As suggested under Recommendation 1, the program, College Council, and administrative reviews of the CPRs have been made more explicit and included in the timeline (**KCCP 1-6**).
The report on the College’s performance measures comes from both the UHCC System and the institutional researcher’s office. The chancellor presents the VPCC’s fall and spring reports at the annual Fall Convocation and arranges a College Conversation during the fall semester to discuss goal attainment and whether the College should change its strategic priorities (this is a subset or a refinement of a particular existing goal). The College Council will approve the strategic priorities, and they will be used as the focal points for the APRUs and CPRs in the following year.

The CPR process uses College goals and priorities to develop action plans that outline a vision for the next five years and beyond. The newly revised Program Review policy includes additional reviews of the CPR before it is finalized. Each year in the spring, an administrative team will review the years’ CPRs and prepare a list of recommendations based on alignment with College goals, benchmarks, and resource requests. The recommendations will be discussed with the program or unit representatives and then shared with the division and College Council. In October of the following fall semester, the data on action plans will be collected and analyzed in preparation for the annual College Conversation on the achievement of goals.

Quality Assurance of Processes

The APRU process (the UHCC System refers to it as the Annual Report of Program Data or ARPD) is visited annually by the UHCC Instructional Program Review Council (IPRC). This council is made up of UHCC faculty and staff from across the seven campuses who come together solely to evaluate the ARPD process. The process takes place over the academic year and changes are implemented in August. Appendix XV contains several agendas and minutes from various IPRC meetings that discuss process changes. The APRU process measures the achievement of College goals at the program or unit level on an annual basis.

The CPR process measures the achievement of College goals and learning outcomes over a five-year period of time, but it also contains a larger plan (and associated action plans) for the coming five years. The College has placed the evaluation of the CPR process on a two-year cycle, beginning Fall 2014. KCCP 1-6 has been revised to integrate the CPR process into the College Council on a schedule that will facilitate its inclusion in the College Conversation on the Assessment of College Goals. As mentioned, the APRU and CPR submittal deadlines are now October 31 (new deadline beginning in Fall 2013). The chancellor provided a recap of the VPCC’s spring presentation on the campuses’ performance data, as well as other goal measurements, during Fall Convocation. This year, the College Conversation on the Assessment of College Goals will take place in September. This Conversation will bring the integrated planning loop to a full cycle. Listed in the table below is the timeline for the evaluation of the various processes.
### Process/Entity Evaluators Date of Evaluation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Process/Entity</th>
<th>Evaluators</th>
<th>Date of Evaluation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>APRU (ARPD)</td>
<td>IPRC (UHCC Committee)</td>
<td>Annually</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CPR</td>
<td>Process Task Force appointed by CC</td>
<td>Every even year begin 2014 (fall semester)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resource Allocation Process</td>
<td>College Council</td>
<td>Annually (spring semester)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Mission Statement Review

The mission of the College is reviewed every two years by the College Council and this takes place in the fall. The next review is scheduled for AY2013-2014 and will take place after the College Conversation on goals and strategic priorities. If College Council determines a more thorough review and revision is necessary, the extensive five-year process will be enacted (KCCP 1-8). Otherwise, a full campus wide and community review of the mission statement will take place every five years to ensure that it accurately reflects the current mission of the Institution. The next five-year review will be in 2016.

### Recommendation 3: Student Learning Programs and Services

**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. (ER11, Standards II.A.3, II.A.3.b)

**University of Hawai‘i Community Colleges**

**Eligibility Requirement 11 General Education**

The institution defines and incorporates into all of its degree programs a substantial component of general education designed to ensure breadth of knowledge and promote intellectual inquiry. The general education component includes demonstrated competence in writing and computational skills and an introduction to some of the major areas of knowledge. General education has comprehensive learning outcomes for the students who complete it. Degree credit for general education programs must be consistent with levels of quality and rigor appropriate to higher education. See the Accreditation Standards II.A.3, for areas of study for general education.

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

**Standard II.A.3.b (General education has comprehensive learning outcomes for the students who complete it, including the following) A capability to be a productive individual and life-**
long learner: skills include oral and written communication, information competency, computer literacy, scientific and quantitative reasoning, critical analysis/ logical thinking, and the ability to acquire knowledge through a variety of means.

In Spring 2012, ACCJC identified an issue that longstanding general education requirements within some Associate in Applied Science Degrees (AAS) did not appear to meet Accreditation Eligibility Requirements and Standards. The historical practice of allowing English and math general education requirements to be met through developmental courses or to allow other general education courses to have extremely low reading or math levels did not meet the Standards and therefore, required curriculum and program modifications.

The University of Hawai’i Community Colleges (UHCC) immediately revised the policy on general education to bring the policy framework for general education into alignment with the Standards and promulgated the new policy UHCCP #5.200 General Education in All Degree Programs. Colleges then began the curriculum processes for making the necessary change in program requirements, including consultation with program advisory committees, faculty and program departmental review, curriculum committee and faculty governance review, and administrative approval of the required changes. The evaluation report of the visiting teams reaffirmed the importance of making these general education modifications.

The approach has been similar on all affected campuses. The English requirement has been raised to English 100, the basic expository writing class and the math requirement to Math 100, the basic non-algebra sequence college math class. Remedial and developmental classes no longer can be used to satisfy general education requirements.

At the same time, curriculum work has begun on the development of college-level applied writing and applied mathematics classes that could better meet the needs of the AAS degree programs while meeting the general education standards. Once these courses are developed, additional program modifications may be made to incorporate these courses either as the recommended or an optional means to satisfy the general education requirement.

In summary, all AAS degree programs at Hawai‘i Community College, Honolulu Community College, Kaua‘i Community College, and Leeward Community College are now in compliance with the Standards. The program by program details of the changes and the processes leading to those changes are described in the College responses to this recommendation.

Kapi‘olani Community College and Windward Community College were not impacted by this recommendation as they do not have AAS degree programs.

As a result of this change in degree requirements, an issue emerged related to the certificate level programs within the AAS degree programs. UHCCP #5.203 Program Credentials: Degrees and Certificates had an upper limit of 30 on the number of credits allowable for a technical certificate of achievement. Several programs expressed a desire to increase that number to enable a student who earned credit for all of the technical courses within an AAS field of study, but did not complete all of the general education, could be recognized through
a certificate of achievement. Accordingly, **UHCCP #5.203 Program Credentials: Degrees and Certificates** was modified to raise the allowable number of credits in a certificate program within the AAS fields of study to 51. This policy was promulgated on September 2013.

**Kaua’i Community College**

Currently and historically all Associate of Arts (AA) and Associate of Science (AS) degrees offered by Kaua’i Community College required college-level (course numbers 100 or higher) general education courses. These courses meet requirements for transfer to four-year University of Hawai’i institutions as well as out-of-state colleges and universities. However, at the time of the 2012 Self-Evaluation Report, eight Associate of Applied Science (AAS) degree programs had requirements that were non-transfer level (below 100 course numbers) general education courses.

The eight AAS programs are Automotive Body Repair and Painting (ABRP), Accounting (ACC), Automotive Technology (AMT), Business Technology (BTEC), Carpentry (CARP), Culinary Arts (CULN), Electrical Installation and Maintenance Technology (EIMT), and Hospitality and Tourism (HOST). The courses in these programs that students were allowed to take for general education requirements that were not college-level are listed in the following table.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>APRP</th>
<th>ACC</th>
<th>AMT</th>
<th>BTEC</th>
<th>CARP</th>
<th>CULN</th>
<th>EIMT</th>
<th>HOST</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>English 21</td>
<td>Anthro 20</td>
<td>Anthro 20</td>
<td>Anthro 20</td>
<td>Anthro 20</td>
<td>English 21</td>
<td>Anthro 20</td>
<td>English 21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English 22</td>
<td>Electricity 20</td>
<td>English 21</td>
<td>Electricity 20</td>
<td>English 21</td>
<td>English 22</td>
<td>English 21</td>
<td>English 22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Math 50</td>
<td>English 21</td>
<td>English 22</td>
<td>English 21</td>
<td>English 22</td>
<td>Math 50H</td>
<td>English 22</td>
<td>Speech 20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physics 50</td>
<td>English 22</td>
<td>Math 50</td>
<td>English 22</td>
<td>Math 50</td>
<td>Math50</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Psych 21</td>
<td>Electronics 18</td>
<td>Physics 50</td>
<td>Electronics 18</td>
<td>Physics 50</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speech 20</td>
<td>Speech 20</td>
<td>Speech 20</td>
<td>Speech 20</td>
<td>Speech 20</td>
<td>Speech 20</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speech 31</td>
<td>Speech 31</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

For all eight of these programs, all elective options for courses below 100-level were eliminated. A new college-level physics course was developed to replace Physics 50. In addition, English 100, a transfer-level freshman English course, is now a minimum requirement for all AAS degrees. Math 100 or above is now the quantitative reasoning general education requirement. These changes were developed by the eight AAS programs, vetted through the curriculum committee and approved by the Vice Chancellor for Academic
Affairs and the Chancellor. The eight program action request forms (Appendix XVI) show the new curricula for these programs and the signature and dates of the approval process. All changes become effective with the Fall 2013 semester.

**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)*

The Academic and Non-Academic Grievance Policies are located in three locations on the College website, in the College catalog, and in the College’s handbooks. The College no longer assembles or prints a schedule of classes; instead, students are referred to their counselors or directly to the “Class Availability” site via a student information handout or newspaper ads.

A reference to each policy is located one click from the front page under “Current Students.” The policies are also located on the Student Life website under the Student Handbook and on the Kauaʻi Community College Catalog website. A version of the policy is in the printed Kauaʻi Community College Catalog (Appendix XVII, pp.163-169), and it is also made available to students via the Vice Chancellor for Student Affairs office or through the Student Life Counselor. The policies are also included in the Kauaʻi Community College Faculty and Staff Handbook website and in all printed handbooks.

**Recommendation 5: Resources**

**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)*

**University of Hawaiʻi Community Colleges**

*Standard III.A.1.c Faculty and others directly responsible for student progress toward achieving stated student learning outcomes have, as a component of their evaluation, effectiveness in producing those learning outcomes.*

**Regular Faculty Evaluation**

Within the University of Hawaiʻi Community Colleges (UHCC), the faculty classification system and collective bargaining definition include regular instructional faculty, counselors and advisors, librarians and other academic support personnel, and other professionals who are responsible for student learning.
The evaluation system for faculty is based on a peer review and merit linked to a faculty classification system with ranks of instructor, assistant professor, associate professor, and professor. The classification document defines the expectations for faculty at the various ranks and forms the fundamental basis for the evaluation system. As noted in our 2012 Self-Evaluation Report, this classification system does include achievement of student outcomes as one of the responsibilities of faculty and a factor in the subsequent evaluation of the faculty performance.

As defined by the collective bargaining agreement and UH Board of Regents (BOR) policies, faculty are currently evaluated using different processes at different periods in the faculty member’s professional progress at the institution. During the first five years of employment, faculty members are probationary and undergo comprehensive evaluations at least three times during the five-year period. These evaluations include the submittal of a dossier documenting the faculty member’s work, including contributions toward the defining and achieving of student outcomes, peer evaluations, student evaluations, professional development, curriculum development, and contributions to the College and community. As a faculty member moves through the probationary period, the evaluation may also include responses or progress toward meeting areas of weakness or concern from prior evaluations. The dossier is evaluated by a committee of department peers (Department Personnel Committee), department chair, academic vice chancellors/deans, and ultimately a decision on contract renewal is made by the chancellor.

At the end of the probationary period, a faculty member applies for tenure. The tenure process includes a similar comprehensive review against the classification requirement but is more summative rather than formative. The successful applicant is granted tenure and the unsuccessful applicant is granted a terminal year contract. In addition to the department-based peer review, department chair review, and administrative review, the tenure application is also reviewed by a faculty committee composed of faculty members from outside the department and faculty members outside the College in the same discipline. The BOR is the final decision maker on granting tenure.

Once tenured, a faculty member may, after a period of four years in rank, apply for promotion to a higher rank. The evaluation process for the promotion application is the same as for tenure except that the criteria are based on the higher expectations as reflected in the faculty classification policy. An unsuccessful promotion applicant is eligible to reapply in future years.

In 1990, the BOR adopted a policy to address the ongoing evaluation of faculty members who did not apply for promotion after achieving tenure or who had reached the rank of professor and were no longer eligible for promotion and therefore, not subject to evaluation. The BOR wanted to ensure that all faculty members were evaluated on a regular basis.

After consultation with the faculty collective bargaining organization, the UHCC plans to adopt a policy on evaluation (sometimes referred to as post-tenure evaluation) that establishes a process requiring all faculty members to undergo evaluation at least once every five years. Because the evaluation process for contract renewal, tenure, and promotion were
already comprehensive in scope, these evaluations are considered by policy to satisfy the five-year evaluation criteria. For faculty members who have not undergone a comprehensive evaluation, the policy will define a department-based process whereby the faculty member submits an abbreviated documentation of his or her contributions to their department and addresses their effectiveness as a faculty member. The assessment is based on the faculty member’s rank and the related duties in the classification system. Under the current policy, the evaluation is entirely within the department unless there is a disagreement between the department chair and faculty member.

The team evaluation report correctly noted that this evaluation policy had not been updated since 1990 and did not reflect the current expectations as defined in Standard III.A.1.c. Accordingly, the Office of the Vice President for Community Colleges (OVPCC), working with the director of human resources and campus academic administrators, modified the policy to reflect the Accreditation Standard.

In accordance with the collective bargaining law, this collective bargaining organization must be formally consulted on the policy change. The revised draft policy was submitted to the University of Hawai‘i Professional Assembly (UHPA) on September 13, 2013. After consideration of the comments from the collective bargaining organization, the revised policy will be promulgated and will guide future evaluations.

As a part of the revised policy, campuses will also be required to maintain and submit records certifying that all faculty members subject to the five-year evaluation have actually completed the evaluation process.

**Lecturer (Adjunct Faculty) Evaluation**

Lecturers are faculty members employed to teach individual classes to meet demand that cannot be met by regular faculty or because of special expertise that the lecturer may bring to a class. The lecturer appointment is for the duration of the class only.

Lecturers must meet the same academic qualifications as regular faculty. The job responsibility for lecturers is limited to the class they are teaching and provides for a limited amount of student contact through office hours or other communication means. The lecturer position does not include curriculum development, development of student learning outcomes, College service, or other professional duties expected of regular faculty members. The lecturer is expected to follow the student learning outcomes and assessment methodologies as adopted by the regular faculty for the courses he or she is teaching.

Lecturers advance through a series of pay bands (A, B, C) with the compensation rate per credit hour dependent on the pay band. Unlike regular faculty members whose tenure and promotion is merit based, the lecturer pay band advancement is currently solely based on the historic number of credits the lecturer has taught.

As noted by the team evaluation report, there is no system evaluation policy for lecturers and there may be inconsistencies from campus to campus in the form of evaluation, frequency of
evaluation, and monitoring of evaluation. Currently, lecturer evaluations are at the department level and involve review of student evaluations and the insights of the department chair and/or discipline coordinator within the department.

Because the lecturer’s status and rank are the same across all community colleges, there is a compelling reason to maintain a consistency in the evaluation process for lecturers. Accordingly, the OVPCC, working with the campus academic administrators, plans to develop a new system policy on lecturer evaluations. The policy will leave the responsibility for the evaluation on the campus and largely within the department but does define the requirement for evaluation, frequency of evaluation, and criteria to be used in the evaluation.

In accordance with the collective bargaining law, lecturers who are half-time or more are included in the faculty collective bargaining unit and the collective bargaining organization must be formally consulted on the new policy. Plans are to submit the proposed policy to UHPA before the end of September 2013. After consideration of the comments from the collective bargaining organization, the new policy will be promulgated and will guide future evaluations.

Additionally, a joint task group from the collective bargaining organization and the community colleges plans to be proposed to consider whether lecturer pay advancement should be merit based rather than credit based and the criteria to be used in such a merit based system. Should such a system be developed and implemented after proper consultation, the evaluation criteria would need to also be adjusted to reflect the policy change.

Pilot Project for ePortfolio Evaluation of Faculty

The current faculty evaluation system is conceived as representing a continuum across the faculty member’s professional career. The faculty expectations as defined in the classification system, rising expectations associated with the ranks, merit basis for promotion, importance of peer involvement as well as administrative oversight in the evaluation, and required periodic evaluation of all faculty are key principles in the evaluation system.

While guidelines are currently published on the different phases of the evaluation (contract renewal, tenure, promotion, and post-tenure evaluation), the documents are paper documents created by and submitted by the applicant. This process results in the faculty member often having to find historic information as they create the application and creates inconsistencies in the information and materials that they may include and make available to the reviewers. The paper submittals are often very cumbersome and create problems in moving them from reviewing body to reviewing body.

To address these issues, a pilot project is underway to consider whether an electronic portfolio approach would work to help faculty members build their evaluation portfolio in real time for use when the application period occurs. The ePortfolio could incorporate direct electronic feeds of information like the results of student evaluations, peer evaluations,
student outcome and assessment results, historical teaching and non-teaching assignments, and other components of the evaluation process. The ePortfolio would also allow faculty members to introduce curriculum materials, professional development experiences, evidence of college or community service, and other documents into the process. Finally, the system would capture online the faculty member’s assessment of the evidence as well as the reviewers’ assessment and/or suggestions for improvement. The initial pilot project will involve faculty members from the campuses as well as UHPA-recommended members.

Other Modifications to Evaluation Policy

The guidelines for contract renewal, tenure, and promotion are reviewed each year for possible modifications. After consultation with the collective bargaining organization, these are then promulgated to eligible faculty.

The vice chancellors for academic affairs at the colleges have focused this year’s review on the language in those guidelines related to learning outcomes and assessment and suggested modifications to ensure the applicant understands the expectations related to outcomes. These revised guidelines were submitted to the collective bargaining organization for consultation as required by law.

Kaua‘i Community College

To ensure that the College has taken action to regularly evaluate all faculty and to include in these evaluations a measure of the effectiveness of the faculty in assessment of student learning outcomes, the Kaua‘i Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs (VCAA) has taken a lead role (Appendix XVIII) in the team of UHCC VCAAs in reviewing the language in UHCC System guidelines for contract renewal, promotion and tenure, and post-tenure evaluations, as described in the System response above. Also as stated above, the VCAAs have also consulted with the System Office on the draft policy for regular evaluations of lecturers to ensure the same. These revised guidelines and new policies will be submitted by the System Office to the collective bargaining organization for consultation. The current faculty contract is effective until 2015 and negotiations are just about to begin for the new contract. Currently at Kaua‘i Community College, part-time faculty (a.k.a lecturers) are evaluated annually if they teach every semester, or every two semesters that they do teach. Lecturers, by their contracts and as stated in the Lecturer Conditions of Employment (Appendix XIX) are required to assess student learning outcomes in all the courses they teach.

In anticipation that the System Office will, after consulting with the collective bargaining organization, publish the revised guidelines, post-tenure review policy, and lecturer evaluation policy, the College’s VCAA has drafted campus procedures, KCCP 4-13 (Appendix XX), for administering faculty evaluations according to these guidelines and policies. These procedures have been reviewed by the campus faculty senate and will be incorporated into the campus policy and procedure manual at the appropriate time.
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. (Standard IV.A.5)

The College formed a Processes Task Force to develop an evaluation process for governance structures and to implement the process. The Task Force met at the end of the Spring 2013 semester and created a list of objectives:

- identify governance processes to be evaluated;
- develop a system of evaluation for College processes to verify and improve their effectiveness;
- establish evaluation schedule for processes; and
- implement the evaluation process for the College Council (our primary governance body) and the Assessment Committee.

The Task Force has met twice (Appendix XXI) and used a website created by the library to research evaluation methods used by other campuses. The Task Force will be using surveys and observations to evaluate the effectiveness of the processes. They seek to complete the evaluation of the College Council and Assessment Committee by Fall 2014 and are currently proposing to evaluate the processes every five years. The evaluation schedule below will be included in the College Council Policy (KCCP 1-7) and the Governance Manual once the actual dates have been determined.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Governance Entity</th>
<th>Evaluators</th>
<th>Date of Evaluation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Assessment Committee</td>
<td>Process Task Force Appointed by CC</td>
<td>Every 5 Years Beginning 2014 Actual Date TBD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College Council</td>
<td>Process Task Force Appointed by CC</td>
<td>Every 5 Years Beginning 2014 Actual Date TBD</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
UH 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 ongoing 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 allocations that lead to program and institutional improvement. (Standards I.B.3, I.B1, II.A.1.c, II.A.2a,e,f, II.B.1, II.B.3.a, and II.B.4, I.B.1, I.B.4, I.B.6)

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

Standard I.B.3 The institution assesses progress toward achieving its stated goals and makes decisions regarding the improvement of institutional effectiveness in an ongoing and systematic cycle of evaluation, integrated planning, resource allocation, implementation, and re-evaluation. Evaluation is based on analyses of both quantitative and qualitative data.

Standard I.B.4 The institution provides evidence that the planning process is broad-based, offers opportunities for input by appropriate constituencies, allocates necessary resources, and leads to improvement of institutional effectiveness.

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

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

Standard II.A.2.a The institution uses established procedures to design, identify learning outcomes for, approve, administer, deliver, and evaluate courses and programs. The institution recognizes the central role of its faculty for establishing quality and improving instructional courses and programs.
Standard II.A.2.e The institution evaluates all courses and programs through an on-going systematic review of their relevance, appropriateness, achievement of learning outcomes, currency, and future needs and plans.

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

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

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

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

UHCC Strategic Planning Process

University of Hawai‘i Community Colleges (UHCC) codified the strategic planning process in UHCC Policy #4.101 Strategic Academic Planning.

The UHCC System has regularly monitored progress toward meeting established outcomes, updated assessment of the internal and external environments, and modified priorities as necessary to reflect changing conditions prior to the development of each biennial budget request. The UHCC System under the leadership of the vice president for community colleges (VPCC) has used the strategic planning process to set budget priorities as well as to establish a focus on critical issues affecting the colleges and the State.

Per UHCC Policy #4.101 Strategic Academic Planning, the VPCC convenes the full UHCC Strategic Planning Council (SPC) in the spring and fall of each year. The membership of the SPC consists of the chancellor, faculty senate chair, and student government chair from each college, and the vice president and associate vice presidents for community colleges. Meeting notes and materials are posted to the public website.

The annual spring meeting is used to review UHCC strategic outcomes and performance measures. The SPC monitors and advises on progress toward the UHCC strategic planning goals. The VPCC uses the meeting to gather impressions and reactions to progress to date and to emphasize and maintain the focus on the things UHCC has identified as important. The VPCC follows this meeting with visits to each college to present college-level detailed
data. During the open meetings for the college community at each campus, the VPCC leads discussions on progress and encourages feedback, e.g., new ideas, process improvement, and college innovations.

The annual fall meeting is used to look at the strategic planning process and to introduce and/or review UH systemwide strategic planning initiatives. The VPCC follows the fall meeting with visits to each college for UHCC systemwide engagement and dialogue.

The UHCC System began the process of updating the current UHCC Strategic Plan in Fall 2012 using the SPC meeting to review and discuss system data products, their status, and how the UHCC System puts data in front of people. The Fall 2012 meeting also began the dialog about how to organize the UHCC System for the update of the strategic plan beyond 2015. More specifically, addressing what the system wants to accomplish at the system level and individual colleges and what the system wants to see measured or measured differently keeping in mind the UHCC System plan’s link to the University of Hawai‘i (UH) System plan and direction. The UH System plan is grounded in the UH Second Decade Project which identifies the state’s higher education needs by geographic region and develops a set of statewide priorities.

At the Fall 2012 meeting, the SPC established a process to identify additional areas of emphasis to be grouped under the current UHCC strategic plan’s goals. In the Spring 2013 meeting working groups, chaired by a chancellor with faculty senate chair (not of the same college), and a student leader supplemented by members knowledgeable and appropriate for the work, were formed. The organization and process for updating the plan beyond 2015 was part of the VPCC’s spring visit to each of the institutions. The working group goals or focus from UHCC Strategic Plan are:

- **Goal A (part 1): Educational Effectiveness and Student Success.**
  - Special Emphasis on Part-Time Student Access and Success and Adult Learners
- **Goal A (part 2): Native Hawaiian Educational Attainment.**
  - Including Review of Other Underserved Populations.
- **Goal B: Functioning as a Seamless State System.**
  - Transfers and Articulation
- **Goal C: Promote Workforce and Economic Development**
  - Special Emphasis on STEM, Workforce – Energizing Areas, and Reviving the Global Curriculum
- **Goal D: Hawai‘i’s Educational Capital/Resources and Stewardship**
  - What It Means to be a Native Hawaiian Serving Institution
  - Government/Non-Profit Partnerships
  - Entrepreneurship, Commercialization, Resource Base
- **Goal E: Develop Sustainable Infrastructure for Student Learning**
  - Clean Energy, Sustainability
- **Focus Area 1: Distance Education**
  - Infrastructure for Student Learning, ADA Delivery, Rigor, Student Success
The working groups will review current performance measures, identify which should stay and/or be revised, and identify potential new members during spring and summer 2013 meetings. The full SPC will discuss and compile measures at its Fall 2013 meeting followed by visits by the VPCC to each college for open, systemwide dialogue. Based on the results of those meetings, the measures will be refined and the full SPC will finalize outcomes and performance measures for the 2015 and beyond update. Results, progress, and next steps will be chronicled in the SPC proceedings or as an attachment.

The BOR Standing Committee on Community Colleges met on August 30, 2013. The VPCC gave an update relating to the progress in meeting the goals in the current strategic plan and reviewed the process for updating the plan including the seven working group areas of focus. The UHCC BOR CC Committee Briefing presentation and the direction of the plan were well-received by the BOR CC Committee. VPCC stated that he would provide another update to the BOR CC Committee in Spring 2014.

Following the meeting of the BOR CC, the VPCC, associate vice presidents for academic and administrative affairs and the chancellors held an executive level meeting, which addressed accreditation, strategic planning process, and budget allocation. Chancellors reported on the status of the goals/focus areas of their strategic planning working groups.

UHCC System tools to support on-going improvement and effectiveness:

In addition to the UHCC Strategic Planning process with its strategic outcomes and performance measures, the UHCC system uses the following tools to support on-going improvement and effectiveness:

- **Community College Inventory: Focus on Student Persistence, Learning, and Attainment**
- UHCC Performance Funding
- Annual Reports Program Data (ARPD)

1. **Community College Inventory: Focus on Student Persistence, Learning, and Attainment**

The UHCC System uses the **Community College Inventory: Focus on Student Persistence, Learning, and Attainment** – a research based tool developed by the Community College Leadership Program, University of Texas Austin to evaluate UHCC system effectiveness. The inventory assesses eleven institutional characteristics that are strongly focused on student success. The Office of the Vice President for Community Colleges (OVPCC) administers the inventory online in odd-numbered years (complementing the Community College Survey Student Engagement (CCSSE) that is administered in even-numbered years--benchmark measurements included in Strategic Plan). The SPC affirmed that the eleven institutional characteristics are important to the system and incorporating selected outcomes in the UHCC Strategic Plan supports the regular assessment and review for on-going improvement and effectiveness of planning. As required in the policy, and evidenced in proceedings of the SPC, the inventory results are reviewed and discussed by the full Council. Additionally, the 2006 comprehensive visit recommended the UHCC System evaluate the
effectiveness of the dual reporting structure for chancellors and the Strategic Planning Process. Overwhelming consensus continues that both reporting and planning are working well and the 2015+ update planning process should also prove to be effective.

The chancellors reviewed the results of the 2013 survey at their August 30, 2013, executive meeting. “The UHCC System has a strategic plan that clearly and succinctly states its goals for future development” continues to receive the highest ranking within the category while “The UHCC System demonstrates its ability to stop doing things that are off mission, low-priority, and/or ineffective in promoting student persistence, learning, and attainment” continues to be scored the lowest. The full SPC will continue the review and discussion at the Fall 2013 meeting.

2. Performance (Outcomes) Funding

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

The outcomes incorporated into the formula include the following:

a. degrees and certificates awarded;
   b. degrees and certificates awarded to Native Hawaiian students;
   c. degrees and certificates awarded to students in Science, Technology, Engineering, and Math (STEM) fields;
   d. number of low-income students participating the Federal Pell program;
   e. number of transfers from the community colleges to the baccalaureate campuses.

For each outcome, the baseline is the value set by the strategic outcomes for FY 2010 and the target is the value set for FY2011 (for FY 2012 funding).

The outcomes funding model has the following characteristics:

a. For each outcome, the baseline is the value set by the strategic outcomes for FY 2010 and the target is the value set for FY 2011 (for FY 2012 funding).
   b. The outcomes are independent of each other. Campuses can only achieve their full outcomes funding if they meet or exceed the targeted outcomes for each of the measures.
   c. If a campus does not meet the targeted outcome, then any unused funds would be used for other UHCC initiatives.

At the Spring 2013 Instructional Program Review Council (I-PRC), it was decided include program-level performance funding in the Annual Reports of Program Data (ARPD) to be released in August 2013.
3. **Annual Reports of Program Data (ARPD) and Comprehensive Program Reviews**

UHCC Program Review and Annual Reports of Program Data (ARPD) are codified in **UHCCP 5.202 Review of Established Programs**. The policy, developed by broad systemwide dialogue by chancellors, administrators, faculty, and staff defines programs subject to review, frequency of program reviews, content of the program review, dissemination of program reviews, and assessment of the program review process. Each college has established and operates its own college-level program review process within the framework of the UHCC system policy and the UH Board of Regents (BOR) policies.

The system-level process is managed by the OVPCC through the UHCC I-PRC. The I-PRC is comprised of key data users from across the seven community colleges with functional representation of chancellors, vice chancellors for academic affairs, division/department chairs (with further representation from general education faculty and Career Technical Education faculty), assessment coordinators, and institutional research (IR). The I-PRC meets once in the fall and once in the spring semester. The fall meeting is used to discuss the current ARPD reports, college process/progress and midterm data definition and data calculations (i.e., in the 2012 ARPDs the calculation of persistence was modified to exclude from the denominator those students who had received associate degrees and would not be expected to persist in the program). The spring meeting is used to assess the effectiveness of the UHCC system program review process (including ARPDs), review the measures and content, and ensure that the review provides the information necessary for program assessment and improvement. The Comprehensive Program Reviews, Annual Reports of Program Data, and Records of Proceedings for the I-PRC meetings are posted and made public on the UHCC website.

The OVPCC provides the data for Annual Reports of Program Data by August 15 of each year. The data are from the immediate prior program year (July 1 - June 30). This standardization of data and timing allow colleges to compare against similar programs and employ “best practices” in program improvement. Data are publicly released by August 15. Access to the analysis section of the ARPD is controlled by user id limited to those administrators, faculty, and staff who have an analysis and input role as determined by the institution. At the end of the review cycle (generally the end of the fall semester), analysis and program planning, along with an executive summary of all annual reports within the area (Instruction, Academic Support, Student Support Services) are finalized and the full ARPD is made public. ARPD data and analysis serve as the foundation of the Comprehensive Program Review (CPR). Colleges have set CPR schedules within the BOR requirement of review at least every five years. CPRs are publicly available through the college websites and a link to the most recent CPR is included in the ARPD.

Following the comprehensive visits of Fall 2012, the OVPCC surveyed all key data users (vice chancellors for academic affairs, deans and assistant deans department and division chairs, program directors, and IR). The online survey asked users to evaluate the usefulness/importance of the current ARPD data elements and to suggest data they wish they had. The OVPCC Academic Planning, Assessment, and Policy Analysis (APAPA) Office compiled the results of the survey and conducted focus group discussions with the various
constituents including additional training and professional development needed. The process identified a gap in data information provided at new faculty, staff, and administrator orientation. Current college practices do not include data training. The UHCC IR Cadre is developing key data information to be included in orientation as well as website “cheat sheets” to direct inquiries to available tools and data. Additional outcomes from focus group discussions will be reviewed by the UHCC I-PRC in Fall 2013 including how to meet identified training and professional development needs.

At the August 30, 2013, executive level meeting, the VPCC, associate vice presidents for academic and administrative affairs, and chancellors approved the basic design of an assessment tool for program review that will provide additional information on student flow, progress, and achievement at the program level. The conceptual model is broadly based on the principles identified in the Gates-funded Completion by Design on the student loss and momentum pathways.

Commitment to the Assessment of the UHCC Culture of Evidence

Following discussion at the chancellors’ August 2013 executive meeting, the VPCC issued a UHCC policy codifying the UHCC System’s commitment to a culture of evidence. The UHCCP #4.202 Culture of Evidence requires that at least every three years starting in 2013, the OVPCC will survey stakeholders and users of major UHCC analytical tools (e.g., UHCC Strategic Planning Outcomes and Performance Measures, Comprehensive Program Reviews, Annual Reports of Program Data). This survey will measure the effectiveness of the planning process and importance and usefulness of the data and for training and/or professional development needed to maximize use of these tools for planning and resource allocation that supports institutional effectiveness in meeting college and system mission. The results will be made public by posting to the system website Culture of Evidence.

UHCC Budget Allocation Process

Since 2009, the UHCC budgets have gone through a period of great flux including reductions in State general funding, negotiated pay reductions for all employees and subsequent restorations of pay, State imposed restrictions, and tuition increases. Responding to these external forces has created some confusion around budget allocations. The confusion has been compounded since many of the budget reductions occurred outside the normal budget cycles.

Despite the budget flux and the enrollment increases, the UHCC System and campuses were able to manage the finances and still maintain a healthy cash positions. However, in order to make the budget allocation process more transparent, the budget allocation model was put into a formal policy, UHCCP #8.000 General Fund and Tuition and Fees Special Fund Allocation, that was promulgated in September 2013. Key elements of the budget allocation policy include
• In accordance with State budget policy, State general funds are allocated based on a current service base with enhancements based on specific program change requests as approved by the Legislature.
• Approximately 5 percent of the operating budget is allocated based on five performance metrics – student graduation, Native Hawaiian student graduation, STEM graduation, Pell financial aid recipients, and UH transfers to baccalaureate institutions. In order to receive the outcomes funding portion of the budget allocation, campuses must meet numeric targets for each of these metrics.
• An additional pool of funds is allocated to campuses to meet enrollment growth and to fund need-based financial aid.
• Campuses retain tuition and fee income.
• Campuses retain and manage non-credit and auxiliary services income.

Campuses are expected to allocate funds within their campus in accordance with planning and program review priorities.

The budget allocation policy is posted on the UHCC System website. In addition, the actual allocations for the year as well as historic trends in revenue, expenditures, allocations, and reserves are distributed to each campus and also published on the system website Budget, Planning and Finance.

The associate vice president for administrative affairs also meets with campus leadership to discuss the allocations, trends, and financial projections for each campus. The broad information on the budget allocation is also shared by the VPCC during his regular campus presentations.

The budget allocation model will undergo a continuous review, including an assessment of efficiency metrics, to determine whether further adjustments to the current service base will need to be made.

**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 development 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)

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

*Standard II.A.1.c The institution identifies student learning outcomes for courses, programs, certificates, and degrees; assesses student achievement of those outcomes; and uses assessment results to make improvements.*
Standard II.A.2.c High-quality instruction and appropriate breadth, depth, rigor, sequencing, time to completion, and synthesis of learning characterize all programs.

Standard III.C.1 The institution assures that any technology support it provides is designed to meet the needs of learning, teaching, college-wide communications, research, and operational systems.

Standard III.C.1.c The institution systematically plans, acquires, maintains, and upgrades or replaces technology infrastructure and equipment to meet institutional needs.

Standard III.C.2 Technology planning is integrated with institutional planning. The institution systematically assesses the effective use of technology resources and uses the results of evaluation as the basis for improvement.

In considering this recommendation and in discussions with the University chief information officer (CIO), it was determined that the primary issue was not that the various components of technology infrastructure and its relationship to teaching and learning were not planned. Rather, the issue is there was no source that provided a comprehensive view of the system approaches to technology and the resulting impacts on those approaches to college level planning and resource allocation. Similarly, there existed significant information on the impact and assessment of various technologies but this information was not necessarily reported in the context of the planning initiatives.

After further conversation, the solution did not appear to be developing a “Plan” in the traditional sense of a paper-based document focusing on intended changes over a period of time. Instead, a decision was made to develop a dynamic, online resource that would capture and make available to colleges information on the current state of various aspects of technology within the University, the current state of development projects underway, planned future development projects, and longer term trends under consideration. As projects proceed through their development or new projects are added, the online plan would be updated to reflect those changes.

The online resource would also include links to policies, governance and development groups, budget and resource allocation information, assessment and outcomes information, delineation of college responsibilities for technology, and recommendations to colleges in implementing those responsibilities.

The online resource would cover the full-range of technology-related concerns including infrastructure, enterprise application, business process improvements, teaching and learning, distance education, information security, and other impacts of technology.

Finally, the online resource would document systemwide academic plans for degrees and courses that would be distributed online or through hybrid instruction to extend the degree and course offerings to rural populations and the neighbor islands. This section would also identify necessary infrastructure, training, and support for distance-delivered programs, as well as links to the results and outcomes of distance education.
The outline of the online resource includes:

I. Overview of the UH Commitment to and Planned Use of Technology

II. Infrastructure
   A. Intercampus and Other External Networks
   B. Intracampus Networks
   C. Internet I and II Connections
   D. Wireless Connectivity
   E. Central IT Servers and Support Services
   F. Campus-Based IT Servers and Support Services
   G. Data Security
   H. Other

III. Enterprise Business Applications
   A. Financial Management Systems (Kuali)
   B. Student Systems (Banner)
   C. Financial Aid Systems (Banner Financial Aid)
   D. Degree Audit and Advising Systems (STAR)
   E. Research and Grant Management Systems (myGrant)
   F. Human Resource Systems (PeopleSoft)

IV. Business Process Improvements
   A. Workflow Applications (eTravel, eLeave, etc.)
   B. Document Management
   C. Data Reporting and Analysis
   D. Other

V. Academic Applications
   A. Supported Distance Learning Technologies, Including Training
   B. Distance Education Program Delivery
   C. Supported Classroom-Based Technologies, Simulation Technologies, Classroom Design, Etc.
   D. Supported Computer and Other Teaching-Related Technology Equipment

VI. Policies
   A. Data Governance
   B. Data Security
   C. User Responsibilities
   D. Social Media
The online resource/plan is currently under development through the University of Hawai‘i Information Technology Services (ITS). During development, the site is being reviewed and critiqued by both the ITS personnel responsible for the functional area but also by campus- and system-level personnel who have responsibilities that are dependent on the use or understanding of the University’s technology plans and directions. The site is expected to be released to the general UH community and the public in Fall 2013. The development version of the site can be viewed at www.hawaii.edu/itplan.

UH Recommendation 5: Board and Administrative Organization

In order to meet the Standards, 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 (Standards IV.B.1.e, IV.B.1.g)

Standard IV.B.1.e The governing board acts in a manner consistent with its policies and bylaws. The board regularly evaluates its policies and practices and revises them as necessary.

Standard IV.B.1.g The governing board’s self evaluation processes for assessing board performance are clearly defined, implemented, and published in its policies or bylaws.

The University of Hawai‘i Board of Regents (BOR) for the past year has been engaged in an intense period of self-assessment of itself and University governance and business practices. The impetus for this self-assessment was driven by an investigation into a failed concert meant to benefit the UH Mānoa athletics department that resulted in a $200,000 loss to the University. The Hawai‘i State Senate established a Special Committee on Accountability and broadened the investigation to include other aspects of University governance, accountability, and transparency. After a series of investigative hearings, the Senate issued a series of recommendations to the BOR.

Parallel to this external review, the BOR initiated its own review of the circumstances surrounding the failed concert and the broader issues of BOR and administrative structure and accountability and an examination of BOR policies and practices related to these governance issues.

At its September 5, 2012, meeting, the BOR established an Advisory Task Group (ATG) consisting of both UH Board members and community members to address these operational and governance issues. Phase 1 of the ATG’s work focused on the specific circumstances of the failed concert and the adequacy of management and fiscal controls related to the event. The ATG Phase 1 effort was further refined at a September 8, 2012, meeting and the resulting report from the ATG was accepted by the BOR at its meeting on November 15, 2012. November 15, 2012 BOR Minutes [pages 8-11] ATG Report Phase 1.

To address the issues of Board governance and self evaluation, the BOR engaged Dr. Terrence MacTaggart of the Association of Governing Boards to conduct an assessment
workshop with BOR members as part of the meeting on October 18, 2012. **October 18, 2012 BOR Minutes** [pages 1-5]. The workshop covered a wide range of governance issues. On January 24, 2013, the BOR authorized the ATG to begin Phase 2 of its work focusing on UH Board governance and practice. The scope of Phase 2 was further defined at a February 21, 2013, meeting of the BOR to include both BOR operational matters and the high level organization structure of the University. The BOR received a status report on the ATG Phase 2 work at its April 18, 2013, meeting. The ATG presented its findings to the BOR in four reports:

**Report 1** included the results of interviews with the BOR members on the individual regents’ views on the operational and governance. This report was presented to the BOR Audit Committee on May 16, 2013, and to the full BOR at its May 16, 2013, meeting.

**Report 2** included an assessment of then pending legislation on University governance and whether such legislation reflected best practices in higher education governance.

Both Reports 1 and 2 were presented to the BOR Audit committee on May 16, 2013, and to the full Board at its May 16, 2013, meeting. **May 16, 2013 BOR Minutes** [pages 9-10].

**Report 3** made several recommendations for BOR governance, including:

1. The BOR work with the BOR executive administrator and secretary of the BOR to develop a process for tracking unfinished business and ensuring that such unfinished business be placed on the appropriate BOR standing committee (e.g., Committee on Community Colleges) agenda for follow-up and completion.

2. The BOR approve the University’s general counsel as direct report to the University president and delegate the authority necessary to the president to oversee this position. The general counsel should have a dotted line reporting responsibility to the BOR to be able to provide it with advice and bring matters to its attention.

3. The BOR adopt an administrative procedure that members may follow to request that items be placed on the BOR agenda. The procedure should also include a section for feedback to members on disposition of the requests.

4. The BOR amend its bylaws to require appropriate action items be first referred to standing committees for review and recommendations. Each standing committee should maintain an annual calendar and compliance checklist to ensure all critical tasks are completed and specific duties and responsibilities are accomplished as outlined in the respective standing committee charters.

5. The BOR determine the nature and extent of staffing needed to support the additional workload of the standing committees and evaluate its current staff resources and assignments to determine changes needed to support the standing committees’ workload.
6. The BOR work with UH System administration to ensure the strategic plan be regularly reviewed and updated with BOR involvement. The BOR, at the direction and leadership of the BOR chair, establish a “Board Goals and Accomplishments” annual or two-year plan.

7. The BOR orientation content should be reviewed and updated and that annual training updates be made part of its annual schedule. The BOR should also ensure that its members annually sign a statement affirming their responsibilities and commitment to meeting the expectations placed upon them as regents.

8. The BOR improve its accountability and financial oversight of University operations by additional involvement by the BOR Committee on Budget and Finance and improved periodic financial reporting mechanisms (the exact nature of the financial reports should be developed collaboratively by the Committee on Budget and Finance and University Administration but should also include reports comparing budgeted expenditures against actual expenditures).

9. The BOR take steps to improve the effectiveness of its scheduled meetings such as:
   a. Referring informational items to standing committees, requiring less frequent reports of a recurring nature, or the use of a consent agenda.
   b. Scheduling certain meetings as “informational only” meetings with no action items.
   c. Expanding the use of standardized reports to enable quicker comprehension and understandability.
   d. Establishing a prescribed total amount of time for public input at each meeting, after considering compliance with all appropriate legal guidance.

Report 3 was presented to the Audit Committee on July, 2013, and to the full BOR at its July 18, 2013, meeting. [July 18, 2013 BOR Minutes](#) [pages 5-7].

**Report 4** of the ATG dealt with issues of University high level governance and made several recommendations related to the reporting lines to the University president and to the BOR. The ATG reviewed applicable statutes, rules and regulations governing the University’s system level operations, Executive Policies, roles and responsibilities and delegations of authority. In addition, the ATG conducted interviews with system level management and others and reviewed published materials on leading practices from organizations. Report 4 is the final part of the ATG’s Operational Assessment of the University’s system level operations.

The BOR continues to use the ATG Phase 2 reports in its assessment of the University structure and its policies. Some policies have already been changed as a result, including:
   1. Changes to the policy on professional improvement leaves for executives (adopted February 21, 2013)
2. Changes to the BOR policies on intercollegiate athletics (adopted May 16, 2012).
   Note: While the community colleges do not have intercollegiate athletics programs, the policy change is reflective of the action of the BOR in reviewing and modifying, as appropriate, its policies.

In addition to the self-assessment and related actions outlined above and on the recommendation of the ATG, the University of Hawai‘i System is developing an online policy management system that allows for development and approval of policies, distribution of policies, and tracks the policy history for UH policies, including BOR policies. The system will include a tracking mechanism to ensure that all policies are reviewed periodically and replaces a manual system kept in the BOR and other system offices. A system committee has been established to select and guide the implementation of the software.