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Leeward Community College (Leeward CC) opened its doors in the Fall of 1968 as the first Community College in the State developed without a connection to a pre-existing technical school. With a mission based on the recognition of the diversity of the communities it serves, and on the belief in the dignity and potential of each individual to learn, the College was the first post-secondary institution in West O‘ahu.

In 1968, Leonard T. Tuthill, our first Provost, welcomed over 1,640 students into humble old buildings that once housed Pearl City Kai Elementary School. That first semester witnessed more than twice the anticipated number of students ready to explore the “Community College” experience. In the spring of 1969, the College moved to its current location, on forty-nine acres near the geographic center of O‘ahu between Pearl City and Waipahu. Since those beginnings in inauspicious temporary facilities, enrollment has grown to place the College among the largest community colleges in the State. Approximately 6,000 students are regularly enrolled each semester in liberal arts and career and technical education programs offered on campus, at off-campus locations in the community, and through distance education courses.

The last buildings at Leeward were completed in the late seventies, and as the College approaches its fortieth anniversary, the infrastructure has been showing its age. Still, the architectural design has proven very flexible. The growth of technology has been accommodated through major upgrades in electrical capacity and installation of comprehensive wired networking. Major physical renovations have been made to the Student Center to accommodate the growth of the Culinary Arts program, and railings throughout the campus were recently replaced. Lighting throughout the campus has been improved, creating a safer nighttime environment, and the air conditioning plant has been upgraded although comfortable temperatures in classrooms and offices is still an elusive goal. With the release of planning funds in Spring 2006, Leeward is looking forward to building its first major structure since the College was completed.

Leeward CC is committed to serving the residents of the communities of Leeward and Central O‘ahu in particular, and the State in general, by providing balanced and comprehensive programs, services, and educational opportunities. To achieve this end, the College must
know its students, their needs, their educational goals, and the effectiveness of its programs and services in meeting these needs and goals. Leeward Community College has instituted a Program Review process intended to provide demographic information on the diverse communities it serves and information on in student achievement and learning. This information serves as the basis for improvements in addressing the College's mission.

The UH System, in an effort to provide data for long range planning, recently completed its Second Decade project. Of the four top regions in the state with the greatest needs for higher education resources, three are in Leeward CC’s service area. This area is also predicted to have the largest population growth of any in the state. While the College has always had a strong liberal arts transfer program, it lacks the diversity of vocational and workforce directed programs available at the O’ahu’s two other large community colleges. Clearly the College needs to address this deficiency, but the old model of high cost, high capitalization programs is impractical given the rapidly changing needs of Hawai‘i’s employers. The college is pursuing partnerships with business to develop tailored programs that can be quickly deployed and provide for cost sharing opportunities. The College has recently received funding to prototype this approach for applied science and technology programs such as training in chemical technology—particularly appropriate for a College that has a long history of innovation in chemistry teaching.

Leeward CC since the early 1980’s has hosted another campus of the UH System on its grounds—UH West O’ahu. During this time, there have been a number of initiatives for development of a new UHWO campus in Kapolei area. With a newly forged public/private funding proposal, it appears a new campus for UHWO is likely before the end of the decade. The impact of an expanded UHWO on the College is a major topic for conversation. The challenge is to develop a collaborative rather than competitive framework that places student needs as the priority.

As end of the decade approaches, the College faces both promise and challenge. One constant will be a focus on learning and students as its motto adopted almost forty years makes clear: To Help People Learn.
History Since Last Accreditation

2001-2003

When Leeward Community College began to revise its Academic Development Plan in 2001, it redefined the new directions as a strategic plan. Beginning in 2001, a Steering Committee comprised of students, faculty, staff, and administrators engaged in extensive campus-wide dialogue to arrive at an understanding of how the College could best implement the goals stated in its mission.

The resulting Strategic Plan (SP) 2002-2010 provided a framework of goals, objectives, and prioritized action plans that were consistent with the concepts of a Program Review model recommended by the Accrediting Commission. The College developed a plan to revisit the SP on an annual basis, beginning in 2003, with the purpose of using campus-wide dialogue in the cycle of ongoing evaluation, planning, and improvement. The Strategic Plan, adopted in May 2002, includes five major goals:

- **Goal A:** Provide opportunities for the pursuit of knowledge, personal enrichment, and creativity
- **Goal B:** Stimulate the cultural and intellectual life of the community by providing artistic, professional, and enrichment opportunities
- **Goal C:** Improve educational effectiveness
- **Goal D:** Build partnerships
- **Goal E:** Acquire and manage resources efficiently

With the 2001 reaffirmation of accreditation, the College began to address, through its Accreditation Implementation Committees (AICs), five recommendations from the 2000 ACCJC Visiting Team and three carry-over recommendations from the 1994 Visiting Team. In 2003, the College approved both a Curriculum Revision and Review Policy and a Shared Governance Policy, both resulting from the work of the AICs. During this time, the UHCC System submitted a Substantive Change Request for reorganization of CC’s to ACCJC that eliminated the Chancellor’s Office. This change converted Provost positions into Chancellor positions at each CC campus, each reporting directly to the UH President.
In responding to the 2000 Visiting Team's recommendations, the College also approved the *Policy on Unit/Area Program Reviews* in May 2003. The *Policy* provided a first step in the formal and systematic assessment and collection of data on student learning, enabling the College to measure mission-driven outcomes. Based on this *Policy*, the Faculty Senate Program Review Committee began implementing the process in September 2003; however, at the time of the November 2003 Team Visit following the submission of its Midterm Report, the College had not yet clearly articulated the connection between *Program Review* and other institutional planning efforts. The College's understanding of, and support for, assessment of institutional effectiveness, planning for improvements, and resource allocation were not yet fully developed.

The 2003 Visiting Team found the Campus Council and COMPASS issues to be adequately addressed by the College. However, other issues remained problematic. The Team also issued a new recommendation to review the “N” grade.

### 2004

In January 2004, the College appointed two co-coordinators for Accreditation, who, along with other campus leaders, participated in a system-wide workshop on current self study standards. Realizing the overarching importance of *Program Review*, the College also appointed a *Program Review* Coordinator.

That same month found the College placed on warning as a result of its Midterm Report to ACCJC, due to incomplete progress on three issues: the resolution of the “N” grade; incorporating Program Review in planning and resource distribution; and formalizing planning in technology, information, and learning resources. The Commission also voiced concerns on issues raised by the proposed System reorganization.

In 2003-2004, Leeward CC’s initial approach to *Program Review* focused on the assessment of instructional programs, individual courses, and Support Areas. Program assessment activities were organized within the Associate in Arts (AA), Associate in Science (AS), and Associate in Applied Science (AAS) degrees and certificates constituent to them. By the end of Spring 2004, the initial phase of assessments was completed in all six of the General Education Outcomes of the AA degree and in selected outcomes in the AS, AAS degrees and certificates. Implementation of the Support Area assessments began with each area establishing goals and objectives, selecting outcome measures, analyzing and reporting on the results, and developing action plans for the upcoming year.

In April 2004, the Progress Report on the “N” grade was submitted, bringing resolution to the issue.

In June 2004, ACCJC found progress in addressing System reorganization issues incomplete and required a Progress Report on November 2004, with visit.

To improve Leeward’s *Program Review* process, the College brought in assessment consultant Julie Slark in August 2004. As a result of the consultation, the College expanded its understanding of *Program Review*, placing assessment activities into a larger vision that integrates assessment with planning and budgeting.
Also in 2004, several individuals who were already engaged in research and planning activities participated in the AAHE Assessment Conference in Glendale, where they began to formulate implementation of College's Program Review model. The four participants became the core of Leeward's Assessment Team, a group that has worked extensively with program and area assessment leaders on the design and implementation of assessment projects. The rich dialogues that occurred have spurred a rethinking of what we do in our classrooms to support student learning and have provided a basis for future actions that must be taken.

From August 2004 through February 2005, the Reorganization Committee, with broad-based, campus-wide membership, met and discussed the reorganization of the administrative level of the College. In February 2005, the College's governance groups, the Campus Council and the Faculty Senate, approved the Reorganization Resolution. Final Board of Regents approval is expected in Fall 2006.

Beginning in Fall 2004, College leadership developed and shared the revised Program Review model with the campus. As the College carried through its assessments, the Program Review process was continuously modified. It now provides the mechanism by which course, program, and Support Area assessment data become the basis for planning and budgeting decisions.

2005 - 2006

January 2005 saw both the appointment of the Course Assessment Coordinator and another requirement from ACCJC. The College continued on warning, with an April 2005 Progress Report required, focusing on five System issues. The UH Community Colleges needed to demonstrate, both individually and collectively, their development and implementation of a comprehensive assessment, planning, and improvement process, supported by the governance structure of UHCC system.

As the UHCC System laid out plans for an integrated Program Review process, Leeward CC continued its progress on assessment and further refinement of its Program Review model. Course SLO design and assessment modules were added to the College's website, and the course assessment database was added to Curriculum Central, the College's online curricular database.

During this time, the College began to discuss updating its mission statement. The current mission was revised and approved in the Spring 2004 semester, and further revised in Spring 2005. The revision process included a mixture of faculty, staff, student, employers, and community input.

Progress Report #3 was submitted in March 2005, with the College removed from warning in June 2005, although another Progress Report was due to the Commission to address system issues.

In May 2005 the Policy on Program Reviews was modified to formalize the College's Assessment Team. The modified policy includes standardized assessment templates that are used to summarize and report how assessment results are translated into budget allocations.
Between May and November 2005, the following activities increased the College’s effectiveness in assessment and Program Review:

- Modification of Curriculum Central to serve as a repository for information obtained via assessment of all courses, including distance education (DE) courses, according to current accreditation standards.
- Provision of guidance and information on assessment tasks and timelines to Division, program, and Support Areas through information sessions and small group meetings conducted by the Assessment Team.
- Distribution in April 2005 to all faculty of a “Handbook on Outcomes Assessment for Two-Year Colleges,” by Edward A. Morante to provide tools for developing program and course assessment plans.
- Adoption of the UH CC System’s Program Review protocols.

In an attempt to better integrate evaluation, planning, and improvement, College leadership worked diligently from Fall 2004 to Summer 2005 on the design of the Annual Review process. The process focused on the analysis of data provided by the Program Reviews of student learning and institutional effectiveness from all Units within the College. In August 2005, the Chancellor presented a template for the process to the Administrative Staff, the Assessment Team, participants in the College’s Leadership Retreat, and the campus as a whole at Convocation.

Divisions use the Annual Review template as a planning document for focused discussions. These discussions (1) occur in the same categories as the overall Program Review model; (2) have guiding questions that connect assessment with standards of good practice; (3) are filtered through a Strengths, Weaknesses, Opportunities, and Threats (SWOT) lens; (4) insist on the usage of SLO data and assessments, and (5) result in budget lists that are derived from dialogue among faculty, staff, and administrators. Together, the goal of the Program and Annual Review processes is the integration of assessment, planning, and budgeting as evidenced by the College’s 2007-2009 Biennium Budget proposal.

The November 2005 Visiting Team report made the following statements about the College’s Program and Annual Review processes:

“The team found that Leeward Community College is actively engaged in a variety of assessment activities and has an established culture and practice of assessment and improvement. The College’s decision to maximize use of electronic media for collection, analysis and presentation of information is extremely innovative. The team believes those engaged in the design have a good understanding of the elements of an effective institutional assessment process, and that the electronic format may actually assist faculty to do the work necessary. The conceptualization is excellent; what remains to be seen is how well faculty and staff ultimately implement it.”

The Annual Review process was implemented on a college-wide basis in the Spring 2006 and was the major building block of the 2007-2009 Biennium Budget Proposal. The College continues to refine its assessment, planning, and budgeting processes in an effort to support student learning.
Leeward Community College Service Area

Leeward Community College is situated in a region that accounts for more than a third of the island’s population, with a rate of increase more than three times that of the entire island. The shift in population to the western side of the island is reflected by the College’s enrollment pattern. Enrollment at Leeward CC over the past 10 years exhibited a cyclical trend of highs and lows as indicated by the following data on historical headcounts and going rates of high school graduates.
Statistical Look at Leeward Community College

Historical Fall Headcount and Full-Time Equivalent (FTE) Enrollment

![Graph showing historical fall headcount and FTE enrollment at Leeward Community College from 1995 to 2005.]

Source: MAPS Fall Enrollment Report, University of Hawai‘i, Community Colleges Fall 2004, Table 1, Table 2

Going Rate High School Graduates (percentage)

Leeward Community College going rate: Percentage of O‘ahu public and private high school June graduates who enroll in Leeward Community College, and all the Community Colleges in the University of Hawai‘i System.

![Graph showing going rate high school graduates percentage from 1999 to 2004.]

Note: Figures include both public and private HS graduates
Source:
Leeward MAPS, High School Background of First-Time Students, Table 3 and Table 6 (series)
Hawai‘i MAPS, High School Background of First-Time Students, Table 4
Nation National Center for Education Statistics, “The Condition of Education, 2005” Student Effort and Educational Progress, Table 20-2 Immediate Transition to College, Indicator 20
**Statistical Look**

**Going Rate High School Graduates (number)**
Number of O'ahu public and private high school June graduates who enrolled at Leeward Community College the following Fall semester.

![Bar chart showing Fall Enrollment - Recent High School Graduates from 1998 to 2004.](chart1.png)

Source: MAPS, High School Background of First-Time Students, Table 2

**Enrollment Projections**
Enrollment projections indicate that the College will continue to grow at a moderate rate over the next five years. The number of elementary- and high school-age students is not much higher than the current college-age population. This seems to indicate that there will be no significant increase in college-age students over the next decade. However, there are currently more than 70,000 students enrolled in the Leeward-Central Districts, and demographic projections indicate that most of the modest increase in population over the next ten years will occur in the areas served by the College. An aggressive outreach effort, coupled with the implementation of Philippine and Hawaiian Studies curricula, is expected to boost enrollment.

![Bar chart showing Leeward Community College Headcount Enrollment Projection (Credit Students) from 2005 to 2011.](chart2.png)

Source: MAPS Enrollment Projections University of Hawai'i Community Colleges Fall 2005 to Fall 2011, Table 4, Middle Projection Series
Student Enrollment - Ethnicity and Gender, Fall 2005
Leeward Community College's students reflect the diversity of its service area. Approximately 60% of the College’s students are female.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LEEWARD CC</th>
<th>All Students</th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>Female</th>
<th>No Data</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All Students</td>
<td>5,709</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>2,275</td>
<td>39.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chinese</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>10.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Filipino</td>
<td>1,463</td>
<td>25.6</td>
<td>614</td>
<td>10.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indian Subcontinent</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Japanese</td>
<td>670</td>
<td>11.7</td>
<td>316</td>
<td>5.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Korean</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laotian</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thai</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vietnamese</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Asian</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>0.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hawaiian and Pacific Islander</td>
<td>1,024</td>
<td>17.9</td>
<td>334</td>
<td>5.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guam Chamorro</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hawaiian Part Hawaiian</td>
<td>850</td>
<td>14.9</td>
<td>278</td>
<td>4.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Micronesian</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Samoan</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>0.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tongan</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Pacific Islander</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mixed Pacific Islander</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>0.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mixed Asian/Pacific Islander</td>
<td>295</td>
<td>5.2</td>
<td>136</td>
<td>2.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Ethnic Groups</td>
<td>1781</td>
<td>31.2</td>
<td>725</td>
<td>12.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>African American</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>0.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Indian/Alaska Native</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>0.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caucasian</td>
<td>627</td>
<td>11.0</td>
<td>201</td>
<td>3.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td>131</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>0.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mixed</td>
<td>902</td>
<td>15.8</td>
<td>348</td>
<td>6.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Response</td>
<td>211</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>1.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: MAPS Fall Enrollment UH, Community Colleges 2005, Appendix C (series)
**Number of Hawaiian/Part Hawaiian Students Enrolled**

About 15% of the College’s total enrollment is comprised of Hawaiian/Part-Hawaiian students.

Source: MAPS Fall Enrollment Reports, UH Manoa, UH Hilo, UH West O’ahu, and UH Community Colleges

---

**Percentage of Hawaiian/Part Hawaiian Students Enrolled**

The data shows the percentage of Hawaiian and part-Hawaiian student population as a portion of the total Hawaiian/part-Hawaiian population in the UH System. Of the seven community colleges within the UH System, the largest percentage of Hawaiian/part-Hawaiian students is enrolled at Leeward Community College.

Source: MAPS Fall Enrollment Reports, UH-Manoa, UH-Hilo, UH-West O’ahu, and UH Community Colleges
### Enrollment by Residency for Tuition Status, Fall 2001 to Fall 2005

For tuition purposes, approximately 90% are classified as residents.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Fall 2001</th>
<th>Fall 2002</th>
<th>Fall 2003</th>
<th>Fall 2004</th>
<th>Fall 2005</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No.</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>No.</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>No.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resident</td>
<td>4,988</td>
<td>89.7</td>
<td>5,308</td>
<td>89.7</td>
<td>5,590</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resident Converted</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residents Subtotal</td>
<td>5,034</td>
<td>90.5</td>
<td>5,355</td>
<td>90.5</td>
<td>5,654</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Exempted</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Military Exemption</td>
<td>390</td>
<td>7.0</td>
<td>405</td>
<td>6.8</td>
<td>396</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty/Staff Exemption</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institutional Exemption</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Exchange</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pacific-Asian Exemption</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East-West Center</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>&lt;0.1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethnic Hawaiian Exemption</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Resident Subtotal</td>
<td>528</td>
<td>9.5</td>
<td>563</td>
<td>9.5</td>
<td>544</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Data</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GRAND TOTAL</td>
<td>5,562</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>5,918</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>6,201</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: MAPS Fall Enrollment Report University of Hawai‘i Community Colleges, Appendix B Selected Characteristics of Credit Students
Staff by Ethnicity and Gender Fall 2003 (Percent)

The diversity of the College's employees parallels the diversity of its students.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Exec/ Mgr</th>
<th>Admin, Prof &amp; Tech</th>
<th>Civil Service</th>
<th>Instruct Faculty</th>
<th>Other Faculty</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All Employees</td>
<td>301</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian/Pacific Islander</td>
<td>207</td>
<td>68.8</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>62.5</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>80.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>171</td>
<td>56.8</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>62.5</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>73.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Japanese</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>33.9</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>37.5</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>50.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chinese</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>7.3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>12.5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Filipino</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>13.0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>12.5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>15.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Korean</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indian Subcontinent</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hawaiian &amp; Pacific Islander</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>12.0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hawaiian / Part Hawaiian</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>9.3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Samoan</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Asian &amp; Pac. Islander</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Ethnic Groups</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>31.2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>37.5</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>19.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White, Non-Hispanic</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>26.6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>37.5</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>19.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black, Non-Hispanic</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amer Indian/Alaskan Nat.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Ethnic</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Response</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>165</td>
<td>54.8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>12.5</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>54.3</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>62.3</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>52.3</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>61.9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>136</td>
<td>45.2</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>87.5</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>45.7</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>37.7</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>47.7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>38.1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source:  

Statistical Look
### Faculty by Rank, Ethnicity, and Gender Fall 2004

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ethnicity</th>
<th>Total Faculty</th>
<th>Professor</th>
<th>Associate Professor</th>
<th>Assistant Professor</th>
<th>Instructor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>Count</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ALL FACULTY</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian/Pac Islander</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>60.0</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>59.6</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chinese</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>6.9</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8.5</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Filipino</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hawaiian / Part Hawaiian</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indian Subcontinent</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Japanese or Okinawan</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>30.0</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>38.3</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Korean</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Samoan</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Asian &amp; Pacific Islander</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caucasian</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>37.5</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>40.4</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mexican/CubanCentral &amp; S. American</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Puerto Rican</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Indian / Alaskan Native</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Response</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Total Faculty</th>
<th>Professor</th>
<th>Associate Professor</th>
<th>Assistant Professor</th>
<th>Instructor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>52.5</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>61.7</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>47.5</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>38.3</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: UH Community Colleges Human Resources Office
**Longitudinal Student Achievement Data**

To supplement the assessment of student learning outcomes in all of its courses, programs, and support areas, the collects information on student progress and achievement and progress toward meeting their educational objectives. The following graphics provide a quantitative measure of these student achievement data.

**Student Retention**

Retention refers to those students who enrolled in a course during the Fall semester and did not drop before the end of the semester. Retention is calculated by dividing the number of students registered at the end of the semester, excluding those with “W” grades, by the total number of students registered for the semester. Within the University of Hawai‘i Community College System, retention has also been called Course Completion Rate.

![Retention Rate (Fall Semester)](image)

Source: Banner ODS – Views Schedule Offering, and Student Course
Note: Data excludes Cooperative Education, and Directed Study classes

**Student Persistence**

Persistence refers to students who enrolled during a Fall semester, and also enrolled in the immediately following Spring semester.

**Persistence Rate**

![Persistence (Fall to Spring)](image)

Source:
1) MAPS Spring Enrollment Report, (Registration Status – Continuing Student)
2) Banner ODS – Views: Schedule Offering, and Student Course
Annual Number Degrees and Certificates Awarded

Source: MAPS Degrees and Certificates Earned Table 2 (series)

Note: Certificate data only includes Certificates of Achievement (CA)
Data for CC, COM, ASC not included

Continuing Enrollment, Transfer, and Graduation of first-time, full-time, degree-seeking students within 150% of first time enrollment.

Source: IPEDS Graduation Rate Survey

Notes:
1) Numbers are unduplicated
2) Graduation – first time, full time students who received a degree or certificate within 150% of time from first time enrollment
3) Transfer – first time, full-time students who transfer (as matched by National Student Clearinghouse data) to another postsecondary institution within 150% of time from first time enrollment
4) Continuing – first time, full time students who are still enrolled at the same institution within 150% of time from first time enrollment and who have not received a degree or certificate
5) Transfer-Out Information available beginning Fall 2000 cohort
Transfers to Colleges and Universities

The table looks at the transfer behaviors of students whose last term of attendance was between the semesters of Fall 2001 to Fall 2003 compared against National Student Clearinghouse (NSC) data in June 2005. As some students have attended multiple colleges, the first college that a student attended was selected for this analysis.

Transfer Numbers and Rates

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Term Last Attended</th>
<th>Total # of Records</th>
<th>Transfers</th>
<th>Transfers to 4-Year Institution</th>
<th>Transfers to UH Community College</th>
<th>Transfers to Hawai'i Private Institutions</th>
<th>Transfers to Out of State Institutions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall 2001</td>
<td>1362</td>
<td>505</td>
<td>37.1%</td>
<td>162</td>
<td>32.1%</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall 2002</td>
<td>1468</td>
<td>506</td>
<td>34.5%</td>
<td>168</td>
<td>33.2%</td>
<td>180</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall 2003</td>
<td>1830</td>
<td>537</td>
<td>29.3%</td>
<td>207</td>
<td>38.5%</td>
<td>198</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall 2004</td>
<td>2087</td>
<td>453</td>
<td>21.7%</td>
<td>205</td>
<td>45.3%</td>
<td>166</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spring 2002</td>
<td>1601</td>
<td>604</td>
<td>37.7%</td>
<td>209</td>
<td>34.6%</td>
<td>165</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spring 2003</td>
<td>1676</td>
<td>555</td>
<td>33.1%</td>
<td>192</td>
<td>34.6%</td>
<td>167</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spring 2004</td>
<td>1944</td>
<td>545</td>
<td>28.0%</td>
<td>232</td>
<td>42.6%</td>
<td>167</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summer 2002</td>
<td>726</td>
<td>504</td>
<td>69.4%</td>
<td>283</td>
<td>56.2%</td>
<td>89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summer 2003</td>
<td>697</td>
<td>430</td>
<td>61.7%</td>
<td>248</td>
<td>57.7%</td>
<td>77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summer 2004</td>
<td>818</td>
<td>474</td>
<td>57.9%</td>
<td>280</td>
<td>59.1%</td>
<td>99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Winter 01/02</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>60.6%</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>60.0%</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Winter 02/03</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>53.3%</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>50.0%</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Winter 03/04</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>66.7%</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>62.5%</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: 1) Last Term Attended derived from the Operational Data Store (ODS) Student Course View (7/19/2005).
2) Transfers, the National Student Clearinghouse – first institution after leaving a community college.
Transfer Success Data

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Originating Campus</th>
<th>Spring UHCC AA Graduates</th>
<th>Average Cumulative GPR</th>
<th>Cumulative Completion Rate</th>
<th>Average 6 yr Completion Rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total Grads</td>
<td>Enrolled at UH Manoa No.</td>
<td>% of AA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hawai‘i CC</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.60%</td>
<td>2.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Honolulu CC</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>44.00%</td>
<td>2.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kapi‘olani CC</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>52.30%</td>
<td>3.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kaua‘i CC</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>21.20%</td>
<td>3.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leeward CC</td>
<td>209</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>24.40%</td>
<td>2.98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maui CC</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>26.30%</td>
<td>3.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Windward CC</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>27.60%</td>
<td>2.81</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: UH MAPS

Enrollment rates of AA graduates varied considerably by UHCC campus. Kapi‘olani CC showed the highest average initial fall semester enrollment rate, at 49%, with the enrollment rate peaking at an average of 52% in the first spring semester. Honolulu CC also showed a relatively high average initial fall enrollment rate, at 39%, peaking at 46% in the second fall semester. Average initial fall enrollment rates for Kauai, Leeward, Maui and Windward CC measured between 19% and 27%, while Hawai‘i CC had the lowest average initial fall enrollment rate at 2%.

Completion results varied greatly by UHCC campus. Maui CC posted the highest cumulative completion rate for the Spring 1997 cohort, at 93%. Kapi‘olani CC was next at 79%, followed by Honolulu (77%), Windward (63%), Leeward (60%), Kauai (53%) and Hawai‘i (50%).

The average six-year completion rates by campus were: Hawai‘i (42%), Honolulu (76%), Kapi‘olani (77%), Kauai (48%), Leeward (62%), Maui (81%) and Windward (58%).

In general, students who transfer to UH Manoa having first earned an Associate in Arts degree at one of the UH Community Colleges perform as well or better than students who enroll as first-time freshmen at UH Manoa. Performance measurements for the UH Manoa first-time freshmen who survived to the end of their third year of enrollment were comparable to the measurements for the AA transfer students. However, AA transfer graduates performed better during their first year of study than did first-time freshmen during their first year of enrollment. On average, UH Manoa first-time freshmen carry a higher credit load than do AA transfers.

This study raises many issues that might be addressed by further research, especially whether or not there is any meaningful difference in the success of students who transfer to UH Manoa without having first earned an associate credential as opposed to those who transfer with the associate degree. Also, a comparative study of students who have earned the AS degree versus the AA degree could prove interesting. Finally, a system-wide study that would include transfers to UH Hilo and UH-West O‘ahu, in addition to UH Manoa, seems warranted.
Basic Skills Completion

Students lacking academic preparation for their chosen college programs is a national and local concern.

Basic Skills are defined as math and English courses not applicable to a degree or certificate. Basic Skills Completion is calculated from:

- student enrollment in the final basic skills course prior to the regular college curriculum,
- successful completion of the basic skills class, and
- successful completion of the following regular college curriculum course

The following figures show the completion rate of those who enrolled in a basic skills course prior to the regular college curriculum, as compared to completers in the first regular college curriculum course who enrolled without taking a basic skills prerequisite course.

Source: Banner—Operational Data Store (ODS) Captured 07/14/2005

Notes:
1) ENG 21 is a pre- or co-requisite for ENG 22
2) ENG 22 is the minimum level of English required for Automotive Technology, Culinary Arts, and Substance Abuse Counseling programs; ENG 100 is the minimum level of English (i.e., college level curriculum) required for all other majors
Job Placement and Preparation

Employment Status

![Bar chart showing employment statuses of Career Technical Education Graduates by year: Unemployed, FT Homemaker/Caregiver, Unemployed by Choice, Employed Part-Time, Employed Full-Time.]

Source: UH Community Colleges campus Graduate and Leavers surveys

Graduates and Leavers Job Preparation

![Bar chart showing percentage of graduates and leavers prepared: Well Prepared, Moderately Well Prepared, Adequately Prepared, Poorly Prepared.]

Source: UH Community Colleges campus Graduate and Leavers surveys
Student Engagement

Research shows that the more actively engaged students are—with college faculty and staff, with other students, and with the subject matter they study—the more likely they are to learn and persist toward achieving their academic goals. Student engagement, therefore, is a valuable yardstick for assessing whether, and to what extent, an institution is employing educational practices likely to produce successful results.

CCSSE Benchmark Scores

Source: CCSSE 2002 National Report
Results of Last Comprehensive Visit

The 2000 self study Visiting Team found that there were no standards with which Leeward Community College was out of compliance. The recommendations that follow were aimed at improvement and refinement of efforts at the College:

Issues from the 1994 Self Study:

1. The team recommends that curriculum review and revision be made a systematic and cyclical process with the goal of assuring academic rigor and integrity in all courses and programs (Standards 4D.2, 4D.6).

2. The team recommends that the college clearly define the role of all constituencies on the Campus Council. (Standards 10B.8, 10B.9, 10B.10)

3. The team recommends that the college analyze factors that may be contributing to administrative instability and turnover and develop appropriate local responses. (Standard 10B.4)

Issues from the 2000 Self Study:

The following are new recommendations made in 2000:

1. The team recommends that the college reexamine and adapt the application of the Program Health Indicators (PHI) model (or another appropriate program review model) to all its programs, and especially to student services, so that a structure, process, and culture are developed for its effective use in planning, decision making and program performance improvement. (Standards 5.3, 5.10)

2. The team recommends that the college identify and make public expected learning outcomes for all of its degree and certificate programs; that the general education component of all degree programs be published in clear and complete terms in the general catalog; that the general education component be based on a philosophy and rationale that are clearly stated and publicized; and that criteria be provided by which the appropriateness of each course in the general education component is determined. (Standards 4B.3, 4C.1, 4C.2)
3. The team recommends that the college review the changes in placement scores that have resulted from its use of the COMPASS test and develop appropriate response strategies in the student services and instructional areas to ensure that students achieve their educational goals in as timely and efficient a manner as possible. (Standard 5.5)

4. The team recommends that the college review its practices related to storage and safety of student records to determine if they are in compliance with established guidelines. The college should pay particular attention to requirements related to ensuring that files are protected from fire and other disasters. (Standard 5.9)

5. The team recommends that the college formalize its planning procedures in the areas of technology and information and learning resources to address needs in the following areas: determining the sufficiency of information and learning resources, planning for the acquisition and maintenance of educational equipment and materials, ensuring accessibility of information and learning resources, providing professionally qualified staff, ensuring sufficient and consistent financial support, forging outside agreements, and evaluating the adequacy and effectiveness of learning and information resources and services. (Standards 6.1, 6.2, 6.3, 6.4, 6.5, 6.6, 6.7)

In response to these recommendations, the former Provost/Chancellor created the following Accreditation Implementation Committees:

**Accreditation Implementation Oversight Committees**

1. **Administrative Instability and Turnover**
   - Institutional Research Analyst: Andrew Rossi
   - Senior Personnel Officer: Takako Desaki
   - Acting Dean of Instruction: Douglas Dykstra
   - Dean of Student Services: Stella Ho-McGinnes
   - Provost: Mark Silliman
   - Director of Administrative Services: Clifford Togo
   - OCET Director: Lucy Gay
   - Campus Council Chair: Manny Cabral
   - Faculty Senate representatives: Jack Pond
   - APT Representative: Kathleen Cabral
   - Secretary to the Dean of Instruction: Cheryl Mokuau, Vice-chair
   - Secretary to the Provost: Terry Richter, Vice-chair
   - Chair of the Phase 1 Reorganization Planning Committee: Donald Thomson, Chair
   - Head Librarian (representing Academic Support): Diane Sakai, Recorder
   - Two Division Chairs: Kay Caldwell; Robert Hochstein

2. **Campus Council Constituency Roles and Governance**
   - Convener: Cliff Togo
   - Lecturer Designate: Dottie Sunio
   - Faculty Senate Chair: James Goodman
   - Academic Support: Ralph Toyama
Chair, Arts & Humanities: James West
APT Representative: Dale Hood
Clerical Staff Council Representative: Terry Richter
Students Representative: David Donaldson
Auxiliary Services Office: Derrick Uyeda

3. Curriculum Revision and Review
Acting Dean of Instruction: Bernadette Howard, Co-chair
Curriculum Committee Chair: Nancy Buchanan
2nd Curriculum Committee representative: Paul Lococo
Curriculum Central specialist: Barbara Hotta
Division Chairs of all 6 instructional Divisions (or their designees):
   Arts & Humanities: James West
   Business Technology: Shelley Ota
   Language Arts: Kay Caldwell
   Mathematics & Natural Sciences: Manny Cabral
   Social Sciences: Donald Thomson
   Vocational-Technical: Robert Hochstein
Student Services Division Chair (or designee): Stuart Uesato
Selected Discipline or Program Representatives or Coordinators
   (one from each of the 6 instructional Divisions):
   Arts & Humanities: Patricia Kennedy, Co-chair
   Business Technology: Jean Hara, Recorder
   Mathematics & Natural Sciences: Michael Bauer
   Language Arts: Gail Levy
   Social Sciences: Grace Miller, Second Recorder
   Vocational Technology: Fern Tomisato
   Language Arts: Leslie Munro

4. Degrees and Certificates
   (Learning Outcomes and General Education Component)
   Acting Dean of Instruction: Bernadette Howard
   Faculty Senate representative: Patricia Neils
   Curriculum Committee representative: Jake De St. Croix, Co-chair
   Faculty Representative from each of the 6 instructional Divisions:
   Business Technology: Sandy Hoshino, Second recorder
   Arts & Humanities: Gailynn Williamson
   Language Arts: Sandra Kelley, Recorder
   Mathematics & Natural Sciences: Franklin Iha
   Social Sciences: Wesley Teraoka
   Vocational Technical: Ray Tanimoto
   Academic Advising Coordinator (Student Services Division):
   Candy Hochstein, Co-chair

Results of Last Comprehensive Visit
5. Placement Testing Impacts
Assessment Specialist: Frank Sherry, Chair
OTAR/Enrollment Services Coordinator: Nancy Buchanan
Dean of Student Services: Stella Ho-McGinnes
Writing Coordinator: Gail Levy
Reading Coordinator: Alan Smolka
Math Coordinator: Stanley Uyemura
English 100 faculty representative: Susan Hamilton, Back-up Recorder
LRC Representative: Rae Watanabe
Faculty Senate representative: Mark Minasian
Acting Dean of Instruction: Bernadette Howard, Vice-chair

6. Program Reviews/Program Health Indicators
Assistant Dean for Academic Services: Michael Pecsok
Institutional Research Analyst: Andrew Rossi
Program Review Analyst for Vocational Programs: Raymund Liongson
Student Services Division Chair (or designee): Stuart Uésato, Co-recorder
Faculty Senate representative: Gail Levy
Faculty Representatives

7. Strategic Planning for Technology and Information/Learning Resources
Assistant Dean for Academic Services: Mike Pecsok
Computer Center Manager: Richard Yamane
Computing Lab Manager: Carolyn Cortez
ICS Discipline Coordinator: Kazuo Chambers
Faculty representative from Business Technology Division: Michael Meyer
Faculty Senate representative: Judy Kappenberg
Educational Media Center Acting Coordinator: Irwin Yamamoto, Chair
Educational Communications and Technology Developer,
   EMC: Leanne Chun, Vice-chair
LRC Coordinator: Beth Kupper-Herr
Educational Communications and Technology Developer, LRC: Ross Egloria, Recorder
Head Librarian: Diane Sakai
Staff Development Coordinator: Cindy Martin
OCET representative: Shaun Fujii
Leeward CC at Wai‘anae representative: William Akama
Director of Administrative Services (or designee): Clifford Togo
Student Services Division representative: Warren Mau

Results of these Accreditation Implementation Committees’ work are discussed in “Responses to Recommendations,” pages 58–67.
Leeward Community College’s Policy on Program Reviews (rev. 2005) is the primary document that addresses development and assessment of student learning outcomes at the course and program levels. It is designed to accomplish the following:

• Ensure educational programs are continually improved
• Address student and community needs
• Inspire dialogue throughout the campus
• Establish a culture of evidence that provides data for decision-making. (p. 1)

According to the Policy, a program is defined as any degree, and includes the Associate in Arts (AA), Associate in Science (AS), Associate in Applied Science (AAS), and the Office of Continuing Education and Workforce Development (OCEWD). Support Areas are administrative or support activities related in terms of objectives, clients served, or resources used, and include the Office of the Chancellor, Academic Support, Student Services, and Administrative Services. Through assessment of student learning in Programs and Support Areas, the College engages in integrated planning, implementation, and budgeting.

The College has identified SLO for all of its courses and programs. For courses, Discipline faculty have determined SLO after reviewing similar courses at other Community Colleges and four-year institutions, as well as guidelines established by professional organizations. SLO for each course can be found on the core outlines in Curriculum Central. All credit courses are reviewed according to the Policy on Curriculum Revision and Review.

Courses have been placed on a six-year grid that indicates when they start the review cycle. Beginning in 2004, course assessment was included as part of the review process, and by 2009, the entire curriculum will have been reviewed via this process. A Course Assessment Coordinator collects data and provides an annual report on progress. As soon as is feasible, course assessment results will be posted on Curriculum Central.

The following table indicates the College’s current progress on course assessment.
Program SLO were developed by System-wide agreement and are listed in the College Catalog. The College offers three degree programs: the AA, AS, and AAS. Assessment of AA SLO began for Written Communication as early as 1999, but the remaining AA General Education SLO assessment began in 2004. A summary of results was published in the Assessment Analysis Report (http://emedia.leeward.hawaii.edu/cs/planning/reports/). Results of program review of the AA are available online at http://emedia.leeward.hawaii.edu/cs/ProgReview/.

Both course and program SLO assessment are in their early implementation stages at the College, and for the most part, faculty and staff are still struggling to address the question of how best to assess SLOs. However, available data from these assessments have been incorporated in the Annual Review process that was initiated in 2005-2006 as the College's central budget and planning tool. Division's Annual Reviews record results of course and program assessment and the changes that have been implemented.

For example, in the area of course assessment, Speech 251 and Acc 201 produced changes that resulted from assessment. In Speech 251, faculty developed a common audience analysis form for students to complete, which led to a 29% gain in assessment results for this SLO. Accounting 201's assessment led to a discussion of the importance of teaching basic concepts and offering accounting tutorials, which led to a 3% increase in SLO achievement.

Programs are also struggling to develop appropriate assessment tools. As part of that process,
the Fall 2005 assessment of AA SLOs in Written Communication developed an assessment process that was totally online. Included in the process was the test of a classroom change proposed as a result of earlier assessment. The earlier assessment indicated that students had difficulty in developing their essays. Selected classes included the use of graphic organizers as a development tool; the 2005 assessment included a comparison of writing classes that did not teach the use of a graphic organizer with those that did. In the Experimental Group, 57.5% of papers were rated as acceptable for second-year college writing, as compared to 52% of the Control Group's papers. The result, if verified by future assessment, will enable the Writing Assessment Committee to provide specific recommendations to the college to improve achievement of the written communication SLOs.

The practice of using course and program SLO assessment results to make improvements in student learning, and the policies governing this practice, are still evolving. Only some of the course and program SLOs have been assessed at this point, but already the information is being used to guide budget prioritization and to improve student learning. As the practice continues and more program and course SLO assessments are incorporated into Annual Reviews, the College will have a data-based, rational, and collegial planning process.
Leeward Community College provides assurance of quality at off-campus instructional sites and in its distance learning offerings. All courses offered off campus undergo the same assessment process as courses delivered on the Pearl City campus. Additional assessment data is compiled for distance learning courses.

Off-campus sites include a satellite campus in Wai‘anae (LCCW) and periodically at regional high schools. Courses at the high schools are offered on an as-needed basis, while courses are offered year round at LCCW. Offerings include courses in the liberal arts and selected business classes. Additional off-site instruction is offered at state prisons facilitated through the Distance Education (DE) program.

To insure quality, the respective Division Chair at the Pearl City campus selects instructors for all LCCW and other off-campus courses. Individual faculty also undergo peer and student evaluations each semester.

Currently, LCCW does not have a specific operating budget, relying on Divisions to cover costs of courses offered in Wai‘anae. The current Biennium Budget proposal includes a substantial request to increase capacity and support for LCCW operations.

During the 2005-2006 academic year, faculty teaching Distance Education courses were required to provide information as to how the specific delivery system used (WebCT, Cable TV, etc.) supports the learning objectives of the course. This information is available in the core course outlines in Curriculum Central. Faculty who use one or more forms of Distance Education are also engaged in dialogue on the success of the delivery systems used. This dialogue takes place via email, in Distance Education meetings, and as part of the various Distance Education workshops, including summer WebFun sessions. For example, in summer 2006, the WebFun II sessions (for more advanced WebCT users) focused on podcasting, including a pedagogical discussion on various ways this technology could be used to enhance student learning.

Student support needs for DE courses are assessed in two ways. Before the start of each semester, Leeward CC’s Distance Education Coordinator holds an orientation session for both course content and WebCT training. At the orientation sessions, students are given a
paper-based evaluation that measures their satisfaction with their orientation sessions and preparedness for using WebCT in their DE course. At the end of each semester, students are sent an online evaluation that measures their satisfaction levels with Distance Education academic and support services (online evaluation: http://moosurvey.kcc.hawaii.edu/e-learn/eval/faq.html). Their opinions are solicited so the College Units can improve services or offer new services.

The UH Community Colleges E-Learning consortium also sends an electronic student services survey to all faculty teaching via distance at the beginning and end of each semester. Faculty are asked to distribute the survey through email to all of their students. Results are electronically submitted and tabulated. A detailed report of student service satisfaction is reported to all campuses for use of the institutions to evaluate and improve services.

The DE Program is coordinated through the Educational Media Center (EMC). In addition to the orientation discussed above, services provided to DE students include phone or walk-in WebCT technical support, online student and academic support web resources, and degree and program information. The WebCT orientation teaches important technology skills and WebCT functionality required for successful online performance. The Distance Education Coordinator also provides year-round online, walk-in or phone support for technical issues and questions and concerns specific to DE courses and programs. HelpDesk services are provided to assist students with WebCT as well as computer hardware and software issues.

Distance Education faculty have numerous opportunities for instructional and technology development. To ensure quality of technology-enhanced and distance-delivered courses, faculty have the opportunity to receive one-on-one technology mentoring, which customizes training to the instructors’ needed skills. Additionally throughout the semester, technology- and pedagogical-themed workshops are offered, as well customizable small group workshops. During the summer, the EMC hosts a three-week WebFun I and WebFun II institute. WebFun I runs over a two-week period and teaches faculty the tools of WebCT and the instructional design process for developing an online course. WebFun II, offered over a week’s time, and is geared towards technically experienced faculty and offers advanced technology and instructional best practices workshops and seminars.
The University of Hawai‘i System, inclusive of Leeward Community College, is audited on an annual basis by an independent accounting/auditing firm. The consolidated financial statements of the UH System are prepared in accordance with the Government Accounting Standards Board (GASB) principles, which establish the standards for external financial reporting for public colleges and universities.

This financial audit is conducted as part of, and in accordance with, the annual OMB Circular A-133 audit, which is required by the Federal government in order to provide financial and compliance information on all federally funded grants and contracts. The A-133 audit ensures that all federal funds are expended in accordance with applicable laws, regulations, and federal requirements. The Compliance Supplement, which is updated annually, is used by the accounting/auditing firm in setting forth the compliance provisions of federal assistance programs relevant to the A-133 audit process.
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Institutional Commitments

Leeward Community College has demonstrated a consistent and increasing commitment to a central issue: student learning as a basis for action. The College’s commitment to periodic review of its mission has insured that student learning is central to the College’s purpose. Student learning needs, assessed through placement testing and demographic analyses, are a major factor in determining the delivery systems offered. Assessment of the learning that occurs in courses and programs, carried out by faculty and staff who are engaged in the design and continuous assessment of student learning outcomes (SLOs), is the basis for improvement of learning. Results of assessment are fed into the Program and Annual Review processes, through which the College has committed to a rationale for all planning decisions and budget submissions.

To support student learning and institutional effectiveness, the College is committed to the hiring of qualified personnel and to supporting their professional development. The College uses system-wide minimum qualifications as established in UH administrative and executive policies to ensure that personnel demonstrate appropriate knowledge and the ability to teach effectively. A strong commitment to professional development opportunities is shown through the College’s Innovation Center for Teaching and Learning (ICTL) that promotes assessment, success in learning, and effectiveness in teaching. Leeward CC is the only community college in the System with a tenured, full-time Staff Development Coordinator.

Considerable time and money have been committed to both the Program and Annual Review processes. The College is committed to improving its effectiveness by continuously modifying the assessment and planning processes that result in budget priorities.
Evaluation, Planning, and Improvement

In a cycle of evaluation, planning, and improvement, the College analyzes information from various sources, including the U.S. Census Bureau, Hawai‘i State Government planning documents, Department of Business, and Management and Planning Support (MAPS) documents from the University of Hawai‘i’s Institutional Research Office to update its mission. The campus’ Strategic Plan 2002-2010 is derived from, and driven by, the College’s mission and is revisited each year as a means of promoting ongoing analysis and continuous improvement. Beginning in 2006, the Strategic Plan’s revisit took the form of the new Annual Review process, designed to bring together assessment, planning, and budgeting.

Evaluation, planning, and improvement of student learning are evidenced through faculty and staff efforts with course, program, and Support Area assessments, and in resulting changes in curriculum and/or practices. Implementation of the Policy on Program Reviews calls for each Division and Support Area to complete a template based on course and program SLO assessment, including perceived strengths, weaknesses, opportunities, and threats of the Division or Support Area, and use of this information to develop prioritized initiatives and requests.

Ongoing evaluation and improvement of Student Services has occurred since 2003. The Student Activities Office, for example, has engaged in dialogue and implementation needed to facilitate co-curricular learning experiences and appreciation of diversity via participation in clubs and organizations. The Office of Continuing Education and Workforce Development (OCEWD) engages in ongoing discussions regarding appropriate courses and workshops for personal development and enrichment. COMPASS, the Computerized Adaptive Placement Assessment and Support System that is used system-wide, has been the focus of continuous evaluation since 1998, in an effort to properly place students in English and math classes.

Every College employee is evaluated systematically and periodically to assess effectiveness and to determine areas of possible improvement. Professional development activities are also assessed.

The College has developed the Program and Annual Review processes to determine its human, financial, physical, and technology resources needs. The process calls for all Divisions, Units, and Offices of the College to submit and prioritize needs to form a College Plan for budgeting and programmatic purposes.

In the area of leadership, neither the Faculty Senate nor the Campus Council, the College’s two major governing bodies, has been evaluated on their integrity or effectiveness. The College will formalize processes in this area.
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Student Learning Outcomes

Leeward CC’s commitment to student learning is described in its mission. The mission is revised periodically to reflect the changing demographics and needs of a rapidly growing service area. Student learning is at the heart of the College’s Program and Annual Review processes, with ongoing dialogue evident among faculty and staff within Divisions and Support Areas, as well as across the campus, about the assessment and improvement of student learning outcomes achievement.

Faculty and staff design, assess, and analyze data in an effort to improve student learning. Policies and processes are in place for assessing learning outcomes of courses and programs (including assessments of breadth, depth, rigor, sequencing, time to completion, and synthesis of learning), designed by faculty who teach these courses. Results of assessments are included in Division Program Reviews, which are fed into the College’s Annual Review to insure that improvements are budgeted and instituted.

Student Services and Academic Support are also engaged in Program Review to assess the impact of their services on student learning. For example, in response to surveys, Academic Support’s Educational Media Center has developed strategies to assist students taking distance learning courses, including the following activities: 1) documentation and interactive tutorials available through the web, 2) on-campus orientation for students in Distance Education, specific Internet courses, and Technology-Enhanced courses.

The College has begun the practice of using course and program SLO assessment results to make improvements in student learning, but the policies governing this practice in connection with faculty evaluation are still evolving. The College will work with the system-wide Human Resources Office to recommend revision of the guidelines for contract renewal and tenure and promotion to reflect an emphasis on producing student learning outcomes.

The College actively seeks ways to support professional development of all its personnel and evaluates the results of most of those activities via evaluation forms and surveys. Additional funds to support assessment were included in the College’s supplemental budget request, and part of these funds may be used to support professional development directed toward assessment.

Organization

Organizational structures at Leeward CC that support dialogue about student learning and institutional processes include the Faculty Senate, the Campus Council, the College’s Administration, Academic Divisions, Clerical Staff Council (CSC), Administrative Professional and Technical (APT) Group, and Operations and Maintenance (O&M) Group. The College’s Program and Annual Review processes insure faculty, staff, and administrator participation in these processes. With the Program and Annual Review processes in place, more dialogue has occurred than in the past; however, discussions must continue among faculty and staff across the curriculum to determine changes needed to improve program SLOs.
The College has in place organizational structures to support a diverse student population, including the disabled and those needing supplemental instruction. Structures are also in place to support faculty in developing teaching methods and delivery modes, including Distance Education. The College’s degree programs and its General Education philosophy and requirements are clearly organized and presented in its annual catalog.

While the College is organized to support student learning through its Library, Educational Media Center, Information Technology Group, Learning Resource Center, and Math Lab, faculty are also supported in their professional development through the Innovation Center for Teaching and Learning (ICTL). These support structures rely on the input of faculty, staff, and students to select appropriate educational equipment and materials. Survey results and internal assessments indicate that access and security of student support services are sufficient.

The College follows UH System policies and procedures that govern classification, appointment, and compensation of faculty, staff, and administrators. Organizational processes ensure appropriate evaluation of administrators, faculty, and staff.

Leeward Community College, through its policies and procedures, assures that human, financial, physical and technology resources are maintained appropriately to provide a healthful learning and working environment. The implementation and ongoing refinement of the Program and Annual Review processes are positive steps in addressing current concerns about meeting standards of good practice.

The College’s governance structures have charters and by-laws but must develop processes to evaluate their effectiveness. Executive/Managerial administrators undergo annual evaluation by their supervisors, in addition to the annual 360 Assessment/Evaluation; however, results are not shared with the campus community.

The Board of Regents is the organization that is vested with the governance of the University of Hawai‘i, making decisions concerning the internal organization and management of the University System. The Board appoints and evaluates the President of the University, approves all other executive appointments, and designs policies to support the Community College mission. The Office of the Vice President for Community Colleges acts as liaison between the Community Colleges and the BOR, and is viewed as a hopeful step in providing services to support the Community Colleges. The newly-reorganized Community College Standing Committee of the Board of Regents is designed to deepen understanding of the Community College accreditation process and requirements.

Leeward CC’s Chancellor appropriately delegates authority to administrators and to the campus’ governance organizations, the Faculty Senate and the Campus Council. The recent implementation of the Annual Review process, which guides institutional improvement, continues to evolve under the leadership of the Chancellor.
Dialogue

Many dialogue and working sessions have occurred over the years to insure that issues related to assessment, planning, and other major policies and practices of the Campus have proper exposure. Dialogue about demographic and socioeconomic changes have been the basis for periodic revisions of the College’s mission, first in 2004 and then again in 2005, as well for the development and revisits of the College’s Strategic Plan 2002-2010. Leeward CC’s Program and Annual Review processes are also based on campus-wide dialogue about the assessment of student learning and institutional effectiveness. Faculty, staff, and administrators engage in ongoing discussions to develop and assess student learning outcomes for their Disciplines and Support Areas; results of these assessments serve as the basis of prioritized lists that lead to budget requests. Throughout the year, workshops and working sessions allow all areas of the campus to engage in dialogue that leads to better learning.

Ongoing dialogues about student learning occur among Student Services and Academic Support Units. These discussions have facilitated the Support Area assessments that are part of the Program Review process initiated in 2003. Unit assessments have led to changes in practice and to prioritized lists for the College’s Annual Review process. For example, selection of equipment and materials is the result of dialogues between Academic Support Units, including the Library, Educational Media Center (EMC), Information Technology Group (ITG), and Learning Resource Center (LRC), and the faculty, staff, and students who use these services.

Dialogue is integral to the hiring process, particularly for faculty members and administrators. In most situations, faculty within each Discipline participate in discussions regarding criteria and qualifications of faculty positions within the Discipline and also serve on screening (interview) committees that engage in discussions to select new faculty. Through discussion, Leeward CC’s Innovation Center for Teaching and Learning plans and organizes a wide range of professional development activities to meet the needs of Leeward faculty and staff.

The Program and Annual Review processes are the College’s attempt to integrate assessment, planning, and budgeting in all areas of decision-making. These processes are intended to ensure that all decisions concerning human resource, physical, financial, and technology services are based on inclusive and informed dialogue. The College will need to engage in ongoing evaluation of the effectiveness of the Program and Annual Review processes in responding to the campus’ needs.

The Chancellor recognizes the importance of inclusive dialogue, collaboration, and the principles of shared governance, and has encouraged campus-wide involvement to arrive at a collective understanding of how the College might improve its effectiveness. Campus leaders welcome dialogue to assist in creating an environment for decision-making, innovation and excellence.

Integrity

The College demonstrates concern with honesty and truthfulness in its policies, practices, and procedures and its manner of representation to its constituencies. This integrity begins with Leeward Community College’s statement of mission and is carried through in the programs and services offered to help students learn. Through the Program and Annual Review processes, the College conscientiously attempts to assess student learning and institutional effectiveness and to implement changes for improvement. Governance structures such as
the Faculty Senate’s Curriculum and Program Review committees support these processes and
insure that quality courses, programs, and services are in place.

The College’s integrity is shown through its honest communication with students and the
community it serves via publications, including its yearly Leeward Community College Catalog.
The Catalog states the College’s mission, describes admission requirements, policies, programs
of study, and support services available. Transfer of credit and the Student Conduct Code,
with its focus on academic honesty, are also found in the Catalog. The 2004-2005 Leeward CC
Catalog received the First Place Paragon Award from the National Council on Marketing and
Public Relations in March 2005. In addition to the Catalog, policies affecting students are also
available online at http://www.lcc.hawaii.edu/.

The integrity of personnel procedures is maintained by the consistent use of policies university
wide. The integrity of the interview and hiring process of prospective applicants is guided
by Policy A9.540: Recruitment and Selection of Faculty and APT. Leeward faculty follow
CCCM# 2600: Statement of Professional Ethics that offers guidance on research and scholarly
activities. The College does a commendable job of providing an Affirmative Action Plan
(AAP) for ensuring equity and diversity among employees. Workshops offered by the College
help to ensure the integrity of its employees by keeping them current with such issues as legal
responsibility in the workplace, workplace violence, copyright, and patent policy.

Financial documents, including budget and independent audits, reflect appropriate allocation
and use of financial resources to support student learning programs and services. The College
effectively manages its budget within the limitations imposed by the State. Audits of the
management of the College finances are conducted by external agencies on a regular basis,
and the College has responded to all audits in a timely manner, making changes as needed.
The financial planning and budgeting at the campus level is continuously evaluated to clarify
and improve the guidelines and processes that are used to acquire and expend the College’s
allocation.

The Chancellor and members of the Administrative Team have strived to create an
environment that encourages all faculty and staff to participate in the decision-making
process that respects each individual’s honesty and integrity. During the Summer 2006, the
College pulled together its first Program Review document, making the results available to
the public. Some concern persists among faculty about the use of performance data such as
SLO achievement, but the College is committed to an informative and fair unveiling of the
College’s main activity: supporting student learning. The Annual Review Process is designed to
allow every member of the campus to assess what they do and to provide input for change that
leads to improvement. The Shared Governance Policy provides for faculty, staff, administrator,
and student participation to insure integrity of its decision-making processes. The College has
conscientiously worked towards implementing steps to best achieve standards of good practice.
ACCJC’s responses to these efforts have been positive.

The 2005 re-organization of the UH System, supported by the functional statement of the
UH President, the Vice President for Community Colleges, and the Chancellors, are in line
with current ACCJC standards. The System is in the early stages of developing and defining
role-delineation and governance and decision-making processes to assure their integrity and
effectiveness in meeting educational goals.
## Organization for the Self Study

### Accreditation Teams/Leaders

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institutional Commitment</th>
<th>Student Learning Outcomes</th>
<th>Dialogue</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Aaron Bush</td>
<td>Larry Andres</td>
<td>San Albers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mike Bauer</td>
<td>Camden Barruga</td>
<td>Paula Asamoto</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elsie Hyde</td>
<td>Weirong Cai</td>
<td>Kaz Chambers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Judy Kappenberg</td>
<td>Laurie Libarios</td>
<td>Dave Coleman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gail Levy</td>
<td>Donna Matsumoto</td>
<td>Jake De St. Croix</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cindy Martin</td>
<td>Cheryl Mokuau</td>
<td>Beth Kupper-Herr</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mike Moser</td>
<td>Kabi Neupane</td>
<td>Jason Levy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barry Nakamura</td>
<td>Patria Ramos</td>
<td>Deenie Musick</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tara Rojas</td>
<td>Jennie Thompson</td>
<td>Therese Nakadomari</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grace Miller, team leader</td>
<td>Chris Whiteside</td>
<td>Alex Ramos</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Jonathan Wong</td>
<td>Terry Richter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Linda Yamada</td>
<td>Stu Uesato</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Janice Ito, team leader</td>
<td>Carleen Yokotake</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Barbara Hotta, team leader</td>
<td>Aulii Ross, team leader</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Evaluation, Planning, and Improvement</th>
<th>Organization</th>
<th>Integrity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Andrzej Dabrowski</td>
<td>Tommylynn Benavente</td>
<td>Kay Caldwell</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ann Dorado</td>
<td>Nancy Buchanan</td>
<td>Lori Lei Hayashi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Becky George</td>
<td>Manny Cabral</td>
<td>Kakkala Mohanan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Karen Hayashida</td>
<td>Leanne Chun</td>
<td>Karen Fujishima-Lee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ross Higa</td>
<td>Ron Flegal</td>
<td>Blake Hunrick</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rodney Hirokawa</td>
<td>Juliet Lee</td>
<td>Wanda Miyamoto</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sandra Kelley</td>
<td>Paul Lococo</td>
<td>Michael Nester</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Della Kunimune</td>
<td>Lenore Maruyama</td>
<td>Donnabelle Pascual</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stan May</td>
<td>Shelley Ota</td>
<td>Jim West</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pat Mitiguy</td>
<td>Wes Teraoka</td>
<td>Susan Wood</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kay Ono</td>
<td>Mike Wong</td>
<td>Susan Lum, team leader</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ian Risleley</td>
<td>Bob Asato, team leader</td>
<td>Gailynn Williamson, team leader</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jan Shimabukuro-Lee</td>
<td>Lani Uyeno, team leader</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Sandy Hoshino, team leader</em></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Accreditation Co-Coordinators:

Bob Asato, Accreditation Liaison Officer
Lani Uyeno, Co-Cordinator
## Accreditation Timeline

### 2000–2002

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Event</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>September 1, 2000</td>
<td>College Self Study submitted for Reaffirmation of Accreditation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>August 2001</td>
<td>College initiated the revision of its Academic Development Plan.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>January 19, 2001</td>
<td>Accreditation reaffirmed. Visiting Team found College to be in compliance with all standards; however, three recommendations from the 1994 Visiting Team were not resolved – 1) Create a Curriculum Revision and Review process with goal of assuring academic rigor and integrity in all courses and programs, 2) define the role of all constituencies on Campus Council, 3) analyze factors contributing to administrative instability and turnover and develop appropriate local responses. Visiting Team 2000 New Recommendations: 1) Reexamine and adapt PHI model (or other Program Review model) to all programs, esp. to student services, so that a structure, process, and culture are developed for its effective use in planning and decision making, 2) Identify and make public SLO for all degree and certificate programs, that gen ed component of all degree programs be published in catalog, that gen ed component be based on a philosophy and rationale clearly stated and publicized, that criteria by which appropriateness of each course in gen ed component is determined. 3) Review changes in placement scores that resulted from use of COMPASS and develop response strategies in student services and instruction, 4) Review storage and safety of student records, 5) Formalize planning procedures in the areas of technology and information and learning resources. These issues were to be handled by the Accreditation Implementation Committees.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>February 2001</td>
<td>Accreditation Implementation Committees (AIC) created; 7 AICs were formed, as Student Services Records issue was handled within division.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>November 1, 2002</td>
<td>Interim Report submitted.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May 2002</td>
<td>College adopted revised Academic Development Plan; renamed the revision as the <em>Leeward CC Strategic Plan 2002-2007</em>.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
January 2003 UHCC System submitted to ACCJC Substantive Change Request for reorganization of CCs (eliminated Chancellor’s Office, established reporting structure of 7 chancellors to UH President, changed Provost to Chancellor).

ACCJC gives approval with reservations. Progress Report from System needed November 2003 and April 2004 to address reorganization issues.

February 2003 College initiated first “annual revisit” of the Leeward CC Strategic Plan.

March 2003 Curriculum Revision and Review Policy approved.

August 12, 2003 Leadership Retreat at Aloha Stadium.


November 14, 2003 Visiting Team found Campus Council issue to be fully addressed; issue regarding curriculum revision and review to be incomplete; administrative instability – remains “unstable”; “insufficient progress in implementing Program Review” with need to identify and implement a viable program review model; COMPASS adequately addressed; student learning outcomes for courses and programs adequately addressed, student records issue fully addressed; information technology not adequately addressed. Team issued a new recommendation to review the “N” grade.


January 2004 Program Review process initiated for instructional programs and Support Areas.

January 23, 2004 College placed on Warning as a result of Midterm Report. Two reports required: 1) 4/1/04 on “N” grade; 2) 10/15/04 on Program Review, incorporating Program Review in planning, resource distribution; formalizing planning in technology, information, and learning resources; System issues.

April 1, 2004 Progress Report #1 on “N” grade submitted.

Feb 19–Apr 8, 2004 Dialogue Sessions 1-5 on Student Learning Outcomes presented by Accreditation Co-coordinators.
June 2004  ACCJC found progress in addressing System reorganization issues incomplete and required Progress Report on November 2004 (with visit).

July 5–9, 2004  Accreditation Co-coordinators conduct Self Study Workshop with Administrators.

August 2004  College leadership met with Consultant Julie Slark. College revised and broadened the scope of its Program Review.

August 2004  Leadership Retreat: focus on Administrative Reorganization Proposal and Accreditation.

September 9-12, 2004  College sent four leaders to AAHE Conference, Glendale CA.

September 14, 2004  ACCJC Self-Study Workshop, Honolulu CC.

Sept–October 2004  Vice Chancellor presented revised Program Review model to entire campus through a series of open forums and meetings with Divisions and Support Units.

September 9, 2004  Progress Report #2 on Program Review; College Assessment, Planning, and Budgeting; and Planning for Information Tech, Learning Resources; System issues submitted.

October 4, 2004  First Self Study Team Leaders’ Meeting. Leaders agreed to use Themes approach to Self Study.

October 22–25, 2004  Visiting Team found progress made at the College towards a Program Review process with articulated SLO “impressive.”

2005

January 2005  Convocation focused on Re-Organization. Formal introduction of Vice Chancellor and Accreditation Team Leaders. Worked on Curriculum Grid for Critical Thinking.

January 2005  Appointment of Course Assessment Coordinator.

January 31, 2005  College continued on Warning. April 1, 2005 Progress Report to focus on five System issues (all System issues, with individual campuses responding on efforts with Program Review, resource allocation, and support needs from the System).
**Accreditation Timeline**

- **February 2005**: Assessment and Strategic Plan Coordinators met with Division Chairs regarding course assessment and timelines. Course assessment module on Curriculum Central designed. Met with Curriculum Committee Chair to discuss DE course Modifications, Course Assessment within Curriculum Central. Policy on Program Reviews modified.

- **March 30, 2005**: Progress Report #3 submitted to ACCJC.

- **April–May 2005**: Assessment Team meetings with program, Support Area project directors.

- **May 13, 2005**: Initial Meeting, UHCC Standard IV Systemwide Workgroup.

- **June 28, 2005**: College removed from Warning, but Progress Report #4 due to Commission.

- **July 20, 2005**: Accreditation Team Leaders’ Meeting.


- **August 31, 2005**: Initial Self Study Theme drafts due.

- **September 16, 2005**: Progress Report #4 submitted.

- **September 9, 2005**: UHCC Standard IV Systemwide Workgroup meeting.

- **September 13, 2005**: Team Leaders’ Meeting.

- **September 16, 2005**: Progress Report #4 submitted.

- **October 3–17, 2005**: Assessment Team Meetings.

- **October 14, 2005**: Reshaped Self Study Theme drafts due.

- **October 20, 2005**: Team Leaders’ Meeting.

- **November 4, 2005**: BOR Community College Committee Meeting.

- **November 7, 2005**: Team Leaders’ Meeting.

- **November 17, 2005**: Team Leaders’ Meeting.

- **November 28, 2005**: Team Leaders’ Meeting.

- **November 30, 2005**: Writing Assessment Gen Ed Meeting.

- **December 5, 2005**: Team Leaders’ Meeting.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Event</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>December 14, 2005</td>
<td>Team Leaders’ Meeting.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>December 15, 2005</td>
<td>Draft of combined Self Study document due.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>January 11, 2006</td>
<td>Posting of Self Study drafts on Docushare: Campus input invited.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>January 25, 2006</td>
<td>Deadline for campus response to initial drafts.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>January 27, 2006</td>
<td>UHCC Standard IV Systemwide Workgroup meeting.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>February 9, 2006</td>
<td>Team Leaders’ Meeting; Curriculum Grid Meeting.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>March 2, 2006</td>
<td>UHCC Standard IV System-wide Workgroup meeting.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>March 6, 2006</td>
<td>Team Leaders’ Meeting.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April 19, 2006</td>
<td>Posting of near final drafts of themes COM and ORG Campus Input Invited.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April 26, 2006</td>
<td>Posting of near final drafts of themes DIA and INT Campus Input Invited.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May 1, 2006</td>
<td>Posting of near final drafts of themes SLO and EPI Campus Input Invited.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May 10, 2006</td>
<td>Faculty Senate Review of near final drafts of all themes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May 11, 2006</td>
<td>UHCC Standard IV Systemwide Workgroup meeting.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>July 28, 2006</td>
<td>Final draft to President, Vice President for Community Colleges.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>August 4, 2006</td>
<td>Final draft to Board of Regents.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Organization of the College

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Position</th>
<th>Name</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Chancellor</td>
<td>Peter Quigley</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institutional Research</td>
<td>Andy Rossi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marketing</td>
<td>Kathleen Cabral</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dean, Student Services</td>
<td>Nicole S. Striegel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Division Chair</td>
<td>Nancy Buchanan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Admissions &amp; Records</td>
<td>Warren Mau</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Counseling &amp; Advising</td>
<td>Patsy Dudoit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Financial Aid</td>
<td>Aileen Lum Akana</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Campus Health Center</td>
<td>Jamie Boyd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Career Development Center (Job Prep Services)</td>
<td>Sandy Hoshino</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vice Chancellor, Academic Affairs</td>
<td>vacant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assistant Dean* (Arts &amp; Sciences)</td>
<td>James Goodman (interim)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assistant Dean* (Career &amp; Technical Education)</td>
<td>Mike Tagawa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic Division Chairs</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arts &amp; Humanities</td>
<td>James West</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Language Arts</td>
<td>Kay Caldwell</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Math &amp; Sciences</td>
<td>Manny Cabral</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Sciences</td>
<td>Don Thomson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business Technology</td>
<td>Shelley Ota</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vocational–Technical</td>
<td>Robert Hochstein</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assistant Dean* (Academic Support)</td>
<td>Mike Pecsok</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic Support Units</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educational Media Center</td>
<td>Leanne Chun</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Learning Resource Center</td>
<td>Beth Kupper-Herr</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Library</td>
<td>Ralph Toyama</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Computer Center</td>
<td>Kaz Chambers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Information Technology Group)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Curriculum Resource Center</td>
<td>Cindy Martin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Innovation Center for Teaching &amp; Learning)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wai‘anae-Nanakuli Education Center (Leeward CC Wai‘anae)</td>
<td>Will Akama, Coordinator</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Director, Administrative Services</td>
<td>Mark Lane</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Admin Services Units</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Human Resources</td>
<td>Mike Wong</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business Office</td>
<td>vacant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operations and Management</td>
<td>Doug Hill</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Director, Office of Continuing Education and Workforce Development</td>
<td>vacant</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*working titles: program deans, e.g. CTE Dean.*
University of Hawai‘i Community Colleges

Organizational Chart
University of Hawai‘i Community Colleges
as of June 2005
## I. Institutional Mission and Effectiveness

### A. Mission
- Authorization and purposes of the community colleges: College (C) \(\lor\) VPCC (C) \(\lor\) UHCC System (C) \(\lor\) UH President System (C) \(\lor\) UH BOR (A) \(\lor\) State (A)
- UH System policy on organization: College (C) \(\lor\) VPCC (C) \(\lor\) UH President System (R) \(\lor\) UH BOR (A)
- UHCC system mission statement: College (C) \(\lor\) VPCC (R) \(\lor\) UH President System (R) \(\lor\) UH BOR (A)
- Specific UHCC College's mission statement: College (R) \(\lor\) VPCC (R) \(\lor\) UH President System (R) \(\lor\) UH BOR (A)

### B. Improving Institutional Effectiveness
- UH System Policies on planning and academic affairs: College (C) \(\lor\) VPCC (C) \(\lor\) UH President System (R) \(\lor\) UH BOR (A)
- UH System Procedures on planning and academic affairs: College (C) \(\lor\) VPCC (C) \(\lor\) UH President System (A)
- UHCC policies and procedures on planning and academic affairs: College (C) \(\lor\) VPCC (A)
- Assessment of effectiveness of UHCC system programs and services: College (C) \(\lor\) VPCC (A)
- Assessment of effectiveness of college programs and services: College (A)
- Communicating the outcomes of system effectiveness: College (R) \(\lor\) VPCC (A) \(\lor\) UH President System (C) \(\lor\) UH BOR (C)
- Communicating the outcomes of campus effectiveness: College (A) \(\lor\) VPCC (C) \(\lor\) UH President System (C) \(\lor\) UH BOR (C)
- Academic Information system: College (C) \(\lor\) VPCC (C) \(\lor\) UH President System (A)

## II. Student Learning Programs and Services

### A. Instructional Programs
- UH System Policy on academic affairs: College (C) \(\lor\) VPCC (C) \(\lor\) UH President System (R) \(\lor\) UH BOR (A)
- UH System Procedures on academic affairs: College (C) \(\lor\) VPCC (C) \(\lor\) UH President System (A)
- UHCC policy and procedures on academic affairs: College (C) \(\lor\) VPCC (A)
- Policy Regarding the Establishment of Degree Programs: College (C) \(\lor\) VPCC (R) \(\lor\) UH President System (A)
- Procedures for Establishing a degree program: College (C) \(\lor\) VPCC (A)
- Establishment of a degree program: College (R) \(\lor\) VPCC (R) \(\lor\) UH President System (R) \(\lor\) UH BOR (A)
- Establishment of specific courses: College (A)
- Assessment of effectiveness of college programs and services: College (A)
- Course Scheduling: College (A)
- Academic requirements and regulations: College (A)
- Continuing education instruction and training: College (A)

### B. Student Support Services
- UH System Policy on student affairs: College (C) \(\lor\) VPCC (C) \(\lor\) UH President System (R) \(\lor\) UH BOR (A)
- UH System Procedures on student affairs: College (C) \(\lor\) VPCC (C) \(\lor\) UH President System (A)
- UHCC policy and procedures on student affairs: College (R) \(\lor\) VPCC (A)
- Design and delivery of student services: College (A)
- Assessment of effectiveness of college programs and services: College (A)
- Admission: College (A)
- Student Records: College (A)
- Financial Aid: College (A)
- Health Services: College (A)
- Annual Catalog and related student information: College (A)
- Student Information System: College (C) \(\lor\) VPCC (C) \(\lor\) UH President System (A)

Key to Decision Responsibility:  
- **A**: Approval  
- **R**: Recommendation  
- **C**: Consultation/Information
## DISTRIBUTION OF RESPONSIBILITY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FUNCTION/TASK</th>
<th>College</th>
<th>VPCC UHCC System</th>
<th>UH President System</th>
<th>UH BOR</th>
<th>State</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>II. Student Learning Programs and Services (cont’d)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. Library and Learning Support Services</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UH System Policy on library and support services</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UH System Procedures on library and support services</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UHCC policy and procedures on library and support services</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Design and delivery of library and learning support services</td>
<td>A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assessment of effectiveness of college programs and services</td>
<td>A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Library resources information system</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>III. Resources</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A. Human Resources</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UH System policy on personnel</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UH System Procedures on personnel</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UHCC policy and procedures on personnel</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Classification of Executive Positions</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Selection and Appointment of Executive Positions</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annual Evaluation of Executive Employees</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Classification of Managerial Positions</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Selection and Appointment of Managerial Positions</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annual Evaluation of Managerial Employees</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>C</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Selection and Appointment of Faculty Positions</td>
<td>A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annual Renewal of Probationary Faculty</td>
<td>A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promotion and Tenure of Faculty</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Classification of APT Positions</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Selection, appointment, evaluation, and renewal of APT positions</td>
<td>A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Classification of Civil Service Positions</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Selection, appointment, evaluation, and renewal of civil service positions</td>
<td>A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negotiation and approval of collective bargaining agreements</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employee benefits</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information system</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. Physical Resources</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UH System policy on land and facilities</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UH System Procedures on facilities</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UHCC policy and procedures on facilities</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College facilities master plan</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Major capital improvements</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minor capital improvements</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Repair and maintenance</td>
<td>A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Security</td>
<td>A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building and grounds maintenance</td>
<td>A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Key to Decision Responsibility:  
A= Approval  
R = Recommendation  
C= Consultation/Information
### III. Resources (continued)

#### C. Technology Resources
- UH System Procedures on information technology: C C A
- UHCC policy and procedures on information technology: C A
- Design, installation and operation of UH network services: C C A
- Design, installation and operation of UH administrative software: C C A
- Design, installation and operation of academic computing resources: A

#### D. Financial Resources
- UH System policy on finance: C C R A
- UH System Procedures on finance: C C A
- UHCC policy and procedures on finance: C A
- General Fund Budget Request Format and Guidelines: A
- University System General Fund Budget Request: C C R A C
- General Fund Budget Appropriation: C C C C A
- Level of Tuition and Student Fees: C R R A
- University System Annual Allocation: C C R A
- College Annual Allocation: C A
- College Budget Internal Allocation and Execution: A
- Accounting and records management: C C A
- Audit: C C R A
- Risk management: C C A
- Payroll: C C A
- Information system: C C A

### IV. Leadership and Governance

#### A. Decisionmaking Roles and Processes
- UH System policy on administration: C C R A
- UH System Procedures on administration: C C A
- UHCC policy and procedures on administration: C A
- College administrative policies and procedures: A
- Governmental relations: C C A
- Community relations: A
- Marketing and publications: A

#### B. Board and Administrative Organization
- UH System policy on organization: C C R A
- UH System Procedures on organization: C C A
- UHCC policy and procedures on organization: C A
- UHCC table of organization and functions: C R R A
- College table of organization and functions: R R R A

---

Key to Decision Responsibility:  
- A = Approval  
- R = Recommendation  
- C = Consultation/Information
Leeward Community College certifies that it is in compliance with the ACCJC Eligibility Requirements for Accreditation (Adopted June 1995; Revised January 1996; Revised January 2004):

1. Authority
The University of Hawai‘i Community Colleges are authorized by Act 39 of the 1964 Hawai‘i State Legislature. Leeward Community College was founded in 1968 and authorized by the UH Board of Regents to operate as an educational institution and grant degrees.

2. Mission
Leeward Community College’s mission statement is approved by the University of Hawai‘i Board of Regents and is consistent with University of Hawai‘i Strategic Plans. It is reviewed and updated at regular intervals and is published in the College Catalog.

3. Governing Board
The University of Hawai‘i Board of Regents has a constitutional mandate that grants it “exclusive jurisdiction over the internal organization and management of the University.” Article X, Section 6, of the Hawai‘i State Constitution grants the Regents the “power to formulate policy and to exercise control over the University through its executive officer, the President of the University.” This constitutional provision was incorporated into law in Chapters 26-11 and 304-4 of the Hawai‘i Revised Statutes. The Board is composed of 12 members and by law is required to “represent geographic subdivisions of the state.” All University of Hawai‘i personnel are required to follow Executive Policy E5.214 Conflicts of Interest.

4. Chief Executive Officer
The Chief Executive Officer of the College is the Chancellor who is appointed by the Board of Regents. The Chancellor provides leadership in planning and setting priorities for the College, managing resources, and ensuring implementation of statutes, regulations and policies.

5. Administrative Capacity
Leeward Community College has an administrative structure established to meet the institution’s purpose, size, and complexity. Currently, the College has eight Executive/Managerial positions. Under a proposed reorganization, one more Executive/Managerial position would be added. Minimum qualifications for administrative officers are set by the University of Hawai‘i Board of Regents.
6. Operational Status
Leeward Community College operates year round with Fall and Spring semesters and Summer sessions. Courses are designed to meet the varying needs of the students. Since AY 2000-01, an average of 513 students received degrees and certificates annually.
(Source: UH MAPS Reports, http://www.hawaii.edu/cgi-bin/iro/maps?dgccy05.pdf)

7. Degrees
The 2005-06 Catalog lists 51 programs of study leading to a degree or certificate. In AY2005-06, 93% of the College’s students had declared a program of study.
(Source: MAPS http://www.hawaii.edu/cgi-bin/iro/maps?seccf05aw.xls)

8. Educational Programs
The College’s primary degree programs, the Associate in Arts, Associate in Science, and the Associate in Applied Science are two-year collegiate level programs in recognized fields of study. Degree and certificate programs meet standards set by the UH Board of Regents.

9. Academic Credit
The award of academic credit is consistent with guidelines approved by the UH Board of Regents. The unit of credit is in compliance with the definition in the Handbook of Accreditation by the Accrediting Commission for Senior Colleges and Universities, Western Association of Schools and Colleges.

10. Student Learning and Achievement
Educational objectives and expected learning outcomes for programs are published in the Degree and Programs section of the Leeward Community College Catalog. Course objectives and outcomes are listed in the course Core Outlines.

11. General Education
Courses in general education for the AA degree satisfy lower division general education (GE) requirements of four-year colleges and universities. Of the 60 credits required for the AA degree, 43 credits are general education courses. Outcomes and competencies for AA general education in Arts and Humanities, Mathematical or Logical Reasoning, Natural Sciences, Social Sciences, World Civilizations, and Written and Oral Communication are listed in the College Catalog (pp. 60-63). The AS and AAS degrees focus on vocational and technical skills intended to prepare students for the workplace. Their general education components are not intended to satisfy baccalaureate GE requirements. GE credits required for completion of AS and AAS degrees range from 25% to 35% of the total needed for graduation. Nonetheless, in all cases (AA, AS, and AAS), each area—Humanities/Fine Arts, Natural Sciences, Social Sciences—is addressed.

12. Academic Freedom
Academic freedom for faculty is protected in Article IX of the Agreement between the University of Hawai’i Professional Assembly and the Board of Regents of the University of Hawai’i. The College Catalog states “The University of Hawai’i Leeward Community College embraces those aspects of academic freedom that guarantee the freedom to teach and the freedom to learn. Free inquiry and free expression for both students and faculty are indispensable and inseparable.” (p. 169)
13. Faculty
Leeward Community College in the Fall of 2005 employed 177 full time faculty. All faculty meet minimum requirements established by the University of Hawai‘i Community Colleges. Faculty duties are described in the annually updated Promotion and Tenure Guidelines and in the faculty contract (Agreement between the University of Hawai‘i Professional Assembly and the Board of Regents of the University of Hawai‘i).

14. Student Services
Leeward Community College has a comprehensive program of student services. Within Student Services, the College employs 35 FTE faculty and staff providing advising, counseling, job placement, career planning, financial aid, student activities, health care, and admissions and records.

15. Admissions
The admission policies of the College support the open access policy of the University of Hawai‘i Community Colleges.

16. Information and Learning Resources
Within Academic Support, the College employs 43.50 FTE faculty and staff providing student support through tutoring, testing, library, technology and media, and disability services. Both the Library and Learning Resources Center (LRC) are equipped with computer and audiovisual resources and physical resources to support student learning activities, such as access to online and web-based resources and individual or small group study sessions and tutoring. The College also provides a range of support services for students with disabilities through its Kāko‘o Ike (KI) office. The Educational Media Center (EMC) provides support in instructional technology and Leeward CC’s Distance Education Program. The Information Technology Group (ITG) operates and maintains the College Computing Labs (CCL) and the Help Desk.

17. Financial Resources
Leeward Community College had in 2005-06 a funding base of $14.3M in general funds and $4.5M tuition funds. The College’s Strategic Plan (SP) 2002-2010 provides a framework of goals, objectives, and prioritized action plans to address the institution’s mission. Beginning in Spring 2004, the College began a systematic assessment of student learning outcomes in all of its courses, programs, and Support Areas. In an attempt to better integrate evaluation, planning, and improvement, College leadership worked diligently from Fall 2004 to Summer 2005 on the design of the Annual Review process. The process, implemented in Spring 2006, focused on the analysis of data provided by the Program Reviews of student learning and institutional effectiveness from all Units within the College and served as the basis for a college-wide planning list that was used for the Leeward CC’s biennium budget proposal.
18. Financial Accountability
An independent certified public accounting firm annually audits the University's financial statements. Internal control procedures are outlined in the University of Hawai'i Administrative Procedures Manual. The auditing procedures provide objective third-party review of internal controls and procedures. The results and recommendations of the audit are then presented to the Board of Regents. Other major campus audits include the required Federal Compliance Audit or A-133, the Vocational Education Act Audit, the Financial Aid Audit, various legislative audits, and unscheduled and unannounced audits performed by the University's Office of the Internal Auditor.

19. Institutional Planning and Evaluation
The major planning documents of the College are the University of Hawai'i Strategic Plan, University of Hawai'i Strategic Plan for Information Technology, Leeward Community College Strategic Plan, and the Leeward Community College Long Range Development Plan. The College regularly evaluates its programs through comprehensive program reviews and annual reviews described at http://emedia.leeward.hawaii.edu/cs/progreview/. The implementation of the Annual Review process allows the College to engage in a cycle of evaluation, planning, budgeting, implementation, and revaluation, as described at the College's planning website, http://emedia.leeward.hawaii.edu/cs/planning/.

20. Public Information
Leeward Community College publishes through its Catalog, Schedule of Courses, program brochures, admissions forms, website, and other publications, current and accurate information about the College and its programs. These publications include educational mission, course, degree and program offerings, admission requirements, transfer information, financial aid information, major policies affecting students, and all other required information.

21. Relations with the Accrediting Commission
The University of Hawai'i Board of Regents assures that Leeward Community College adheres to the eligibility requirements, accreditation standards and policies of the Commission. The University of Hawai'i Board of Regents certifies that the College will disclose to the Commission required information necessary to carry out the Commission's accrediting responsibilities.

Statement of Assurance
We certify that Leeward Community College continues to comply with the eligibility requirements for Accreditation established by the Western Association of Schools and Colleges.

Kitty Lagareta
Chairperson, Board of Regents

David McClain
President, University of Hawai'i

John Morton
Interim Vice President, Community Colleges

Peter Quigley
Chancellor, Leeward Community College
Responses to Recommendations from the Most Recent Comprehensive Evaluation

Issues from the 1994 Self Study:
The ACCJC Visiting Team in 2000 found that Leeward Community College was not out of compliance with any of the standards. However, in spite of substantial efforts on the part of the College, three recommendations from the 1994 team concerned issues that were still not completely resolved.

1. The team recommends that curriculum review and revision be made a systematic and cyclical process with the goal of assuring academic rigor and integrity in all courses and programs (Standards 4D.2, 4D.6). 1994 recommendation carried into 2000 study

In August 2001, the former Provost/Chancellor gave formal charge to seven Accreditation Implementation Committees (AIC). The AIC on Curriculum Revision and Review, in September 2002, proposed a policy to institutionalize and formalize curriculum revision and review at the College, with the goals of assuring academic rigor and integrity in courses and programs and promoting useful and necessary dialogue among Discipline and Division faculty on course content and learning outcomes.

The Policy on Curriculum Revision and Review (March 2003) stipulates that Divisions are responsible for determining which courses are reviewed each year, with all courses reviewed over a six-year cycle. Each Discipline reviews the accuracy of its core outlines and their rigor, integrity, currency, and continued articulation with the System, and modifications are sent through normal curriculum procedures. By 2009, the entire curriculum will have been reviewed via this process. Disciplines are also responsible for comparing core outlines with individual syllabi of faculty, and correcting discrepancies.

In addition, all Distance Education (DE) courses are required to specify what methods will be employed to ensure timely and effective interaction between faculty and students, and student to student. Information about the technological skills needed by a student to succeed in the course and the appropriateness of the curriculum’s rigor must be provided by the instructor. DE courses are assessed simultaneously with the same courses offered face-to-face.
The November 2003 ACCJC Visiting Team found Curriculum Central, an online database system for filing and retaining core course outlines, to be a “significant advancement” for the College. The Team urged faculty to continue establishing course student learning outcomes, to develop strategies for assessing them, and to use the data to evaluate institutional effectiveness and to plan improvement of courses and programs.

Currently, faculty are participating in the design and assessment of SLO and are at various stages of collecting data, making plans of action, implementing those plans, and evaluating results. Documentation of course SLO assessments and resulting changes are available from the Course Assessment Coordinator and will be placed on Curriculum Central sometime in the 2006-2007 academic year. Some of these results can also be found in Divisions’ Annual Reviews.

2. The team recommends that the college clearly define the role of all constituencies on the Campus Council. (Standards 10B.8, 10B.9, 10B.10) (1994 recommendation carried into 2000)

The 1994 visiting team recommended that Leeward CC “develop and implement a written policy that articulates a decision making process that is representative and clearly states the role of faculty, support staff and students.”

During the 2002-2003 academic year, the AIC on Campus Council Constituency Roles and Governance, comprised of representatives from all of the major campus constituencies, authored *The Shared Governance Policy of Leeward Community College and the Principles of Shared Governance at Leeward Community College*, which were approved by the Faculty Senate, the Campus Council, and the Provost (May 2003). The policy was distributed widely to all campus members. The *Report on the Relationship of the Faculty Senate to the Campus Council and a Description of Campus Council Constituencies*, revised May 29, 2003, states the following:

“The Faculty Senate is the chief academic policy recommending and advisory body of the Faculty. It remains the primary vehicle for maintaining and developing the curriculum of the college and advising the Provost on academic policies. The Faculty Senate is also charged with conveying to the Provost a unique faculty view on budgetary matters, planning issues, financial expenditures and campus priorities.”

“The Campus Council functions as a recommending and advisory body of the college, especially in resource allocation and to allow all campus constituencies an opportunity to provide input and report back to their constituencies. Unlike the Faculty Senate, the Campus Council does not involve itself in matters relating to curricular development or academic policy except insofar as these raise substantial budgetary issues.”

The *Report* provides a listing of the Campus Council membership, including representatives from faculty constituency groups, seven from administration, one student, and one each from Administrative, Professional, Technical (APT), Clerical Staff, and Academic Support employees.

The ACCJC visiting team found that the College fully addressed the recommendation.
3. The team recommends that the college analyze factors that may be contributing to administrative instability and turnover and develop appropriate local responses. (Standard 10B.4) (1994 recommendation carried into 2000; address in 2006)

The AIC on Administrative Instability and Turnover made recommendations designed to address instability, including salary increases, professional liability insurance, on the job training, evaluations, and additional support staff. Some administrators began to spend at least one day a week out of their offices and attended off-campus meetings or completed work at home. However, administrative instability has been a long standing issue at the College. While each administrator has individual reasons for career decisions, there are some general factors:

Lack of advancement opportunities at the College. While the number of administrative positions at the College is limited (there are currently eight), the College tends not to advance its own administrators. The last permanent Dean of Instruction/Vice Chancellor hired internally left more than twenty years ago. Within the UH system, the College has a reputation for “being tough” on administrators.

While campus attitudes and perceptions cannot be changed immediately, the new emphasis on dialogue, transparency in governance, and data-driven decision-making should take some of the focus off of individuals and concentrate it on shared goals and objectives. This may help the College move from an adversarial to a more collaborative culture.

Salaries. Salaries for administrators are currently benchmarked at the 50th percentile of the CUPA salary report for new hires. Efforts have been made to raise existing positions to this level. However, there have been a number of lateral moves among administrators in the community colleges in order attain the 50th percentile entry salary. Further, administrative salaries are matched or exceeded by those of senior faculty. Thus it is tempting for administrators to return to faculty positions, since in many cases, salaries are similar or higher. Further, while salaries are matched nationally, Hawai’i has one of the highest costs of living in the country, which makes recruitment and retention difficult.

The College is limited in what can be done to address salary issues as salary placement above the 50th percentile requires Board of Regents approval. Merit pay adjustments are rare, and performance incentives have been severely curtailed for the past four years. With faculty pay raises of 5%, 9% and 11% for the next three years respectively, the College will be hard pressed to match with corresponding administrative pay raises. Thus the salary issue will most likely more acute.
**Workload.** As reported in the College’s application for administrative reorganization, compared with peers, the College is understaffed administratively. While it has a number of non-instructional faculty and reassigned faculty in quasi-administrative roles, there are areas, particularly in personnel matters, where faculty cannot be employed. This problem has become more acute in the past two years, as administrators have left and have not been replaced due to budget and management issues.

The College has been working on an administrative reorganization designed to address, in part, administrative workload. Unfortunately, the approval has been delayed due to some procedural issues as well change in College and university leadership. With the appointment of a permanent Chancellor, it is anticipated the reorganization will again progress. In the meantime, the College has partially addressed workload with the hiring of a new administrator for Career and Technical Education. A temporary clerical position has also been added to the administrative offices.

**Training.** There is no formal training for administrators in the community college system. Much learning is on the job and ad hoc mentoring. This has made the transition into administration difficult for new administration members.

The College has increasingly provided funding for administrative development and travel and tries to provide travel and training for at least one trip per year. The Innovation Center for Teaching and Learning is also researching training needs and programs to address this problem.
Issues from the 2000 Self Study:
The following are new recommendations made in 2000:

4. The team recommends that the college reexamine and adapt the application of the Program Health Indicators (PHI) model (or another appropriate program review model) to all its programs, and especially to student services, so that a structure, process, and culture are developed for its effective use in planning, decision making and program performance improvement. (Standards 5.3, 5.10)

In May 2003, the College approved the Policy on Unit/Area Program Reviews; however, at the time of the ACCJC Team’s visit in October 2003, the process had not been fully implemented. The connection between Program Review and the institution’s planning efforts had not been made, and the Visiting Team voiced concerns about the College’s understanding of assessment, planning, and resource allocation.

After an August 2003 consultation with Julie Slark, Assistant Vice Chancellor of Educational Services, Rancho Santiago Community College District, the College expanded its understanding of Program Review, placing assessment activities into a larger vision that integrates assessment of student learning outcomes, data on student achievement, budgeting and planning.

The revised Program Review model expanded the categories of the review process to include the following:

1. Program Overview
2. Student Learning and Achievement
3. Faculty and Staff
4. Curriculum
5. Support Issues
6. External Factors

Needs and initiatives derived from the course and program assessments were combined with those of all Support Areas and Units that had also conducted reviews of their respective activities. The combined input of program and Support Areas was then used to arrive at a list of priorities representing the College’s annual budgetary needs.

From Fall 2004 to Summer 2005 a more comprehensive approach was developed to integrate assessment, planning, and budgeting. The result was the Annual Review, a comprehensive planning process that is inclusive, data-based, and collegial. Annual Review focuses on the analysis of data provided by the program and course assessment of student learning and institutional effectiveness from all Units within the College.
Divisions use the *Annual Review* template to have focused discussions, guided by questions derived from ACCJC standards, SLO assessments, and student achievement data. Each Division/Unit, after analyzing its strengths, weaknesses, opportunities, and threats, derives a Unit planning list including budget priorities for improvement. These planning lists are consolidated during discussion of the four major Units of the College: Instruction, Student Services, Academic Support, and Institutional Support, resulting in a *College Plan* that serves as the basis of the institution’s budget proposal.

Together, the goal of the *Program* and *Annual Review* processes is the integration of assessment, planning, and budgeting, as required by current accreditation standards.

The four-year planning and implementation cycle of the original *Policy on Program Reviews* will now consist of a set of *Annual Reviews* conducted each year over a period of four years. This will provide the College with longitudinal data concerning both short- and long-term impact of changes made for improvement. *As the Annual Review process is intended to be transparent and widely communicated, all pertinent documents of the process, including budgeting priorities, will be posted on the College website and available to all constituencies of the College.*

To support these processes, several structures are in place:

The *Curriculum Committee*, a standing committee of the Faculty Senate, provides the means for insuring the College’s integrity with regard to quality academic programs and courses. The Curriculum Committee consists of two faculty members from each academic Division and has the responsibility of reviewing course outlines for all proposed or modified courses. The proposed or modified course is submitted to the Curriculum Committee, followed by a review process that includes input from the Disciplines, advisory committees, Divisions, Division Chairpersons, the Curriculum Committee itself, the Faculty Senate, and finally the administration. This multi-tiered process insures that the quality of education at Leeward Community College is in keeping with its institutional effectiveness. To streamline this process, a web-based system called Curriculum Central provides easy access for College faculty and staff. This centralized online curriculum proposal and maintenance system provides not only the course description, but also addresses a myriad of issues:

- justification for the course
- course’s relationship to the College’s *Strategic Plan* and mission
- course’s similarities or differences with related courses throughout the UH system
- rigor appropriate to the level of the course
- student learning outcomes.

The *Faculty Senate Program Review Committee* (FSPRC) was originally formed to oversee program reviews for all academic courses and programs. Although the FSPRC continues to exist, this supervisory function is now a responsibility of the *Assessment Team*, who is responsible for campus assessments in both the academic and support areas. The FSPRC chair serves as a liaison between the Faculty Senate and the Assessment Team.
Responses to Recommendations

Prior to 2005, the College utilized data for institutional outcome measures from the Management and Planning Support (MAPS) Report, a high quality publication of data on various aspects of the institution’s operations. Student enrollment numbers, persistence rates, graduation rates, and student demographics are contained in these reports. The Leeward CC Fact Book is a quick-reference version of MAPS. From the MAPS reports, information specific to Leeward’s institutional outcomes were extracted and published in a more concise form as the Leeward CC Fact Book. The detailed and copious information in the MAPS report is used to analyze the College’s effectiveness and to steer the planning process. Although MAPS continues to be a source of specific and long-term data, STAR is the present database enrollment that taps directly into the SCT Banner system, a unified online information and support system activated in Fall 2003. The extraction of data elements pertaining to student achievement and learning outcomes common to all campuses from this new system is currently a problem that is being worked on by the Deans of Instructions and institutional research officers at the University’s System level.

5. The team recommends that the college identify and make public expected learning outcomes for all of its degree and certificate programs; that the general education component of all degree programs be published in clear and complete terms in the general catalog; that the general education component be based on a philosophy and rationale that are clearly stated and publicized; and that criteria be provided by which the appropriateness of each course in the general education component is determined. (Standards 4B.3, 4C.1, 4C.2)

The ACCJC Visiting Team, in response to the Focused Midterm Visit in 2003, found that the College had adequately addressed this recommendation by publishing, in its 2003-2004 Catalog, System-approved learning outcomes for its degree and certificate programs, as well as the philosophy and rationale for general education. The College requires the Curriculum Committee to review all courses proposed to meet general education requirements to determine their adherence to these learning outcomes. With the development of the Curriculum Revision and Review Policy, each course is subject to regular review for inclusion in the general education core of classes.
The team recommends that the college review the changes in placement scores that have resulted from its use of the COMPASS test and develop appropriate response strategies in the student services and instructional areas to ensure that students achieve their educational goals in as timely and efficient a manner as possible. (Standard 5.5)

The AIC on Placement Testing Impacts, in their March 18, 2003 report, focused on four strategies that were implemented while data from ACT regarding validity and cut-off scores of COMPASS became available. The strategies are as follows:

1. Upon completion of the COMPASS test, every incoming student receives a one-on-one interview with a testing/counseling staff member. This is done to ensure that students understand their scores and to determine if any testing problems or concerns need to be addressed.

2. Both the English and Math disciplines have developed waiver systems to accommodate students who feel they were placed inaccurately according to the COMPASS test. In English, students write an essay and/or retake the reading test. In Math, department members review high school math scores and interview the student, or the student is retested with the Leeward CC Math test (the College’s former placement instrument).

3. For the Math portion of the COMPASS test, the order of the questions has been changed.

4. Math 22 and English 18/19 have been added to the curriculum.

The College has also developed strategies that focus on test preparation, including the following:

1. The test preparation book *Chart Your Success on the COMPASS* is available on the campus at the Library, the LRC, and the Math Lab, as well as at Leeward CC-Wai‘anae, public libraries, and Waipahu High school.

2. Introductory letters to students who plan to attend Leeward include the ACT website (http://www.act.org/compass/index.html) that offers test preparation information.

Beginning in Spring 2003, the Community College System staff and campus faculty representatives of English and mathematics met periodically to review ACT’s analysis of course placement test accuracy and made recommendations for adjustments. English faculty felt that ACT’s study was too narrow, as it did not consider the course content of the revised developmental English courses.

- The reading component of the test will no longer be used to place students in writing classes. However, Leeward CC was allowed to use ENG 21 as a pre- or co-requisite for ENG 22 and as a prerequisite for ENG 100.
Responses to Recommendations

• English faculties would review the ACT analysis of data from 1998-2002 and 2002-2005 to validate COMPASS reading placement test score cutoffs between ENG 21 and ENG 102 and make recommendations to the Chief Academic Officers by Fall 2006.

• The UHCC System Office also agreed to work with faculty in designing and conducting a pilot study to determine whether successful completion in Eng 21 significantly improves student performance in Eng 22 or Eng 100. A report of the findings of this analysis will be presented to the Council of Chancellors in Fall 2006 with implementation of any resulting changes for students registering occurring in Fall 2007.

Ongoing evaluation of the COMPASS Math tests since its institution resulted in the change of a number of cutoff scores. Those scores used by the UH System Office were replaced by those unanimously recommended by math faculty, except for Pre-calculus: Elementary Functions (Math 135). Disagreements among the campus representatives concerning pre-algebra and algebra courses (Math 24, 25) led to current system-wide discussions over Math 24/25/103 and Leeward CC’s introduction of Math 73/83 to better align the College with its sister campuses. A system-wide meeting concerning the alignment of Math 24/25 could not fully resolve the issue concerning course content. A subsequent meeting is scheduled for the Fall 2006, with the goal of producing a uniform curriculum within the System by Fall 2007 by allowing for a revamping of the sequence of concepts in existing courses and/or creating new courses, if needed.

7. The team recommends that the college review its practices related to storage and safety of student records to determine if they are in compliance with established guidelines. The college should pay particular attention to requirements related to ensuring that files are protected from fire and other disasters. (Standard 5.9)

This recommendation has been fully handled.

The 2003 Visiting Team found that the College had fully addressed this recommendation by arranging storage of files at a secure location in fireproof containers. The new Banner SCT student records system, adopted in September 2003, now stores all current records in electronic format at the UH System on the Manoa campus. All data is regularly backed up.
8. The team recommends that the college formalize its planning procedures in the areas of technology and information and learning resources to address needs in the following areas: determining the sufficiency of information and learning resources, planning for the acquisition and maintenance of educational equipment and materials, ensuring accessibility of information and learning resources, providing professionally qualified staff, ensuring sufficient and consistent financial support, forging outside agreements, and evaluating the adequacy and effectiveness of learning and information resources and services. (Standards 6.1, 6.2, 6.3, 6.4, 6.5, 6.6, 6.7)

The visiting team in 2003 suggested that planning for technology and learning resources be integrated into institution-wide evaluation of effectiveness and resource distribution processes. In response to the recommendation, the College initiated a dual approach:

1. The former Provost/Chancellor appointed a Committee for Learning Resources and Information Technology (CLRIT). The charge to this committee was to develop a college-wide plan for technology and Information and learning resources for Leeward Community College based on broad-based input. The Committee carried through the charge during the 2004-2005 academic year, dividing into four subcommittees to develop recommendations that were to be acted upon by the Faculty Senate in Fall 2005.

2. Academic Support Units developed and formalized a 3-year planning and budgeting cycle based on Program Review.

3. Division funds, allocated general funds supplemented by Summer Session earnings that are given to each Instructional Division may be used for Division computers that are not paid for by the Technology Fund. The recommendation from the AIC was each Division develop a 3-year plan of their own for acquiring, maintaining, and upgrading their technology.

During the Summer and Fall 2005, the Annual Review process was developed to link assessment to planning and budgeting. Through the implementation of Program and Annual Review, the College was able to access critical information about programs’ technology needs. The next phase of the Annual Review process calls for the creation of Phase II committees, including an Information Technology Committee, to focus on the following areas such as:

- Space allocation and Use
- Staffing
- External issues
- Equipment

These committees will consider the planning lists resulting from Program Reviews and will recommend priorities, based on their area of expertise.
Introduction to Leeward Community College’s Self Study: A Themes Approach

During the summer of 2004, those who were involved with coordinating Leeward Community College’s application for reaffirmation of accreditation made the decision to take a “themes approach” to its self study. The shock of being placed on Warning by the Accrediting Commission in January 2004, and the subsequent implementation of changes since then, were factors in this decision. Although the College had already begun the process of developing policies and plans for improvement in response to recommendations from the self study in 2000, the pace at which these changes were implemented led to the Commission’s characterizing some of our efforts as “planning to plan.” There was a growing urgency among campus leaders that the College increase its level of effort and rate at which it moved away from past practices. There was genuine concern whether the campus effort over the past six years, and especially since 2004, was sufficient in meeting current standards of good practice.

The attendance by four campus leaders to the AAHE Conference in Glendale, California, in September 2004, and the subsequent ACCJC-sponsored workshop at Honolulu Community College in the same month, reaffirmed this group’s decision to organize by themes, rather than by standards. Although more challenging, those who attended the workshops felt that a true self study, one that would look at the College’s efforts and results, would give us substantive information as the basis for improvement of student learning and institutional effectiveness.

The task of producing the self study was not without its difficulties, especially due to the evidence-based emphasis of each part of the standards. The College’s constituency was asked not only to read and internalize the standards, but also to research sources of evidence and to re-shape them through the lens of the themes, so that the standards were responded to appropriately. Throughout the process, faculty, staff, and administrators have voiced difficulty with this theme-based approach: it was too “slippery”; the Visiting Team would not be prepared to respond to it; we, as accreditation co-coordinators, were asking too much. At some points along the way, the College’s Accreditation Team members also voiced the same concerns.

The self study that sits before you illustrates the effort of more than ninety College members. It is a deeper, richer self study because of the themes approach, as it has forced the College to consider its mission and effectiveness, student learning outcomes, resources, and leadership, from multiple perspectives. Some sections of a standard are approached from all six themes, with different lens from which to approach the standard.
Mission, for example, is approached from Institutional Commitments' and Student Learning Outcomes' perspectives on the College’s purpose of supporting student learning. Evaluation, Planning, and Improvement and Organization focus on the College’s review of its mission to reflect student needs and achievement, and the structures in place to insure currency of the mission. Dialogue chronicles the College’s engagement by faculty, staff, and students in discussions that are central to this revision. Finally, Integrity considers the honesty and truthfulness of the mission and the College’s attempts to publish this information.

We invite you to read through the themes, using the “crosswalks” on the following pages to guide you through the document. To use the traditional “Standards Approach” crosswalk, one will have to move across the themes in the following order (see the guide provided): Commitment (C); Evaluation, Planning, and Improvement (E); Student Learning Outcomes (S); Organization (O); Dialogue (D); and Integrity (I) in response to Standard I.A.I., and proceed in this manner through the remainder of the document. Doing this may sound redundant, but not all standards are addressed by each theme, and enough of a difference exists in each theme’s approach to give the reader an in-depth insight from several perspectives as to how each standard is met and what needs to be improved.

The second, less conventional “Themes Approach” would be to read through the theme, noting how the perspective and response to the standard changes, depending on the lens through which one is looking. Each theme provides the reader with an in-depth examination of some, but not all, of the critical areas of the standards. To obtain comprehensive coverage requires reading all six themes.

We hope that regardless of the option you choose, you will find that the College has made an honest and truthful attempt to learn about itself, what it does well, and what it needs to do better. Through the self-study effort, we have determined where we are now with our mission, student learning, programs, policies and processes, and our treatment of all who are part of Leeward Community College. It is a good first step in designing changes for improvement.
## Theme and Standards Crosswalk by themes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institutional Commitments</th>
<th>Evaluation, Planning and Improvement</th>
<th>Student Learning Outcomes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Standard I</strong> (pg. 77-89)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I.B.2.</td>
<td>I.B.3.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Standard II</strong> (pg. 90-109)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II.A.1.a</td>
<td>II.A.1.b</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II.A.1.b</td>
<td>II.A.1.c</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II.A.1.c</td>
<td>II.A.2.a</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II.A.2.a</td>
<td>II.A.2.e</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II.A.2.b</td>
<td>II.A.2.f</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II.A.2.c</td>
<td>II.A.2.g</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II.A.2.d</td>
<td>II.A.2.i</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II.A.2.e</td>
<td>II.B.3.a</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II.A.2.f</td>
<td>II.B.3.b</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II.A.2.g</td>
<td>II.B.3.c</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II.A.2.h</td>
<td>II.B.3.d</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II.A.2.i</td>
<td>II.B.3.e</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Standard III</strong> (pg. 110-118)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III.A.1.a</td>
<td>III.A.1.b</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III.A.1.c</td>
<td>III.A.1.c</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III.A.5.a</td>
<td>III.A.5.b</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III.A.5.b</td>
<td>III.B.2.a</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III.D.1.a</td>
<td>III.B.2.b</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>III.C.2.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>III.D.1.a</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>III.D.1.b</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>III.D.1.d</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Standard IV</strong> (pg. 183-184)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IV.A.5.</td>
<td>IV.B.3.g</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Standard I</strong> (pg. 127-141)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I.A.1.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I.A.3.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I.A.4.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I.B.1.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I.B.2.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I.B.3.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I.B.4.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I.B.6.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I.B.7.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Standard II</strong> (pg. 142-168)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II.A.1.b</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II.A.1.c</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II.A.2.a</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II.A.2.e</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II.A.2.f</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II.A.2.g</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II.A.2.h</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II.A.2.i</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II.B.3.a</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II.B.3.b</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II.B.3.c</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II.B.3.d</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II.B.3.e</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Standard III</strong> (pg. 169-182)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III.A.1.b</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III.A.1.c</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III.A.5.b</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III.B.2.a</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III.B.2.b</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III.C.2.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III.D.1.a</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III.D.1.b</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III.D.1.d</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Standard IV</strong> (pg. 183-184)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IV.A.5.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IV.B.3.g</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Organization</th>
<th>Dialogue</th>
<th>Institutional Integrity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I.B.4.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Standard II (pg. 365-375)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>II.A.1.b</td>
<td>II.A.1.b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>II.A.1.c</td>
<td>II.A.1.c</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>II.A.2.d</td>
<td>II.A.2.d</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>II.A.2.i</td>
<td>II.A.2.i</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>II.A.7.a</td>
<td>II.A.7.a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>II.B.1.</td>
<td>II.B.1.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>II.B.3.b</td>
<td>II.B.2.a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>II.C.1.a</td>
<td>II.B.2.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>II.C.1.b</td>
<td>II.B.2.b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Standard III (pg. 376-382)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>III.A.1.a</td>
<td>III.A.1.a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>III.A.1.c</td>
<td>III.A.1.c</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>III.A.4.a</td>
<td>III.A.4.a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>III.A.5.a</td>
<td>III.A.4.b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>III.B.1.a</td>
<td>III.A.4.c</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Standard IV (pg. 383-385)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>IV.A.1.</td>
<td>IV.A.1.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>IV.A.2.a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>IV.A.2.b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>IV.A.4.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>IV.B.3.a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>IV.B.3.g</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
# Theme and Standards Crosswalk by Standards

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Standard I</th>
<th>Standard II</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Institutional Mission and Effectiveness</strong></td>
<td><strong>Student Learning Programs and Services</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>I.A. Mission</strong></td>
<td><strong>II.A. Instructional Programs</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I.A.1</td>
<td>II.A.1.a.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C, E, S, D, I</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I.A.2</td>
<td>II.A.1.b.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D, I</td>
<td>C, E, S, D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I.A.3</td>
<td>II.A.1.c.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C, E</td>
<td>C, E, S, D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I.A.4</td>
<td>II.A.2.a.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C, E, D</td>
<td>C, E, S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I.A.1.c</td>
<td>II.A.2.b.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C, E, S, D</td>
<td>C, S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I.A.2</td>
<td>II.A.2.c</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C, E, S</td>
<td>C, E, S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I.A.2.d</td>
<td>II.A.2.d.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C, S, O</td>
<td>C, E, S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I.A.2.e</td>
<td>II.A.2.e.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C, E, S</td>
<td>C, E, S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I.A.2.f</td>
<td>II.A.2.f.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C, E, S</td>
<td>C, E, S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I.A.2.g</td>
<td>II.A.2.g.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E, S</td>
<td>E, S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I.A.2.h</td>
<td>II.A.2.h.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C, S</td>
<td>C, E, S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I.A.2.i</td>
<td>II.A.2.i.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C, E, S, D</td>
<td>C, E, S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I.A.3.a</td>
<td>II.A.3.a.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E, O</td>
<td>E, O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I.A.3.b</td>
<td>II.A.3.b.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E, O</td>
<td>E, O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I.A.3.c</td>
<td>II.A.3.c.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E, S</td>
<td>E, S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I.A.4</td>
<td>II.A.4.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I.A.5</td>
<td>II.A.5.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S, O</td>
<td>S, O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II.A.6.b</td>
<td>II.A.6.b.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II.A.6.c</td>
<td>II.A.6.c.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II.A.7.a</td>
<td>II.A.7.a.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D, I</td>
<td>D, I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II.A.7.b</td>
<td>II.A.7.b.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II.A.7.c</td>
<td>II.A.7.c.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II.A.8</td>
<td>II.A.8.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>I.B. Improving Institutional Effectiveness</strong></th>
<th><strong>II.B. Student Support Services</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I.B.1</td>
<td>II.B.1.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C, S, O, D</td>
<td>S, D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I.B.2</td>
<td>II.B.1.a.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C, E</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I.B.3</td>
<td>II.B.2.b.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C, E</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I.B.4</td>
<td>II.B.2.c</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C, E, D</td>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I.B.5</td>
<td>II.B.2.d.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I.B.6</td>
<td>II.B.3.a.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C, E</td>
<td>E, S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I.B.7</td>
<td>II.B.3.b.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C, E</td>
<td>E, S, D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II.B.3.a</td>
<td>II.B.3.c.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E, S</td>
<td>E, S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II.B.3.b</td>
<td>II.B.3.d.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E, S</td>
<td>E, S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II.B.3.c</td>
<td>II.B.3.e.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E, S</td>
<td>E, S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II.B.3.d</td>
<td>II.B.3.f</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II.B.3.e</td>
<td>II.B.4.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Standard III</strong></td>
<td><strong>Standard IV</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Resources</strong></td>
<td><strong>Leadership and Governance</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>III.A. Human Resources</strong></td>
<td><strong>IVA. Decision-Making Roles and Processes</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III.A.1.a. C, O, D, I</td>
<td>IVA.1. D, I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III.A.1.b. E, O</td>
<td>IVA.2.a. I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III.A.1.c. C, S, D</td>
<td>IVA.2.b. I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III.A.1.d. I</td>
<td>IVA.3. I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III.A.2. O</td>
<td>IVA.4. I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III.A.3.a. I</td>
<td>IVA.5. E, O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III.A.3.b. I</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III.A.4.a D, I</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III.A.4.b. I</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III.A.4.c. I</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III.A.5.a. C, S, O</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III.A.5.b. C, E, D</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III.A.6. E, O</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>III.B. Physical Resources</strong></td>
<td><strong>IV.B. Board and Administrative Organization</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III.B.1.b. O</td>
<td>IV.B.2.a-e. O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III.B.2.a. E, O</td>
<td>IV.B.3.a. I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III.B.2.b. E, O</td>
<td>IV.B.3.b-f. O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>III.C. Technology Resources</strong></td>
<td>IV.B.3.g. E, I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III.C.1.a. O, D</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III.C.1.b. O</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III.C.1.c. O</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III.C.1.d. O</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III.C.2. E</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>III.D. Financial Resources</strong></td>
<td><strong>Key to Themes</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III.D.1.a. C, E, O</td>
<td>C = Institutional Commitments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III.D.1.b E, O</td>
<td>D = Dialogue</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III.D.1.c. O</td>
<td>E = Evaluation, Planning &amp; Improvement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III.D.1.d. O</td>
<td>I = Integrity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III.D.2.a. I</td>
<td>O = Organization</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III.D.2.b. I</td>
<td>S = Student Learning Outcomes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III.D.2.c. I</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III.D.2.d. I</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III.D.2.e. I</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III.D.2.f. I</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III.D.2.g. I</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Institutional Commitments

to make a commitment in action
to insure the consistency between mission and institutional goals
to supporting student learning as our primary mission
to review institutional performance
to develop plans for improvement of student learning outcomes

our commitment to students
Theme: Institutional Commitments

The standards ask institutions to make a commitment in action to providing high quality education congruent with institutional mission. The first expression of this is in Standard I, which calls for an institutional mission statement that reflects the intended student population and the institution’s commitment to student learning.

Throughout the standards, the commission asks that institutions insure the consistency between mission and institution goals and plans and insure that the mission is more than a statement of intention—that it guides institutional action. The standards also ask that an institution commit to supporting student learning as its primary mission. The number of references to student learning outcomes throughout the standards are designed to guide this institutional commitment to student learning. The standards’ requirement that the entire institution participate in reviewing institutional performance and developing plans for improvement of student learning outcomes is intended to help the institution sustain its commitment to student learning.

Finally, the requirement that an institution regularly review its mission statement asks that the institution periodically reflect on its mission statement, adapt it as needed, and renew commitment to achieving the mission.

Institutional Commitments

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Standard</th>
<th>Pages</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Standard I</td>
<td>77–89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standard II</td>
<td>90–109</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standard III</td>
<td>110–118</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Appendices | pages 119–120

List of Evidence
Documents and Websites | pages 121–123
Standard I: Institutional Mission and Effectiveness

The institution demonstrates strong commitment to a mission that emphasizes achievement of student learning and to communicating the mission internally and externally. The institution uses analyses of quantitative and qualitative data and analysis in an ongoing and systematic cycle of evaluation, integrated planning, implementation, and re-evaluation to verify and improve the effectiveness by which the mission is accomplished.

I.A. Mission: The institution has a statement of mission that defines the institution’s broad educational purposes, its intended student population, and its commitment to achieving student learning.

Descriptive Summary
The College’s mission statement, published on page 5 in the College Catalog for 2005-2006, states the six principles of the College’s mission.

“As one of the seven community colleges of the University of Hawai‘i, the overall mission of Leeward Community College is contained in the following principles.

Access: To broaden access to postsecondary education in Hawai‘i, regionally, and internationally by providing open-door opportunities for students to enter quality educational programs within their own communities.

Learning and Teaching: To specialize in the effective teaching of remedial/developmental education, general education, and other introductory liberal arts, pre-professional, and selected baccalaureate courses and programs, with the goal of seamless system articulation and transfer, where appropriate. To structure our programs in such a way that they reflect not only academic rigor but also student development, learning outcomes and student goals.

Work Force Development: To provide the trained workforce needed in the State, the Asia-Pacific region, and internationally by offering occupational, technical, and professional courses and programs that prepare students for immediate and future employment and career advancement.

Personal Development: To provide opportunities for personal enrichment, occupational upgrading, and career mobility through credit and non-credit courses and activities.

Community Development: To contribute to and stimulate the cultural and intellectual life of the community by providing a forum for the discussion of ideas; by providing leadership, knowledge, problem-solving skills, and general informational services; and by providing opportunities for community members to develop their creativity and an appreciation for the creative endeavors of others.
Diversity: To build upon Hawai‘i’s unique multi-cultural environment and geographic location, through efforts in curriculum development, and productive relationships with international counterparts, students’ learning experiences will prepare them for the global workplace, with particular emphasis on Asia and the Pacific Rim.

Within this context, the special mission of Leeward Community College is to provide teacher training and serve all the residents of our diverse communities, with particular attention to the Hawaiian population; communities actively transitioning from an agricultural base to a more diversified economic base; and communities making up the fastest growing middle-income suburban population on O‘ahu.” (Leeward CC Catalog 2005-2006, p.5)

In addition, Leeward’s Office of Community Education and Workforce Development (OCEWD) shares in the College’s mission statement and has its own mission statement published on its Website. (http://www.lcc.hawaii.edu/ocewd/Mission.htm)

I.A.1. The institution establishes student learning programs and services aligned with its purposes, its character, and its student population.

Descriptive Summary
The current (2005-2006) published mission is presented above. In Fall 2004, a committee was formed to recommend changes to the mission. The committee included representatives from most constituencies on campus, and also held public forums for additional input. The Campus Council and the Faculty Senate approved the committee’s recommendations, with modifications. In Spring 2005, an amendment to the mission added one sentence at the end of the Learning and Teaching principle: “The College is committed to the achievement of student learning.” This statement should appear in the mission beginning in Fall 2006. However, including a specific statement does not alter what the College is already doing to assess its institutional effectiveness in addressing the needs of its student population.

Commitment to the goals of assessing institutional effectiveness and to addressing the needs of its student population are shown by the following recent activities:

- Adoption (Spring 2005) of a new Leeward CC Policy on Program Reviews, which has as major goals to ensure educational programs are continually improved, to address student and community needs, to inspire dialogue throughout the campus, and to establish a culture of evidence that provides data for decision-making. The Policy establishes continual, on-going assessment of programs and support areas. For purposes of this review, OCEWD is considered a program.

- Implementation of a policy of individual course review and the assessment of course SLOs. This process, now incorporated as part of course review, insures that all faculty will assess their course SLOs by the end of the first cycle of course reviews in Fall 2009. Also, as part of the course review process, each course will address the questions of depth, breadth, and rigor. While not all SLOs of all courses are going to be assessed within the next year, the College has made the commitment to change its approach to teaching by making student learning, and the assessment of that learning, the center of the College culture.
• The number of Distance Education (DE) courses, particularly WebCT courses, has increased significantly in order to make courses and programs more accessible, in keeping with the College’s mission. To insure that teaching effectiveness, rigor, breadth and appropriate use of technology are maintained for courses taught as DE, in Spring 2005 instructors of all DE courses were required to submit course modifications responding to these concerns on Curriculum Central. (See http://emedia.leeward.hawaii.edu/central/) All Distance Education course modifications will have been completed by May 2006.

• Establishment (Spring 2006) of a Digital Media Associate of Science (AS) and Certificates of Completion and Competence in response to expressed student interest in such a program and evidence of job opportunities in digital media.

• Establishment (Fall 2005) of an Associate of Arts in Teaching (AAT) degree, in response to student interest in teaching careers, the need expressed by the Department of Education and by Educational Assistants (EA) for better training and a career ladder for EAs, and the need for primary and secondary teachers statewide.

• Implementation (Spring 2006) of an Annual Review process that requires all units to assess their effectiveness in meeting the needs of our student population. These units include Academic Divisions and all Support Units. Templates for this review and the documents themselves are available in print form in the Accreditation Documents room.

• The use of High School Senior Exit Survey data (from Hawai‘i Department of Education) to help plan workforce development curricula, and possibly new programs.

• Use of the Community College Survey of Student Engagement (CCSSE) Report data for the Annual Review and Biennium Budget development process.

Self Evaluation
Following through on the College’s commitment to planning based on analysis of data, the Annual Review was implemented in Spring 2006 (see Standard I.B.1. below). As to be expected, there were the usual “growing pains” associated with any new process and the difficulties encountered were documented and discussed for possible revisions for the next cycle.

Planning Agenda
• Upon completion of each year’s Program Review and Annual Review processes, the College will assess the extent to which these processes are successful in implementing and achieving the College’s goals of improving student learning and institutional improvement. This assessment will support changes needed to better address these goals.
I.A.3. Using the institution’s governance and decision-making processes, the institution reviews its mission statement on a regular basis and revises it as necessary.

**Descriptive Summary**

The *Institutional Self Study in Support of Reaffirmation of Accreditation* submitted by Leeward CC to the Accrediting Commission for Community and Junior Colleges (ACCJC) on September 1, 2000, notes, “The College will evaluate and revise its mission statement periodically to ensure currency” (under “Directions for Future”). The mission is periodically evaluated for currency to reflect any changes in the Community College System or in Leeward’s goals. National as well as local changes in emphasis for Community Colleges, such as the increased focus on student learning outcomes, are also considered in any evaluation of the mission statement. The mission statement forms the heart of the current *Leeward CC Strategic Plan, 2002-2010*.

**Self Evaluation**

In the most recent review of the mission, the process for evaluation has been effective. Campus governing bodies, as well as the general faculty, were involved. The mission statement is also reviewed at the UH System level for congruence with the University of Hawai‘i mission. The College’s commitment to student learning will be included in the mission statement for during the Fall 2006 semester.

**Planning Agenda**

- The College will establish a regular review schedule of the College’s mission to ensure emphasis on achievement of student learning. Regular review will ensure that programs and services are aligned with the College’s purpose and intended student population.
I.A.4. The institution’s mission is central to institutional planning and decision-making.

Descriptive Summary
The most recent formal statement of planning and decision-making at Leeward CC is the Strategic Plan, 2002-2010. In this plan, the following statements concerning Leeward’s goals and objectives for the future are made:

- Goals are broad statements that describe the direction that the college is headed.
- Goals come from and further describe the mission.
- Objectives provide a gauge of how the goals are to be accomplished within the framework of the mission statements [p. 26].

Thus, clearly, the mission statement, as stated in the Strategic Plan, 2002-2010, is central to planning and decision making at Leeward CC. The College’s recent Policy on Program Reviews (2005) and the Annual Review process (2005) strengthen the relationship between mission and decision-making.

Self Evaluation
Under past administrations, consistency between planning and decision-making, on one hand, and Leeward CC’s mission statement, on the other, has sometimes been absent. The Leeward administration has sometimes made decisions that were not in keeping with the mission statement or the Strategic Plan. Under the new administration, and with the new system of Program and Annual Review (see I.B.1.), decision-making will conform and be more centered on the mission statement and Strategic Plan.

Planning Agenda
- The new Program Review and Annual Review processes will be monitored to insure that the mission is central to all decision-making. Changes needed in these processes will ensure that activities to improve student learning and assessment of that learning are appropriately budgeted.
I.B. Improving Institutional Effectiveness

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

Descriptive Summary
The College has demonstrated its commitment to this dialogue through its requirements for Program Review described in Standard I.A.1. The full effect of this policy has not yet been demonstrated. However, currently the faculty teaching courses up for review (2004-2006) are engaged in dialogue on how to assess SLOs and what to do with that information. Within degree programs, including the large Associate in Arts (AA) degree, committees are meeting to assess program SLOs, develop rubrics for assessment, and design action plans in response to the collected data. In Spring 2006, all academic and Academic Support Units engaged in dialogue, in gathering data, and in responding to the questions of the Annual Review, including an analysis of the strengths and weaknesses of each program.

Program Review, designed to improve student learning, involves every level of the College. Data from the Institutional Research Office is utilized by all Units on campus, as part of the program analysis. See Diagram 1 below.

The Annual Review process was developed in Fall 2005 and implemented on a college-wide basis in the Spring 2006. In this process, all academic Divisions and Support Areas are required to complete an Annual Review Template (see Diagram 2 on the next page) that provides the basis for discussions that are informed by SLO assessment data, a SWOT (strengths, weaknesses, opportunities, threats) analysis, and are guided by questions derived from ACCJC Standards. The result of these planning discussions is a Unit plan that includes the budget priorities for that Area. Each Area’s priorities are then consolidated through discussions among representatives from the four major Units of the College, resulting in a prioritized planning list that becomes the basis of the College's budget proposal. (See Diagram 3)
### Student Learning and Achievement

Describe major actions taken as a result of assessments. (IIA.2.e, f) What has been learned from assessments? What plans are there for changes in the future?

What evidence do you have that students actually are achieving your stated learning outcomes?

Discuss the success of your students when they transfer and the degree to which your division is meeting the learning and employment needs of students (IIA.1a, b).

Discuss how the division approaches class scheduling to meet student needs and the level of student demand for course offerings. (IIA1a, b)

---

**Diagram 2: Annual Review Template**

**Diagram 3: The Planning Process**
Self Evaluation
The structure and policies for an ongoing and self-reflective dialogue aimed at continuous improvement of student learning and institutional processes are in place. Many Career and Technical Education (CTE) programs, particularly those with national standards or program health indicators, have been engaged in regular assessment. However, assessment of most AA degree SLOs has been through at most two cycles of assessment. The written communication SLO is an exception to this statement, but even that area is still in the process of testing a plan of action to improve student learning.

Assessment of course SLOs started in Spring 2004, and by Spring 2006 approximately 55 percent of courses were in the process of being reviewed. The College is committed to the assessment process, but it is not certain when all SLOs of all programs and courses will have been assessed according to the institution's planned schedule.

Involvement of faculty in the SLO assessment process varies. For some courses and programs where SLOs are currently being assessed, not all full-time faculty are involved. Some full-time faculty know of the assessment and choose not to be involved; others have simply not yet been included in the process. Not all part-time faculty (lecturers) are involved. The degree of involvement of part-time faculty in SLO assessment is left up to the various disciplines. Other than general statements, there is no specific requirement that all faculty actively engage in program and course SLO assessment.

The College has made a commitment to improvement of student learning and institutional effectiveness via SLO assessment through Program Review; as yet, however, the College cannot claim to have improved student learning overall as a result, nor to have a collective understanding regarding the use of data and research to improve student learning and institutional effectiveness. However, the current policies and leadership are moving the College in the appropriate direction, and are indeed beginning to create a “culture of evidence.” The Budget Proposal for Fiscal Year 2007-2009 is the result of the first Annual Review cycle. A copy of the 2007–09 College Plan is follows the Evidence Section, on page 462. Dialogue is clearly ongoing; it is beginning to be translated into actual institutional improvement.

Planning Agenda
• Full- and part-time faculty will be involved in the dialogue and assessment of student learning in courses and/or programs. Assessment of student learning outcomes and their improvement will be the basis of budget priorities. Budgeted items will be assessed to reflect their effects on student achievement.

• Administrators will develop a clear policy and timeline describing the elements, connection, and assessment of Program Review, Annual Review, and supplemental and biennium budget requests. A document illustrating the history of each prioritized item will be published and distributed prior to the start of the academic year.
I.B.2 The institution sets goals to improve its effectiveness consistent with its stated purposes. The institution articulates its goals and states the objectives derived from them in measurable terms so that the degree to which they are achieved can be determined and widely discussed. The institutional members understand these goals and work collaboratively toward their achievement.

Descriptive Summary
The goals set by the institution to improve its effectiveness are stated in the Strategic Plan 2002-2010 (p. 27). These goals were derived from the published institutional mission and serve to further elaborate on the mission (p. 26).

The objectives, which were designed to delineate how each goal is to be accomplished, are listed with each pertinent goal (p. 26). Additionally, the precise action plans to accomplish each objective are stated on pp. 29-59 and in the appendix, pp. 61-66, of the Strategic Plan. The action plans include the rationale, responsible division or unit, expected degree of improvement, fiscal impact, and funding sources. The conclusions and recommendations from the program assessments, drawn from the supporting numeric data (See the Report on Program Reviews & Support Area Reviews, Sept. 2004), are the basis of future action plans. In addition, ongoing program reviews under the revised Policy on Program Reviews (2005) will yield new action plans to improve effectiveness.

The institutional members were informed of the goals in a series of College and Division/Unit forums and committee meetings. Members met in Division/Unit meetings to formulate action plans to accomplish the objectives for the stated goals. The chronology of the forums and meetings is published in the Strategic Plan 2002-2010 on pp. 5-9.

In Spring of 2006, each Division and Unit of the College met as part of the Annual Review process, using the Division Annual Review templates. The College has used the annual Program Review to generate prioritized planning lists that have become the basis for the College's biennium budget requests.

Self Evaluation
The Policy on Program Reviews (2005), and the Annual Review of Divisions and Support Areas represent a tremendous commitment on the part of the College to improve achievement of goals. The college-wide involvement in an Annual Review process at the Division and Unit level should bring the College into full compliance with this standard. The College Plan represents the results of the College's initial attempt at Annual Review.

Planning Agenda:
- The College will evaluate its Program and Annual Review processes in determining appropriate goals and objectives and make changes as needed.
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.

Descriptive Summary
The institution has published and widely distributed progress reports focusing on achievement of stated goals. Most prominent are the Report on Program Reviews & Support Area Reviews (September, 2004) and the Assessment Analysis Report (2004). These reports outline a cyclical process that includes three planning cycles: Program Review cycle, Strategic Plan cycle, and Budget cycle. In addition, the College distributed data contained in its 2005 CCSSE.

The Program Review cycle mandates program and Support Area assessments. The Report on Program Reviews & Support Area Reviews and the Assessment Analysis Report are published on the College web site to provide access for the entire campus community. These reports contain the quantitative and qualitative data used to assess progress towards achieving the institution's stated goals.

Prior to this academic year, the results of the assessment portions of Program Review cycle were the basis for the action plans in the annual revisit of the Strategic Plan. Results of action plans from the previous year were reviewed, and new action plans to improve effectiveness were developed in a collaborative process that includes input and decision making at all institutional levels. Working groups of faculty and staff prioritized the action plans by considering the College’s goals, assessment analysis results, and budgetary restraints. These action plans were a prime consideration during the Budget cycle, as administrators and campus governance study the prioritized action plans to determine budgetary priorities.

The implementation in Spring 2006 of the Annual Review process, which required each Academic Division and Support Unit to evaluate its effectiveness, added critical quantitative and qualitative data to the cycle of planning and resource allocation.

Self Evaluation
The College has shown its commitment to improving its institutional effectiveness by its development of a cycle of evaluation, planning and resource allocation. With the implementation of the Policy on Program Reviews (2005) and the Annual Review process (2005), the planning cycle is based upon the analyses of both quantitative and qualitative data. The intent of the current College administration and leaders is clear. The College needs a critical mass of committed faculty and staff to create the type of data-driven planning process that has been envisioned.

Planning Agenda
- The College will evaluate its Program and Annual Review processes to determine their effect in supporting the achievement of its stated goals and make changes as needed.
The institution provides evidence that the planning is broad-based, offers opportunities for input by appropriate constituencies, allocates necessary resources, and leads to improvement of institutional effectiveness.

**Descriptive Summary**

The institution demonstrates that planning is broad-based in section IV, The Planning Process, of the *Strategic Plan 2002-2010*. The chronology of planning forums and meetings published in the *SP* shows that all levels of the institution participate in the planning process. In a series of Division/Unit planning meetings, any institution member can submit an action plan. The action plans are prioritized by Division/Units and reviewed by the institution's Faculty Senate and Executive Planning Committee before submission to the Chancellor's Office.

Projected costs of the action plans and the resulting increase in the budget to fund the implementation of the action plans is listed in the *Strategic Plan 2002-2010*, pages 22-23. The use of program assessment as a primary mechanism to determine budget planning is outlined on page 3 of the *Report on Program Reviews & Support Area Reviews* (Sept. 2004). The ongoing cycle of course assessment and program/Support Area reviews will result in the publication of documents that denote trends in institutional effectiveness and serve as the basis of budgetary decisions.

**Self Evaluation**

Initial attempts of the College in incorporating assessment data in the planning process has resulted in the following specific budgetary decisions, as noted in the *March 2005 Accreditation Progress Report*.

- The request for and approval of the Director of Planning, Policy and Assessment (DPPA) position. The director and his staff will be responsible for ensuring that the results of assessment are integrated into the College's Strategic Plan and its budget priorities.
- A reallocation of a percentage of its yearly budget to provide support for instructors and staff engaged in SLO assessments and to ensure measurable improvements in student learning.
- Approval and funding the College's Associate in Arts Teaching degree, including an Instructional Developer.
- The 2007–09 Biennium Budget proposal was based entirely on the *College Plan*, the compilation of data-driven requests based on *Annual Reviews*.

The implementation of the revised *Policy on Program Reviews* and the *Annual Review* process has moved the College closer to completing the cycle of evaluation, planning and improvement. The College's 2005–2007 Biennium budget proposal (see I.B.2. above) provides evidence of the first completed cycle.

**Planning Agenda**

- The *Annual Review* process will be assessed and changes for improvement made as needed.
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.

**Descriptive Summary**

The *Policy on Program Reviews* established in May 2005 provides the College “with a formal and systematic method for conducting program reviews.” The policy establishes the process that defines and assesses SLOs. The process has begun, so key components for evaluating student learning are in place and in the early stages of implementation.

The *Policy on Program Reviews* identifies the Assessment Team as the body to provide oversight of the review process. The Assessment Team is “comprised of the Vice Chancellor/Chief Academic Officer, the Director of Policy Planning and Assessment (position to be established), the Accreditation Liaison Officer, the Institutional Researcher, a representative from the Faculty Senate, and others as selected by the VC/CAO.”

In the *Annual Review* process, as implemented in the Spring of 2006, all Divisions and Units of the College provided data for the ongoing planning and resource allocation cycle. The second phase of the *Annual Review* process will involve a wider cross section of the campus, through the creation of Phase II committees that focus on the areas such as: Space Allocation and Use, Staffing, Information Technology, External Issues, and Equipment. These committees will consider the planning lists resulting from *Program Reviews* and will recommend priorities, based on their area of expertise. The prioritized lists will be submitted to the Executive Planning Committee, composed of the Faculty Senate and Campus Council Executive Committees, the Deans of Arts and Sciences, Career and Technical Education, and Academic Support, and the Director of Administrative Services and Vice Chancellor. This group will determine the budget priorities of the College.

**Self Evaluation**

The *Policy on Program Reviews* (2005) and the *Annual Review* process both resulted from institutional evaluations of the planning cycle. They were designed to address weaknesses in the previous planning cycles. This modification shows the commitment of the current administration and campus governing bodies, as well as the Assessment Team, to continually evaluate our planning processes.
The new process for planning and resource allocation was implemented in the Spring 2006 and served as the basis for the College’s budget proposal that was presented to the University System in May 2006. The College is currently evaluating the process for improvement.

**Planning Agenda**

- No changes are needed to address this standard.

---

**I.B.7**

The institution assesses its evaluation mechanisms through a systematic review of their effectiveness in improving instructional programs, student support services, and library and other learning support services.

**Descriptive Summary**

The processes for assessing the effectiveness of instructional programs, student support services, and library and other learning support services are the *Program and Annual Review*. The building blocks for these processes are assessment of student learning outcomes and data collected about student achievement, faculty and staff, curriculum, and support. Once fully implemented, every program, Division and Support Area will complete and submit an *Annual Review*, the initial step of a college-wide process to establish priorities that will guide decisions for resource allocation. As the College went through its initial process of program review and budget development, it collected feedback on the process and tools used, with the goal of improving the efficiency of the process.

The requirement of *Annual Reviews* will also provide each program, Division, and Support Area a baseline for assessing their effectiveness over time and allow comparisons of their effectiveness to other College programs, Divisions, and Support Areas.

The responsibility for overall assessment/review of the planning process itself has been assigned to the Executive Planning Committee, composed of the Faculty Senate and Campus Council Executive Committees, the Deans of Arts and Sciences, Career and Technical Education, and Academic Support, and the Director of Administrative Services and the Vice Chancellor. In consultation with the Director of Policy, Planning and Assessment, this Committee will annually review the adequacy of the *Program Review and Annual Review* processes.

**Self Evaluation**

Since the cycle of evaluation required by the *Policy on Program Reviews* and the *Annual Review* process are ongoing, in time it will provide evidence of the effectiveness of each program, Division, and Support Area. The College will use its Executive Planning Committee as a means of assessing its cycle of evaluation. The first cycle of planning under the *Program Review and Annual Review* was completed in the Spring of 2006, and the College has begun the assessment of the process.

**Planning Agenda**

- No changes are needed to address this standard. The College will evaluate the effectiveness of its *Program and Annual Review* processes in improving programs and services and make changes for improvement.
Standard II: Student Learning Programs and Services

II.A. Instructional Programs

II.A.1. The institution demonstrates that all instructional programs, regardless of location or means of delivery, address and meet the mission of the institution and uphold its integrity.

II.A.1.a. The institution identifies and seeks to meet the varied educational needs of its students through programs consistent with their educational preparation and the diversity, demographics, and economy of its communities. The institution relies upon research and analysis to identify student learning needs and to assess progress toward achieving stated learning outcomes.

Descriptive Summary
Leeward Community College is increasingly committed to research and analysis to identify the learning needs of its diverse student body, to develop programs consistent with these needs, and to assess student progress toward achieving program learning outcomes.

The College mission statement is the driving force behind all program and course development and assessment. The current mission (found on page 5 of the Leeward CC 2005-2006 Catalog) was revised and approved in the Spring 2004 semester, and further revised in Spring 2005. The revision process included a mixture of faculty, staff, student, employers, and community input. The process analyzed the needs of the constituent groups and developed a strategy to meet those needs.

All courses and programs proposed at the College need to explain how they meet the mission. For courses, this information is included in the core course outline on Curriculum Central (http://emedia.leeward.hawaii.edu/central/); for programs, this information is included in the original program proposal, or for more recent programs, on Curriculum Central.

The College uses a variety of data to assess student needs. Demographic and other statistical information is regularly collected by the UH Office of Institutional Research and published as Management and Planning Support (MAPS) documents. Online MAPS documents can be viewed at http://www.hawaii.edu/iro/maps.htm. Leeward CC information from MAPS is accessible through the Leeward CC Fact Book. MAPS data is updated every two years and includes enrollment data, persistence rates, graduation rates, and transfer data. Although MAPS continues to be a source of specific and long-term data, STAR is the present enrollment database that taps directly into the SCT Banner system, a unified online information and support system activated in Fall 2003. The extraction of data elements pertaining to student achievement and learning outcomes common to all campuses from this new system is currently a problem that is being addressed by university administrators and institutional research officers.

In Fall 2005, a series of questions was added at the beginning of the mandatory COMPASS testing for incoming students, designed to determine the educational goals, intended programs, and type of student service support needed for Leeward’s student population. In addition, students were asked to indicate what programs they would be interested in that are not offered...
Each of the Career and Technical Education (CTE) programs offering degrees and/or certificates has advisory committees whose membership is comprised of industry professionals and employers. The advisory committees provide input into the types of skills that are desired in entry-level employees. The committees are required to meet at least once a year to provide this valuable input, although they may meet more frequently depending upon the needs of the program. Faculty use this information to create new programs and courses, or to modify existing ones.

All incoming students take placement tests in reading comprehension, writing and mathematics to assess their readiness for college and for appropriate placement into courses. All of the community colleges in the University of Hawai‘i System have standardized COMPASS test placement scores for specific English and math courses. Discipline faculty from reading, writing and mathematics met with our College’s testing specialist to determine appropriate cutoff scores for placement at Leeward. These discussions continue on a regular basis to maintain relevancy of cutoff scores. Faculty evaluate supplemental writing samples when a student does not agree with their writing course placement. English as a Second Language (ESL) students are given the Michigan Test for placement in appropriate ESL courses. Results of placement tests are used to determine the number and level of the College’s developmental and ESL component, which is adjusted to meet student learning needs.

The College’s Policy on Program Reviews (rev. 2005) available at http://home.lcc.hawaii.edu/docs/policies/, mandates the assessment of program student learning outcomes, as well as data demonstrating the currency and continued quality of, and need for, the program. Program Reviews can be found online at http://emedia.leeward.hawaii.edu/cs/ProgReview/.

The research and analysis described above is also to be included in the Division’s Annual Review, which drives the academic input into the College’s budgeting process.

**Self-Evaluation**

While the above processes provide extensive amounts of data, it is not always easily available to those involved in the Annual Review process or other College planning activities. Although most CTE programs try to survey recent graduates to obtain employment data, the returned surveys have been so sparse as to be unreliable. For most CTE programs with state or national level certification, information about the certification of our graduates is not available or is anecdotal. For the Liberal Arts AA program, data on transfer rates into four-year institutions and to other community colleges is available, but does not indicate what programs transfer students are choosing.

While certain data may be lacking, other data has been used successfully. The development and approval of the Associate of Arts in Teaching (AAT) program was a response to student and community needs in the area served by Leeward. The Research Report on the Needs of Incoming Students Fall 2005 (Rossi, 11/05) indicated that over 12% of our incoming students are interested in a career in teaching, confirming the prior research. The College has committed significant resources to the success of the AAT program.
Planning Agenda

- The College will develop a systematic method to provide better data on graduates and transfer students, in terms of employment and the college programs into which they transfer. Accurate feedback on students who leave the College is needed to complement assessment data on the achievement of student learning outcomes and to give the College a better gauge of improvements needed.

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.

Descriptive Summary

Leeward Community College’s commitment is evidenced in the following ways:

- The College allows faculty the freedom to deliver their courses in the manner that best meets the needs of their students. Faculty determine the effectiveness of their modes of instruction in various ways. Regular faculty evaluations by students, as well as faculty assessment of student achievement of course learning outcomes, provide evidence that the mode of instruction fits the objectives and content of the course.

- The Policy on Curriculum Revision and Review has been established (http://home.lcc.hawaii.edu/docs/policies). Under this policy, as a course comes up for review in a six year cycle, faculty are required to review the modes of instruction utilized in the course, and to indicate how discussions occur to determine the suitability of the methods used. (Question #27 in core course outlines, available on Curriculum Central.)

- The College also began a voluntary “Teaching Squares” program in the 2003-2004 academic year in which four faculty observe and critique each other’s teaching, with the goal of insuring that modes of instruction are appropriate to the needs of the students. The program is continuing in the 2005-2006 academic year.

- The College has sponsored a number of workshops and training opportunities for developing teaching strategies, including the Wo Innovations in Learning Day held in March of each year.

- The College has offered technology mentoring for the past five academic years to encourage faculty to use technology in their teaching.

- The College has invested in and offers training in many types of technology that can be incorporated into classroom or Distance Education (DE) courses, including streaming video, narrated PowerPoint, and interactive white board applications. In the summer of 2006, a workshop on pod casting was offered.

- In the area of Distance Education, the College has demonstrated its commitment to meeting the needs of its students in the following ways:
1. In order to meet the needs of students in terms of delivery systems, several types of Distance Education courses have been developed including televised courses, Internet delivered courses (mostly WebCT based) and interactive televised courses. The College is among the leaders in the entire System in the development and offering of DE courses.

2. Because of student demand, the College continues to increase its number of Distance Education offerings, particularly via WebCT. For example, a total of 173 courses in Spring 2005 and 219 courses in Fall 2005 used WebCT, the UH system's online course management software, to deliver all or part of their content (http://webct.hawaii.edu/webct/public/show_courses.pl) and many instructors use their own web pages to supplement classroom instruction.

3. The College has held a two week “Web Fun” summer institute each of the last four summers to train faculty on development “WebCT” delivered courses. The College offered the workshop again in the summer of 2006. In 2004, a second level of “Web Fun” for advanced course development techniques was introduced, and continued in the summer of 2006.

4. All faculty teaching DE courses responded to three questions built into curriculum central designed to assess the effectiveness of their delivery by April 15, 2005. All courses designed for distance delivery in the future will have to respond to those questions.

   • What methods will be employed to ensure timely and effective interaction between faculty and student to student? What technological skills will students need to succeed in this course? How will the instructor execute and ensure the rigor and breadth of the course through electronic delivery?

   • What type of academic support and technology training will be required to ensure pedagogical development of the instructor for this course?

   • How will specific technology be integrated into the course, and how will its use be appropriate to the nature and objectives of the course?

**Self Evaluation**
The College uses various means, including student demand, to insure that its delivery systems and modes of instruction meet the needs of the students.

Currently, there is little data that shows how effective delivery systems and modes of instruction are in facilitating student learning. Policies and procedures are being refined, dialogue is taking place within disciplines, and systems for collecting data are being created. The implementation of the Annual Review process provides an additional incentive, as all change for improvement is tied to SLO assessment.

**Planning Agenda**

• The College will continue to collect and analyze data on student achievement of SLOs and make changes as needed to insure that its delivery systems and modes of instruction are appropriate and effective.
II.A.1.c. The institution identifies student learning outcomes for courses, programs, certificates, and degrees; assesses student achievement of those outcomes.

**Descriptive Summary**

The College has identified student learning outcomes for all of its courses, programs, certificates, and degrees. It has also implemented policies designed to assess student achievement of these outcomes.

For courses, discipline faculty determine SLOs, normally after a review of similar courses at other community colleges and four year institutions. SLOs for each course can be found on the core course outline in Curriculum Central. All credit courses are reviewed on a regular six-year review cycle established by the March 2003 Policy on Curriculum Revision and Review. In the 2004-2005 academic year, the course SLO assessment was included as part of the course review process. When a course came up for review, faculty were also expected to start assessing the course SLOs. The College appointed a Course Assessment Coordinator who currently collects the data and provides an annual report on progress; the current plan is to make all assessment data available on Curriculum Central as soon as feasible. All of these actions illustrate the College’s commitment to course SLO design and assessment.

Program SLOs are published with the program requirements in the College Catalog. The College offers three degree programs (AA, AS, and AAS) and three types of certificates under the AS and AAS degrees. Student learning outcomes from each of the degree programs and certificates are designed by faculty to conform to system-wide policies, and for CTE programs and certificates include input from advisory committees. For the AA degree, committees designed SLOs with faculty from all community colleges in the system. Leeward is the only college in the system to include a set of “Abstract Thinking” outcomes in the AA degree.

Assessment of AA SLOs began as early as 1999; however, a finalized policy on program/certificate SLO assessment did not become established until May 2005, when the Faculty Senate approved a revised Policy on Program Reviews (rev. 5/05), available at http://www.home.hawaii.edu/docs/policies. The College appointed a Program Assessment Coordinator to direct the process and collect the data. The AA program SLOs fall into six categories: Abstract Thinking, Critical Thinking, Information Retrieval & Technology, Oral Communication, Quantitative Reasoning and Written Communication. The results of assessment activity are available at the college’s DocuShare site (http://documents.leeward.hawaii.edu:8080/docushare/dsweb/View/Collection-14).

**Self Evaluation**

Both course and program SLO assessment are still in the early implementation stage at the College. All courses will have started SLO assessment by 2009; not all program SLOs have as yet undergone their first assessment. However, available data on course and program SLO assessments has been incorporated into the Annual Review process, initiated in the 2005-2006 academic year as the College’s central budget and planning tool. The Divisions’ Annual Reviews record some of the results of course and program review and the changes that have occurred. While some program assessment data is available, as noted, on the College’s DocuShare site, other information is found on in the Division’s Annual Review and the AA SLOs’ Annual Review. The Annual Review data is not yet easily or widely available to faculty.
While the College is, for the most part, still struggling to address the question of how to assess SLOs, some results have been used to make changes. Two examples from course SLO include the following:

- Speech 251 developed a common audience analysis form for students to complete, after initial assessment indicated only 36% of students identified/analyzed their intended listening audience. Competency level rose to 65% in the subsequent (Spring 2005) assessment of this SLO.

- Accounting 201 faculty agreed to use a common set of questions for assessing SLOs dealing with accounting concepts and payroll transactions. The first assessment indicated a 72% achievement rate. Accounting faculty met to discuss the importance of teaching the basic concepts and requested accounting tutors from the Learning Resource Center. The second assessment in Spring 2005 indicated 75% of students met the SLOs.

Complete assessment results are available from the Course Assessment Coordinator. The College has not yet implemented its plan to have complete assessment results, including changes, available on Curriculum Central. Once that is implemented, faculty will be able to see and easily discuss what other disciplines are doing in this area, and extend successful examples of improvement into their own disciplines.

Programs are also, for the most part, still struggling to develop appropriate assessment tools. As part of that process, the Fall 2005 assessment of AA SLOs in Written Communication developed an assessment process that was totally online. The online process was developed after several semester of difficulty in getting sufficient numbers of readers together at the same place and time to evaluate the selected written communication SLOs. The online assessment was considered so successful that it has been revised and utilized (summer 2006) for the assessment of another AA SLO, Information Retrieval.

The Fall 2005 Written Communication SLO assessment also conducted an experiment designed to ultimately improve how the College teaches writing. Earlier assessment of Written Communication indicated that our students had difficulty with two specific SLOs: “5. Express a main idea as a thesis, hypothesis, or other appropriate statement” and 6. Develop a main idea clearly and concisely with appropriate content.” (Leeward CC 2005-2006 Catalog, p. 61) For the Fall 2005 assessment, a group of selected classes (experimental group) included instruction on the use of a graphic organizer to help express and develop a main idea; the remaining classes did not teach the use of a graphic organizer. The results are shown in the table below, with a Yes rating indicating that at least two of the three faculty/staff readers of the paper rated it as satisfactory in meeting the stated SLO.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total Number Of Papers</th>
<th>Percentage Rated Yes for SLO #5</th>
<th>Percentage Rated Yes for SLO #6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Control Group</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>56%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Experimental Group</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>72.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Combined</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>63.33%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Based on the one semester of evaluation, teaching the use of a graphic organizer clearly improves student writing. The Co-Coordinators of the Written Communication assessment plan to validate the above results using papers collected in Spring 2006, again from two types of classes, one using the experimental approach and the other the traditional approach. If the results are validated, the College will develop a plan to improve student writing across the curriculum via the use of graphic organizers. Assessment will lead to a specific college-wide plan to improve student writing, and the efforts in Written Communication should serve as a model for assessment in other areas.

As indicated by these examples, the College has invested considerable time and energy in the assessment process. To implement a change in college culture to one based on assessment, the data from course and program assessment, as well as the Annual Review, need to be immediately and easily available to the campus community. A general awareness, not just of the process, but the results from all course and program assessment will greatly stimulate discussion and widespread involvement in assessment and improvement. While budget requests for the next biennium do appear to have been based in large part on the Annual Review process, both Annual Review data and the budget-decision making process were not widely disseminated to the campus due to its completion after spring semester. (Information available from document entitled College Plan: Biennium Budget Request, June 2006, follows the Evidence Section, page 462). The College has upheld its commitment that the cycle of Annual and Program Review should drive the budget process. It needs to improve the process, and disseminate all information.

**Planning Agenda**

- The campus’ Executive Planning Committee and the Assessment Team will evaluate the Annual Review process used this academic year to determine to what extent assessment was used to make decisions. These groups will also assess the degree to which data is being housed in a manner that makes decision making transparent.

---

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.

**Descriptive Summary**

In the last five years, the College has established procedures not only to identify student learning outcomes for all credit courses and programs, but also to use these student learning outcomes as one way to evaluate and improve courses and programs. These procedures were based primarily on recommendations of Accreditation Implementation Committees (AIC) that operated from Fall 2001 to Spring 2003. Specifically, the activities of the AIC Curriculum Revision and Review Committee and the AIC Program Review Committee were responsible for the establishment of current procedures. Reports and other documents of these committees can be found at [http://home.lcc.hawaii.edu/ac2006/](http://home.lcc.hawaii.edu/ac2006/). Scroll down to “Accreditation Implementation Committees.”
Credit courses are initially designed and proposed by faculty within the Discipline. These faculty are responsible for identifying appropriate student learning outcomes, and the Division responsible for the course must approve both the design of the course and the student learning outcomes of the course. Courses are submitted via Curriculum Central (http://emedia.leeward.hawaii.edu/central/), and the approval process includes scrutiny by the Curriculum Committee and the Faculty Senate prior to approval by the Vice Chancellor.

All existing core outlines for credit courses were entered into Curriculum Central when that database was initiated in the 1990’s and were reviewed at that time; all course SLOs were reviewed again by Discipline peers in 2003-2004 per directions by the Dean of Arts and Sciences. All credit courses are reviewed on a regular six-year review cycle established by the March 2003 Policy on Curriculum Revision and Review. (http://home.lcc.hawaii.edu/docs/policies/).

The review process, conducted initially by discipline faculty, currently includes reviewing/revising course SLOs and answering new questions on depth, breadth, rigor, sequencing and currency of course content. All revisions are entered into Curriculum Central as course modifications. These course modifications are reviewed/approved by the Division, Division Chair, Curriculum Committee, Faculty Senate, and the Dean of Arts and Sciences or Career and Technical Education, as per the usual process. When courses are scheduled for their first review under this policy, discipline faculty begin the process of assessing course SLOs. This SLO assessment data is will become available on Curriculum Central sometime in the 2006-2007 academic year. While the actual process of course review began in the Fall of 2004, the first course modifications were sent to the Curriculum Committee in the Fall of 2005. Refer to chart in IIA.2e for current status of course modification and SLO assessment.

The College began its evaluation of programs and units under the Policy on Unit/Area Program Reviews adopted in May, 2003 (http://home.lcc.hawaii.edu/docs/policies). This policy demonstrated the campus’ commitment by mandating a formal and systematic method for data collection and assessment that would be an integral part of the College’s planning, implementing, and budgeting process. However, early efforts of Program Review under the 2003 Policy revealed a disjointed and somewhat isolated process, as reviews were being developed with a narrow focus. Throughout Spring 2003, a campus-wide education effort on the policy and Program Review expectations was conducted by the Chancellor, Dean of Instruction, Faculty Senate, Institutional Researcher, and Accreditation Liaison Officer.

As a result, campus staff and faculty attempted to implement the Policy on Program Reviews in a manner that included articulation with student learning outcomes, strategic planning, and resource allocation. Results of the reviews of programs and Units/Areas conducted under this policy were published in Sept 2004 in Report on Program Reviews and Unit Area Reviews. (http://home.lcc.hawaii.edu/docs/progreview/Program_Review_Report-2004.pdf) This publication included program assessment templates that were not complete because of the publication timing. Complete 2004 templates are available at http://documents.leeward.hawaii.edu:8080/docushare/dsweb/View/Collection-14.
The following units were reviewed, though in some cases, data was lacking at the time of the Report’s publication in Sept. 2004.

- Office of the Provost, Currently Chancellor
  (Marketing, Fund Development, and Institutional Research)
- Academic Support
  (Educational Media Center, Grants Writing, Information Technology Group, International Education, Learning Resource Center, Library, and Staff Development)
- Student Services
  (Admissions and Records, Counseling, Financial Aid, Job Placement, Student Health Center, Student Life, and Student Publications)
- Community Services
  (Contract Training, Facilities Use, OCEWD, Theatre)
- Administrative Services
  (Business Office, Human Resources, Operations and Maintenance, Security)
- Instruction (degree programs)

As a result of the 2004 experience in program review, the Faculty Senate approved a revised program review policy in May 2005, the Policy on Program Reviews, available at [http://home.lcc.hawaii.edu/docs/policies/](http://home.lcc.hawaii.edu/docs/policies/). The main revisions to the 2003 policy included the creation of a revised template, which ties the review process to the College’s mission and Strategic Plan, and requires that the assessment contain a plan of action and an analysis of budget implications. In addition, the revised Policy clearly states that Program Coordinators and Support Area Supervisors “should be continually engaged in some aspect of the program review process”, and notes that program review “is on-going, year-round assessment…” (p.3 Leeward CC Policy on Program Reviews rev 5/05) The revised policy established the following programs and support units as falling under the requirements of the Policy.

**Programs**
(agree upon by the Faculty Senate, Campus Council, and Administration) are as follows:

- **Associate in Arts Degree**
  (Academic Subject Certificates* reviewed with the AA Degree)
  AA Degree Program Student Learning Outcomes:
  Abstract Thinking
  Critical Thinking
  Information Retrieval & Technology
  Oral Communication
  Quantitative Reasoning
  Written Communication

- **Associate in Science Degree**
  (Substance Abuse Counseling Certificate reviewed with the AS Degrees)
  Accounting
  Business Technology
  (Business Foundations Certificate reviewed with the Bus Tech AS Degree)
Digital Media
Information and Computer Science
Television Production

• Associate in Applied Science Degree
  Automotive Technology
  Food Service
  Supervisory Management
  (E-Commerce Certificates reviewed with the Superv. Management AAS Degree)

• Office of Continuing Education and Workforce Development (OCEWD)

The new Associate of Arts in Teaching (AAT) Program will be added to this list.

*Academic Subject Certificates and certificates of 12 credits or fewer will be reviewed via course assessment and student achievement data.

Support Areas
(modeled after the College organizational structure) are as follows:

• Office of the Chancellor
  Academic Administration
  Marketing
  Funds Development
  Institutional Research

• Academic Support Services
  Educational Media Center
  Grants Writing
  Information Technology Group
  Learning Resource Center
  Library
  Innovation Center for Teaching & Learning
  Assessment Office
  International Education

• Student Services
  Admissions & Records
  Counseling
  Financial Aid
  Job Placement
  Student Health Center
  Student Activities

• Administrative Services
  Business Office
  Human Resource Office
  Operations & Maintenance
  Security

The Office of Continuing Education and Workforce Development, or OCEWD, consisting primarily of non-credit courses and programs, is evaluated as a program under the Policy for Program Reviews. All OCEWD courses come under an OCEWD program coordinator, who develops course SLOs in consultation with industry experts, advisory committees, and state or national certification standards for specific areas. OCEWD course SLOs evaluation is conducted by program coordinators and faculty, via a Course Student Evaluation. A Certificate of Participation is issued when a student achieves the student learning outcomes for a specific
course; Certificates of Professional Development are issued when the student has achieved the student learning outcomes for all courses within a specified program. (Not all OCEWD courses are within specific programs.)

As a result of Program Review and assessment policies and practices, transfer considerations, and/or advisory committee recommendations, several of the College’s programs have been modified in the last five years. These include Culinary Arts, Digital Media, Business Technology, and Management, as well as the AA program. As indicated, program modifications have been done to update curriculum, improve sequencing, modify/add student learning outcomes, meet national standards, and/or to improve transferability within the UH system. Details of these changes can be found in the program modification proposals available from the Curriculum Committee Chair, though the College will in the future have all program modification proposals available through Curriculum Central.

Self Evaluation
The procedures and policies described above represent a substantial investment of time and money, and hence commitment, to the goal of using SLO assessment to improve instructional courses and programs. Two faculty (Assessment Coordinators) are assigned to guide the process of instructional course and program assessment, one focused on courses and the other on programs, and operate in conjunction with the established procedures of course and Program Review.

On-going Program Review has been established, though in some areas (particularly some of the AA General Education outcome evaluations), the faculty committees are still struggling to assess all SLOs and to develop appropriate strategies for improvement. However, at the program level, the policy is clear, the work has started, and the majority of the faculty understand the process. Once all programs have been through a cycle of evaluation, planning, and improvement under this Policy, the policy and process can be evaluated.

In terms of course SLO assessment, there is no clear, written policy, and the procedures themselves are still evolving. As noted, courses begin evaluating SLOs when they come up for course review; all courses will have started this process by 2009. [The revised (2006) Division Course Review Timeline is available as a print document.] No clear directive exists as to how many course SLOs need to be evaluated in a given period of time, whether course SLO evaluation is an on-going process, or the extent to which all Discipline faculty (both full- and part-time) should be involved. Workload issues and contract renewal, promotion, and tenure issues concern many faculty. While progress is being made, and most courses up for review have started SLO assessment, without a written policy addressing these issues, the process of course SLO evaluation may be incomplete, and may not significantly contribute to the goal of improving student learning. Without accurate course SLO assessment data, Division assessment, planning and budgeting under the new Annual Review policies will be difficult to implement.

Planning Agenda
- Faculty will develop a written policy on course SLO assessment as part of the review of the Curriculum Revision and Review Policy.
II.A.2.b. The institution relies on faculty expertise and the assistance of advisory committees when appropriate to identify competency levels and measurable student learning outcomes for courses, certificates, programs, including general and vocational education, and degrees. The institution regularly assesses student progress towards achieving those outcomes.

Descriptive Summary
The procedures developed for establishing measurable student learning outcomes for all courses, and for establishing the competency levels and methods to assess the course SLOs (described in II.A.2.a above) place responsibility entirely on the Discipline faculty. These Discipline faculty compare SLOs with similar level courses taught in four-year institutions, and where possible on guidelines established by professional organizations and assistance from community advisory committees. When designing course student learning outcomes, faculty also included SLOs designed to fulfill learning outcomes of the various programs of which the courses are a part. As courses have come up for review as part of six-year cycle established by the March 2003 Policy on Curriculum Revision and Review (http://home.lcc.hawaii.edu/docs/policies/2003/Policy_Curriculum_Revision_and_Review_030318.pdf), faculty have begun the task of assessing student progress toward achieving those outcomes. By 2009, faculty of all credit courses will have assessed at least some of their SLOs. This effort demonstrates commitment on the part of the College to assess student progress towards achieving course SLOs.

The Associate in Science (AS) degree programs (Accounting, Business Technology, Digital Media, Information and Computer Science, Television Production), the Associate in Applied Science (AAS) degree programs (Automotive Technology, Food Service, Supervisory Management) and the Certificate of Completion in Human Services/Substance Abuse Counseling all have program student learning outcomes, developed by the faculty in those programs and published in the Leeward CC 2005-2006 Catalog. College Advisory Boards have been established for programs in Accounting, Automotive Technology, business Technology, Digital Media, Food Service, Information & Computer Science, management, Substance Abuse Counseling, and Television Production. (Members of the Advisory Boards are listed on p. 179 of the Catalog.) Advisory Boards assist in the development of program SLOs. College policy is that boards should meet at least once a year, however, not all of the program advisory boards have met this frequently.

The AA program General Education outcomes (p. 60-61 of Catalog) were originally developed by faculty as part of a system-wide effort to standardize the AA degree. Faculty, meeting in system-wide committees, also developed AA degree competencies for the areas covered in the General Education core: Arts and Humanities, Mathematics and Logical Reasoning, Natural Sciences, Social Sciences, World Civilization, and Written and Oral Communication (p.62-63 in the Leeward CC 2005-2006 Catalog).

The on-going assessment of General Education outcomes is continuing under the Leeward CC Policy on Program Reviews (2005).

The first comprehensive review of programs took place in Spring 2006. A four-year cycle of comprehensive review will then be established for all programs. Under the current policy, all programs are expected to continuously engage in some aspect of program review.
Self Evaluation

As indicated in II.A.2.a above, the implementation of the Policy on Program Reviews (2005) has just started, but commitment is clear, as is the primary role of faculty, assisted by advisory committees in the case of vocational programs. It is essential that the boards meet regularly.

As indicated in IIA.2.a, assessment of course SLOs is also the responsibility of faculty, and the initial assessment of course SLOs has started.

Currently a Coordinator of Course Assessment and a Coordinator of Program Assessment, as part of an Assessment Team, oversee assessment activities. Faculty members on assigned time hold both positions. In order to further demonstrate commitment to the assessment process, these activities need to be assigned to an administrative office.

Planning Agenda

• The responsibilities of the Assessment Team will be permanently assigned to an administrative office in order to ensure that policies continue to be followed.

• As part of its assessment of the Program and Annual Review processes, the College will evaluate the effect of the Policy on Program Reviews on improvement of student learning. The College will also enforce or revise the policy of annual advisory board meetings. Because Program Review focuses on the assessment and improvement of student learning outcomes, this plan will improve student learning.

II.A.2.c. High quality instruction and appropriate breadth, depth, rigor, sequencing, time to completion, and synthesis of learning characterize all programs.

In Spring 2005, questions were added to the course proposal/modification form in Curriculum Central to address breadth, depth, rigor, and sequencing (as well as currency) at the course level. (These questions appear in red on core outlines in Curriculum Central. http://emedia.leeward.hawaii.edu/central/) As part of the course review process, as each course comes up for review, discipline faculty are required to discuss and address these questions. Some form of evidence must be provided that the course has appropriate breadth, depth, rigor, currency, and internal sequencing. As part of the Annual Review process, Divisions are also required (under the Curriculum section) to answer these questions for both courses and Academic Subject Certificates.

Programs are currently not required to address the questions of breadth, depth, rigor, sequencing etc. in the Leeward CC Policy on Program Reviews (2005), but are required to address these questions for programs/certificates on the program Annual Review, under the Curriculum section.

A proposal to revise Leeward’s Associate of Arts degree was approved by the Faculty Senate in Fall 2005. This proposal was the result of a faculty AA degree revision committee with representatives from all Academic Divisions. The committee met from Spring 2003 through Spring 2005, with questions about the breadth, depth and rigor of our AA degree as the primary concerns of the faculty representatives. AA degree requirements were considered in the context of available evidence from the AA General Education SLOs. Potential problems
for students in terms of appropriate sequencing and time to completion were also considered. The dialogue focused on the quality of Leeward’s degree, which was balanced with concerns regarding the ease of transfer within the UH System for our students. Because of the College’s commitment to an AA degree with appropriate breadth, depth and rigor, Leeward’s faculty adopted an AA that is somewhat different from other community colleges in the System in terms of number of hours required in science, social science, and arts and humanities. The AA degree was further revised in Spring 2006 to bring the degree in greater alignment with other community colleges and degree requirements at UH Mānoa.

Self Evaluation
In the development and implementation of its course review, the Annual Review, and specific examples of the AA Degree Revision Committee, Leeward CC has demonstrated its commitment to the goal of including appropriate breadth, depth, rigor, and sequencing into all of its courses and programs. Since much of this has just been implemented, it is difficult at this time to assess improvement in student learning that has occurred as a result of these policies. The College’s Policy on Program Reviews (2005) does not specifically require faculty to analyze the components of appropriate breadth, depth, rigor, and sequencing in all its programs.

Planning Agenda
- The College will revise the Policy on Program Reviews to specifically require analysis of appropriate breadth, depth, rigor, and sequencing as part of the Program Review process.

II.A.2.d. The institution uses delivery modes and teaching methodologies that reflect the diverse needs and learning styles of its students.

Descriptive Summary
The College does not regularly assess student learning styles. Question #27 on the core course outlines in Curriculum Central requires faculty to indicate the teaching methodologies and delivery modes utilized in the course. A perusal of answers to these questions indicates that a wide variety of methods are used, and that most courses combine methods designed for visual, oral, and kinesthetic learners. As indicated by course SLOs, student learning is assessed in multiple ways, depending upon course content. Discipline faculty determine the appropriate delivery modes and teaching methodologies for each course.

The College offers courses in a variety of delivery modes, including traditional face-to-face lecture and/or discussion classes, hands-on classes, including science and other labs, work-based learning, service learning, and Web-enhanced classes. In addition, Distance Education (DE) delivery modes include television and Internet classes, as well as hybrid classes that utilize both modes of delivery. These different modes would appeal to students with different learning styles.

Many programs, particularly in career development areas, are designed to appeal to kinesthetic or auditory learners, while others appeal to the more visual learner. However, most courses and programs are designed to incorporate all learning styles.
The College has sponsored workshops for faculty designed to increase awareness of student learning styles. In addition, some faculty, particularly in Interdisciplinary Studies (IS), Interdisciplinary Social Science (ISS), and Human Services (HSERV) courses, regularly survey students in their classes as a way of helping the students determine their own learning styles.

**Self Evaluation**
The College does little formal assessment of student learning styles and does not schedule ongoing faculty training in the topic.

**Planning Agenda**
- The College will make available to all students a quick survey assessment of learning style, either as part of new student orientation/counseling, or as a voluntary service for students. In addition, an annual workshop on learning styles will be offered, perhaps as part of new faculty orientation.

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.

**Descriptive Summary**
Leeward Community College is undergoing major improvements and revisions in evaluating courses, programs, and certificate/degree requirements. These changes are reflected in new policies and processes that are now being implemented. For example, Curriculum Central was created and holds responses about the courses’ relevance, appropriateness, achievement of learning outcomes, and currency from Disciplines as they complete their course assessments.

The College is committed to high quality education, to student learning, and to improvement of student learning outcomes. The *Policy on Curriculum Revision and Review (2003)* provides for the following:

> “Each discipline will review its own courses (over a six-year cycle), ensuring the accuracy of the core outlines, their academic rigor, integrity and currency, and the continued articulation of the courses with system colleges…”

By Spring 2005, a two-part course assessment process had been developed under the supervision of the Course Assessment Coordinator. (1) As part of the course assessment, faculty teaching a particular course review the core course outline, including the course SLOs and content, for currency, depth, breadth, and rigor. In addition, faculty evaluate the specific course in terms of course sequencing within the discipline. Faculty must also answer specific assessment questions regarding sequencing, depth, breadth, rigor, relevancy, and currency (#8, 13, 16, 27 in core course outlines in Curriculum Central), review all answers on the core course outline, and submit the course modifications via Curriculum Central for approval by their Division. Course modifications are then sent to the Curriculum Committee, which has the primary responsibility for assuring the relevancy, appropriateness and currency of the course. (2) At the same time, faculty teaching the course begin assessing the course SLOs. Faculty develop an assessment instrument, assess at least 2 SLOs for the course as part of the first phase
of SLO assessment, and report the results to the Course Assessment Coordinator. As part of phase 2, faculty must if necessary develop a plan to improve SLO achievement, and assess the SLOs again after implementation of the plan.

The Course Assessment process has been implemented and all courses have been placed on a six-year grid that indicates when they start the review cycle. The timelines originally established indicated that course review would begin in Spring 2004. However, due to the continued revision of the process, the first course assessment modifications began the Curriculum Committee approval process in Fall 2005. Many of these courses have also submitted their SLO assessments to the Course Assessment Coordinator. The table below indicates the College’s current progress on course assessment.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Division</th>
<th>Courses Scheduled for Assessment (rev. S2006)</th>
<th>Assessment Info in Core Course Outline</th>
<th>Core Outlines Approved by Curriculum Committee</th>
<th>Completed SLO Phase 1</th>
<th>Completed SLO Phase 2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Social Science</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business Technology</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Math and Science</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Language Arts</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Services</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vocational / Technical</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arts and Humanities</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTALS</td>
<td>161</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(1) Source: Course Assessment Progress Report 5/17/2006  
(2) Source: Curriculum Committee Report to Faculty Senate May 10, 2006
Comments: The “Courses Scheduled” was revised by Divisions to eliminate courses that are currently not being taught, or in rare instances because of other concerns. For “Completed SLO Phase 2”, in many cases, phase 2 was completed but not submitted/inputted.

Course outlines now state expected SLOs and can be reviewed on Curriculum Central. For those courses that have completed the course assessment information on the core course outline, the information can also be viewed on Curriculum Central, under “proposed core course outline” for those courses not yet approved by the Curriculum Committee, or under “approved core course outline” for those courses that have been approved. Assessment results of those SLOs already assessed (see chart above) can be obtained from the Coordinator for Course Assessment.

Non-credit courses offered by OCEWD also have SLOs stated. (Refer to the link on the website program pages, [http://www.lcc.hawaii.edu/ocewd/](http://www.lcc.hawaii.edu/ocewd/))

The College shows its commitment to assessment of degree programs through its Policy on
"Unit/Area Program Reviews" (2003), which calls for annual data collection, and review to "provide evidence that each area of the College is providing quality support of student learning and related student outcomes." The September 2004 Rossi Report on Program Reviews & Support Area Reviews contains reviews of instructional programs and support areas under the initial Program Review Policy (2003).

A Program Assessment Coordinator organizes and compiles the information obtained in the assessment of academic programs and Support Areas. The most recent and detailed information of the objectives, structure and implementation timeline/flowchart of Program Reviews can be found at the following website: http://emedia.lcc.hawaii.edu/cs/planning/reports/).

The Policy on Program Reviews was revised in May 2005. The revision clarified procedures, and established that program coordinators and Support Area supervisors “should be continually engaged in some aspect of the program review process.” The purpose of the review process is to improve student learning, and to allow both the campus and the community to see and understand what performance levels Leeward’s programs are achieving. The results of Program Reviews are available online at http://emedia.leeward.hawaii.edu/cs/ProgReview/.

The results of individual course SLO assessment feed into the process of Division Annual Review, instituted in Spring 2006. Together, the Program Review and Annual Review processes insure that all courses and programs are relevant, effective, current, and achieving their stated SLOs.

Self Evaluation

The table above indicates the College is making significant progress on course SLO assessment. Of the 161 courses scheduled for assessment, 78% or 126 courses have modified their core course outline, indicating completion of the assessment questions and review of all questions in the outline. Of the 161 courses, almost 44%, or 70 courses, have completed the curriculum review process and have been approved by the Curriculum Committee. The 56 courses that have modified the core outline, but have not had it approved by the Curriculum Committee, are either awaiting Division approval or received Division approval after the Curriculum Committee deadline for Spring 2006. Of the 161 courses, 55% (91) have completed at least phase 1 of course SLO assessment. While these numbers all fall short of the 161 courses that were scheduled for completion, they represent a significant commitment on the part of College faculty to the enormously time-consuming process of course SLO assessment.

The College has not yet been able to implement its plan to have all course SLO data available on Curriculum Central. It is anticipated that this will be accomplished in the 2006-2007 academic year.

The College is committed to evaluating all its courses and programs, and has been continually revising its procedures and policies to do so as it continues to evaluate courses and programs. In some cases, there is no formal policy (such as for course SLO assessment or for using the Annual Review format for AA Program Review). As a result, policy documents on course and program review do not always reflect actual procedures and processes, and some confusion exists on campus as to what the processes are and what they are called.
Planning Agenda

- The Executive Planning Committee and the Assessment Team will evaluate this year’s process to assess the quality and usefulness of the process and the data collected.

- The Course Assessment coordinator and faculty will revise the Policy on Course Revision and Review to incorporate course SLO assessment. Course assessment policies and procedures will be documented in this Policy.

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.

Descriptive Summary

Leeward Community College is committed to evaluation and planning to assure currency and SLO achievement through the implementation of course assessments, program assessments, and annual reviews. All courses, certificates, and degree programs, including general and career and technical education, are being assessed and improved.

The Leeward CC Strategic Plan 2002-2010 is revisited annually. Contained within the document are the College’s objectives, prioritized action plans and their impact on the campus budget. The action plans are assessed annually.

The Policy on Program Reviews (revised 2005) provides for the systematic review of all programs/degrees. The Policy sets a four-year cycle, although programs are expected to continually engage in program review.

The Annual Review process, developed in 2005, requires all Divisions and Support Units to evaluate their effectiveness. The data from this review process became available in the Spring of 2006. Along with data from Program Reviews, the Annual Review data will be incorporated into the new cycle of strategic planning.

Self Evaluation

Through the College’s course assessment, program assessment, and Annual Review processes, the College is attempting to establish a cyclical, data-based evaluation that will drive College planning and budget decisions. Some of these processes are still new, and have completed only one annual cycle. Data is available, but can be difficult to find and to interpret. As data becomes available at the course and program level, the College will be attempting to improve its student learning outcomes. The College has not yet developed a strategy concerning how the results from the recently completed Annual Review will be factored in its next revisit of the Strategic Plan.
Planning Agenda

- The Executive Planning Committee and the Assessment Team will review results to ensure that quality data has emerged from assessment processes, that changes were instituted, and that budget items were put forward as a result. All information and any modifications will be provided to the campus in a timely manner.

- The College will clarify the role of the Director of Planning, Policy, and Assessment, including his role in collecting data on course and program assessments and improvements made, and making them available to all faculty, staff, and administrators, with summaries/interpretations provided. This information will be used in subsequent Program and Annual Reviews and revisits of the Strategic Plan.

II.A.2.h. The institution awards credit based on student achievement of the course’s stated learning outcomes. Units of credit awarded are consistent with institutional policies that reflect generally accepted norms or equivalencies in higher education.

Descriptive Summary
Credit is awarded based upon the grade the student achieves in the course. Each instructor’s course outline contains the student learning outcomes found in the approved core outline for that course. Evaluation methods (exams, papers, group work, etc.) utilized by instructors are designed to measure student success in meeting these outcomes. Direct assessment of student learning outcomes within each course is now part of the course assessment process, and as each course begins this process, data are becoming available to specifically measure how course grades correlate with SLO achievement.

Self Evaluation
The College has begun the process of directly assessing student achievement of each course’s stated learning outcomes. This full cycle of assessment will be completed in the Fall of 2009. Current methods of assessing student achievement (tests, papers etc.) are considered sufficient by many faculty, and are consistent with norms at many institutions of higher learning. The completion of direct SLO assessment for all SLOs in all courses will provide considerable data for a campus-wide dialogue on issue of SLO achievement and its relationship to course grades.

Planning Agenda:

- The College will use the data from SLO assessment to consider how student achievement of course SLOs relates to the awarding of credit.

II.A.2.i. The institution awards degrees and certificates based on student achievement of a program’s stated learning outcomes.

Descriptive Summary
Degrees and certificates are awarded based on student completion of required courses for that degree/certificate. The Leeward CC 2005–2006 Catalog lists the expected learning outcomes for all degrees and programs. These learning outcomes were developed by the faculty of the program, and often, as for the AA General Education outcomes, by faculty from all community colleges in the UH system. Required courses within a program are designed so that at the end...
of the program the student will meet the program learning outcomes; however the College currently does not have actual evidence that this is the case for all programs.

The College is working to establish the extent to which our graduates meet the stated learning outcomes for their degree/certificate programs. Leeward CC’s Policy on Program Reviews (rev. 2005) requires program coordinators to engage in ongoing program learning outcome assessment and to create action plans based on this assessment. This includes coordinators for each of the General Education outcomes for the Associate of Arts degree.

For the AA degree, at least some portion of each General Education outcome has been assessed at least once, and a few, such as the written communication outcome, have had several cycles of assessment. The Assessment Team is in the process of establishing a Curriculum Grid, where all courses meeting AA degree requirements will be evaluated as to which General Education outcomes are addressed in the course, and at what level they are addressed. Twenty-one courses have been identified as those most commonly taken by our AA graduates. In May 2006, faculty identified which General Education outcomes are met by those courses, how they are met, and at what level (Introductory, Practiced, or Demonstrated) they are met. Eventually, the Grid should contain all courses meeting AA degree requirements.

In addition, the AA degree also contains competencies (pp. 62-63 of the Leeward CC 2005–2006 Catalog) that represent the Liberal Arts content of the AA degree. Courses offered in the different areas (natural sciences, arts and humanities, social sciences, etc.) are designed on the basis of meeting the stated competencies in these areas.

Self Evaluation
No formal assessment of program graduates in terms of SLO achievement has been done, except in cases where national certification standards or state testing standards are required, as in certain Career and Technical Education programs. However, that data is not available for all programs. Program SLO assessment data as required by the Policy on Program Reviews (2005) will provide a more realistic view of how students are meeting program SLOs, including the General Education outcomes for the AA degree. The development of the Curriculum Grid should provide information on the extent the Liberal Arts courses most frequently taken for our AA degree teach the General Education outcomes.

Planning Agenda
• The College will design a grid similar to the Curriculum Grid for the AA competencies in each Division. This will provide some evidence that the AA graduates who have taken, for example, three social science classes, have been taught all the social science competencies.

• The College will develop a plan to assess the extent to which graduates achieve program SLOs.

• The Curriculum Grid will be extended to include all courses that satisfy the AA General Education core.
Standard III: Resources

The institution effectively uses its human, physical, technology, and financial resources to achieve its broad educational purposes, including stated student learning outcomes, and to improve institutional effectiveness.

III.A. Human Resources

The institution employs qualified personnel to support student learning programs and services wherever offered and by whatever means delivered, and to improve institutional effectiveness. Personnel are treated equitably, are evaluated regularly and systematically, and are provided opportunities for professional development. Consistent with its mission, the institution demonstrates its commitment to the significant educational role played by persons of diverse backgrounds by making positive efforts to encourage such diversity. Human resources planning is integrated with institutional planning.

III.A.1.a. Criteria, qualifications and procedures for selection of personnel are clearly and publicly stated. Job descriptions are directly related to institutional mission and goals and accurately reflect position duties, responsibilities, and authority. Criteria for selection of faculty include: 1) knowledge of subject matter or service to be performed (as determined by individuals with Discipline expertise); 2) effective teaching; 3) scholarly activities; and 4) potential to contribute to mission of institution. Institutional faculty play a significant role in selection of new faculty. Degrees held by faculty / administrators are from institutions accredited by recognized US accrediting agencies. Degrees from non-US institutions are recognized only if equivalence has been established.

Descriptive Summary

Criteria, qualifications, and procedures used by the institution assure the selection of personnel who demonstrate the appropriate knowledge of the subject matter or service, ability to teach effectively, potential to contribute to the college, and engagement in scholarly activities. The institution uses system-wide minimum qualifications (MQs), and the procedures for selection conform to UH administrative and executive procedures and policies. Specific system-wide hiring and position guidelines, appropriate to every Discipline, list MQs for each faculty position and the criteria for selection of Instructor C-2, the level of hire of new, tenure-track, temporary faculty, and lecturers. (See Revised Faculty Minimum Qualification Guidelines, May, 2001). The job description, minimum qualifications, and desirable qualifications (DQs) for each position are published online at http://workatuh.hawaii.edu, in the Honolulu Star Bulletin, and for E/M positions, in the Chronicle of Higher Education.

Teaching experience and evidence of effective teaching usually are included in the DQs for individual positions. In addition, other DQs are often included to help assess the applicant's potential to contribute to Leeward's mission and the specific goals of the hiring unit.
Self Evaluation
The institution monitors and assures the hiring of qualified personnel. It has maintained flexibility in meeting the challenge of changes in MQs and DQs to meet its needs, as in the area of Distance Education. The institution has sought to improve communication among the various levels of review.

The recent system reorganization and subsequent selection of a Vice President for Community Colleges may lead to changes in the coordination of functioning among the various Community Colleges. Leeward Community College anticipates a closer coordination of efforts among the campuses. However, Leeward CC’s Human Resources Office will still need to study policies at the campus level and work within the framework of the reorganization.

Planning Agenda
• No changes are needed to address this 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.

Descriptive Summary
Faculty are responsible for the development of course and program student learning outcomes. SLOs have been developed for all courses and programs through discussion among Discipline peers, and in the case of CTE programs and courses, with the assistance of advisory committees. As part of the College’s course assessment process, as well as the Program and Annual Review processes, many faculty members are engaged in assessing and implementing changes to improve student learning outcomes. For those courses that have started SLO assessment, faculty have designed assessment instruments and have used the results to redesign the instrument or to change teaching methods. Examples include the following:

• English 100 faculty found that students have difficulty with the development of a central thesis in their writing, one of the course SLOs. To support student learning of this outcome, students will be using a graphic organizer to show the development of their thesis for an in-class writing exercise that will be assessed by all English 100 faculty.

• In Speech 251, the SLO of focus was “The student will be able to conduct an audience analysis.” In Phase 1, assessment of speech outlines showed that 36% of the students identified the audience of the intended communication. Discussions among the speech faculty resulted in unanimous agreement that instructors require the identification of the audience in student outlines. As a result of this change, Phase 2 results showed competency levels at 65%.

• Business 127 faculty focused on the following SLO: “Key information accurately and efficiently for employment in a business setting at 30 gross words a minute (GWAM) on a five-minute timing with no more than five errors…” In Phase 1, all students passed the test; as a result business faculty discussed the SLO and agreed to raise the passing score to 40 net words a minute. The SLO will be reassessed with the new criteria.
These examples show that faculty in many disciplines are producing student learning outcomes, and are engaged in significant thinking and discussion regarding these outcomes.

The actual evaluation of faculty is institutionalized through the Contract Renewal and Tenure and Promotion processes. These processes are documented through system-wide guidelines that are distributed to all faculty members.

According to the current union contract, “Guidelines for filing and processing tenure applications shall be established by the Employer. Criteria shall be in writing and shall be distributed in the guidelines and procedures provided to the applicant along with the tenure application forms and shall be the basis on which judgment for consideration of tenure shall be made.”

The *UH Community College Contract Renewal Suggested Guidelines* recommend that the following information should be included:

“A statement on your teaching ability that includes:

a. A self-assessment of your teaching ability with respect to courses you have taught, including a *discussion of your effectiveness, learning outcomes*, and student responses to your approach, etc. “

*Guidelines for Tenure and Promotion University of Hawai‘i Community Colleges 2005-06* state:

“It is also important to include in your dossier a discussion of the following:

(1) your own philosophy and goals regarding teaching (counseling, or appropriate area of instructional support);

(2) your perceptions about the students we serve, including their needs and aspirations; (Your statement should be made in the context of the Community Colleges’ mission. i.e., an open-door institution that serves a multi-ethnic student population.)

(3) a concise self-analysis of how you have responded to these educational needs; and

(4) the possible impact and contributions you have made toward achieving your professional objectives and meeting your students’ needs.”

Each Division has developed lecturer evaluation guidelines. A review of these guidelines shows that some Divisions are recommending a self-assessment on Lecturers’ ability to demonstrate effectiveness in producing student learning outcomes for their courses. For example, the Arts & Humanities Division’s Lecturer evaluation guidelines ask lecturers to provide in their dossier “Self Evaluation narrative which includes a discussion of student evaluations, student comments, pertinent self-improvement activities and techniques employed to effectively meet student learning objectives.” The Math & Sciences Division requires a brief self-evaluation that includes “how you are able to demonstrate effectiveness in producing the Student Learning Outcomes (SLO) for your particular course.”

Senior Faculty (i.e., post-tenure review) guidelines also require continuing self-assessment, including information on teaching activities, as a basis for review of discipline-related activities and their specific outcomes.
Self Evaluation
The development and assessment of student learning outcomes for courses and programs have been implemented and continue at the College. Some courses and programs are ahead of others in this initiative because they began assessment activities in 2004. Many of the assessments have been based on extensive dialogue among a number of Discipline members, or for the General Education SLO assessments, across many Disciplines. Course assessment will be phased in over a six-year period, with all courses engaged in the SLO assessment process by 2009. Because of the timeline, some faculty members may be unfamiliar with this process, and continued workshops and professional development activities must be supported in this effort.

The UH Community College Contract Renewal Suggested Guidelines recommend a discussion of the faculty’s “effectiveness, learning outcomes and student responses to your approach.” While the Guidelines for UH Community College Tenure and Promotion 2005–2006 do not specifically emphasize the need to address effectiveness in producing student learning outcomes, it does ask “for the possible impact and contributions you have made toward achieving your professional objectives and meeting your students’ needs.” Lecturer evaluation guidelines are inconsistent across Divisions, with a few Divisions requiring a discussion on effectiveness in producing student learning outcomes. The Senior Faculty evaluation guidelines do not specifically ask for a discussion on effectiveness in producing student learning outcomes. However, the faculty and administrators at the various levels who review faculty dossiers are aware of the accreditation shift to assessing and reporting student learning outcomes.

It appears that effectiveness in producing learning outcomes has been a component of faculty evaluation for probationary faculty and some lecturers. The current Community College guidelines for tenure and promotion, as well as the current faculty contract (in effect until June 2009), do not include any reference to SLOs. However, it is the responsibility of faculty members to present evidence for teaching effectiveness in their applications. As faculty engage in the evaluation processes at any level, they may address their participation in course and program assessments, as well as any other assessments of student learning outcomes they have designed for their own classes.

Few issues have generated the concern and discussion on campus as have the College’s response to this standard. The Faculty Senate passed two resolutions related to this standard, and the Faculty Committee of the Senate held an open forum to discuss the incorporation of effectiveness in producing student learning outcomes into the faculty evaluation process. It is likely that more such forums will be held in the future, as well as continuing the various workshops that have been held on SLO assessment. The commitment of all parts of the College to completely meeting this standard is currently difficult to ascertain.

Planning Agenda
• Continued dialogue on campus will take place to develop a common understanding of the definition, development, and assessment of student learning outcomes and their place in faculty evaluation.

• The College will work with the system-wide Human Resources Office to recommend revision of the guidelines for contract renewal and tenure and promotion to reflect an emphasis on producing student learning outcomes.

• The College will revise and standardize lecturer evaluation guidelines and include references to effectiveness in producing student learning outcomes.
III.A.5.a. The institution plans professional development activities to meet the needs of its personnel.

Descriptive Summary
The College’s mission emphasizes learning and teaching, as well as personal development. This institution has demonstrated a strong commitment to professional development opportunities that promote assessment, success in learning, effectiveness in teaching, and fulfillment of personal development.

Leeward CC is the only UH community college with a tenured, full-time Staff Development Coordinator and an Innovation Center for Teaching and Learning (ICTL) (formerly known as the Staff Development Office). An Innovation Center for Teaching & Learning Advisory Committee, composed of 12 members from faculty and staff from across the campus, oversees the programs and operations of the center.

In addition to the activities coordinated by the ICTL, professional development activities are offered through other avenues that meet needs, such as those addressing student learning outcomes, course assessment, program assessment, teaching with technology, and innovative, effective teaching techniques.

Mechanisms to Assess and Meet Professional Development Needs
The institution identifies professional development needs in the following ways:

a. Every three years, a needs assessment survey has been conducted by the ICTL among faculty, lecturers, administrators, and staff about teaching and learning needs. In Spring 2005, the ICTL Advisory Committee passed a revised needs assessment procedure that calls for these assessments to be conducted with specific personnel groups each year. The proposed schedule sets Operations & Maintenance and administration for 2005, Administrative, Professional & Technical (APT), and clerical groups for 2006, and faculty and lecturers for 2007.

b. The ICTL Executive Board represents all Leeward campus constituencies and provides an avenue to bring identified needs from all areas to the Staff Development Coordinator.

c. Individuals, programs, and offices may make their own needs known directly to the Staff Development Coordinator.

d. Personnel groups (Clerical Staff Council, APT Group, Operations & Maintenance Group, Lecturer Group) have been organized and are encouraged to plan, organize, and initiate their own professional development programs and activities.

e. Campus committees (Writing Committee, Retention Committee, etc.) plan and organize activities related to their initiatives.

f. In addition to the professional development needs identified by the ICTL, specific professional development needs are made known by various groups, regarding such issues as student learning outcomes, implementation of actions plans to attain SLOs, etc. These activities may be coordinated through entities other than the ICTL.
The degree of institutional commitment is evident in the depth and breadth of activities offered to the staff. Current professional development programs include:

1. programs open to all
2. faculty programs
3. funding programs
4. programs for specific groups

These activities meet several areas of need: student learning outcomes, course assessment, program assessment, teaching techniques, and other professional and personal development needs.

A complete list of recent programs and activities that serve professional development needs is available at the end of this theme (Appendix A, Page 119). A few specific examples of these endeavors include training sessions on SLO development and assessment, Friday workshops on Teaching Guidelines and Issues for Faculty (TGIF), summer Hawai‘i National Great Teachers Seminar, Teaching Squares program, and WebCT training.

**Self Evaluation**

There is evidence of very strong institutional commitment to professional development activities that meet the needs of the College’s personnel. Funds ($15,000) were provided to transform the Staff Development Office into the Innovation Center for Teaching and Learning, with an emphasis on encouraging innovation and change in the classroom. A series of think tanks held during the Spring 2002 semester generated information from faculty and staff on the needs of the College in relation to professional development. Program initiatives which arose from these needs assessment sessions include the Mid-Semester Assessment program that gathers and provides student feedback to the instructor; Teaching Innovation mini-grants, Early Career Faculty series, a Teaching & Learning Center website, and a faculty development day for Leeward CC. These ideas have been implemented or are in the development stage. The refurbished Center also provides a small conference room available for meetings and computers, scanner, and printer for faculty/staff use.

Many personnel from all sectors of the College have been served by the ICTL. Efforts have been made to meet the needs of Operations and Maintenance, which, in the past, had not been as well represented as other personnel. Financial support for these various activities is evidence of institutional commitment to professional development activities.

The College is in the process of formally assessing improvements in SLOs for courses and programs, and many professional development workshops have been focused on this topic, as well as on improving teaching techniques. These activities should have a positive effect on achievement of student learning outcomes; this has yet to be assessed.

**Planning Agenda**

- The Innovation Center for Teaching and Learning will offer professional development activities focused on assessment of student learning outcomes and the resulting design of prioritized lists based on these assessments.
III.A.5.b. With the assistance of the participants, the institution systematically evaluates professional development programs and uses the results of these evaluations as the basis for improvement.

**Descriptive Summary**

Several mechanisms are used to evaluate the effectiveness of professional development programs, including the following:

1) An analysis of session attendance and category of attendees. For example, fewer lecturers were attending ICTL programs and activities than expected, so adjustments were made to accommodate them.

2) Written evaluations are conducted for many professional development programs and activities. Satisfaction ratings are calculated (1-5 rating scale); open-ended questions are asked regarding specific aspects of the workshop; and general written or verbal comments are solicited. Content of evaluations lead to improvements of professional development programs. For example, the results of the evaluations of the “Connections” and “Partners” customer service program led to a development of customer service training tailored to the needs of the College and taking into consideration the contents of the evaluations. (e.g. low-rated video portion of the training was replaced with high scoring activities.)

Summaries of evaluations for various activities are available from ICTL. These summaries indicate that participants were very satisfied with particular workshops/activities. Two common evaluation questions (rated on a 1-5 scale) are included in all staff development program evaluations:

- “From this session or workshop, I feel I gained information and skills that could help improve my effectiveness at Leeward CC.”
- “Overall this workshop was valuable and informative.”

Evidence of commitment to implementing suggestions for improvement is seen in the steps taken to modify and tailor activities to better meet the needs of the staff, as suggested by feedback from participants in various activities. Additionally, the institution is exploring ways to measure the impact of these activities on SLOs.

**Self Evaluation**

The institution has been evaluating its professional development programs by soliciting feedback/evaluation in each of the activities held. The feedback is then analyzed with respect to level of satisfaction and suggestions for improvement. These suggestions are implemented where feasible. The results of the evaluations of professional development programs have led to changes in the presentation or delivery of the training.

The institution has demonstrated conscientious commitment to evaluating professional development programs and using the results of those evaluations as a basis for improvement, thus meeting the needs of its personnel more effectively. However, feedback on the effectiveness of professional development activities is for specific programs or sessions only.
Planning Agenda

- The Innovation Center for Teaching and Learning will develop indicators of success for professional development activities relating to achievement of student learning outcomes.

III.D.1.a. Financial planning is integrated with and supports all institutional planning.

Descriptive Summary

Institutional and financial planning at the College is closely tied-in with the University of Hawai‘i System and the Hawai‘i State government. Budget priorities from Leeward CC are vetted through the UH Community College System Office, then through the University of Hawai‘i System before receiving funding and approval from the legislative and executive ranches of the State government.

Financial planning at Leeward Community College has been guided by a number of long-term documents and from the campus level, the UH Community College system level, and the University of Hawai‘i System. The two major documents that integrated financial planning and institutional planning at Leeward Community College were the Academic Development Plan (ADP) 1996-2002 and the Leeward CC Long Range Development Plan (LRDP), adopted in 1996. These plans were driven by the College’s mission and aligned with two other planning documents: the University of Hawai‘i System Strategic Plan, 1997-2007 and the University of Hawai‘i’s Community Colleges Strategic Plan 1997-2002. Together, these plans stated the long-range goals, provided the direction, and set the guidelines and priorities for the University of Hawai‘i, UH Community Colleges, and Leeward Community College.

In 2001, the College replaced its Academic Development Plan with the Leeward Community College Strategic Plan 2002-2010 to conform to revisions of the University of Hawai‘i System Strategic Plan 2002-2010 and the University of Hawai‘i’s Community Colleges Strategic Plan 2002-2010. The goals, objectives, and specific action plans that comprise the Strategic Plan are derived from the College’s mission and serves as both a short-term and long-term planning document. The introductory forward of the Leeward CC Strategic Plan states:

"The Strategic Plan will provide information for biennium budget requests, but if you look at pages 22 and 23, Tables 8 and 9, you will see that the cost of our action plans far exceed our current budget. Therefore, for the first year of implementation of the SP, we will need to focus on non-general funded items. Of course, if any funds become available, the Strategic Plan will be used to determine what action plans can be carried through."

Each year, the action plans for Leeward’s Strategic Plan were prioritized by campus vote. Each action plan specified the following: the nature of the action, the rationale, intended results and how they will be assessed, the impact, and the source of funding. The results of the prioritization were forwarded to the campus’ governing bodies, the Faculty Senate and Campus Council, for review. The administrative team used the list of priorities to shape the budget, which was forwarded to the UHCC and UH System for reprioritization. The budget was then returned to the College for review and shifting of resources before it was submitted to the state legislature.
In August 2005, a revised proposal on a planning and budgeting process was developed and presented to the Administrative Staff, the Assessment Team, participants in the Leadership Retreat, and to the campus as a whole at Convocation. This process integrates assessment and analysis in the Program Reviews to planning and budget allocation.

By Spring 2006, the entire Annual Review process, linked to Program Review, had evolved and was in its first cycle of implementation. The process is intended to be data driven, and to link institutional planning to financial planning.

**Self Evaluation**
Under past processes, the funding of Leeward’s priorities has often fallen short of the College’s expectations. Despite this fact, the College has been able to achieve some of its objectives to improving its effectiveness. The College is committed to improving its effectiveness by continuously modifying the planning process that results in budget priorities.

The date for revisiting the Strategic Plan was moved to the spring so that the prioritized lists could be considered in the development of the budget. The College now requires new actions to be based on assessment results and the campus is struggling with the new requirement. The Annual Review process has successfully linked data from SLO assessment and other sources to planning and budgeting.

**Planning Agenda**
- Administrators, Division and Support Area Chairs, and the Assessment Team will assess the Annual Review process to insure that assessment and evidence drive financial and institutional planning.
Institutional Commitments Appendices

note: College Plan can be found in following the Evidence List, page 462.

Appendix A
List of Examples of Professional Development Activities
(Complete List Available as Separate Document)

Learning
• Numerous sessions beginning in February 2004, focusing on student learning, developing measurable Student Learning Outcomes, sample SLO Design, assessment of SLOs, developing actions plans

Assessment
• Convocation presentations on assessment
• Dialogue Sessions focusing on assessment
• Numerous presentations to the faculty on course assessment, program review
• Numerous meetings, presentations to division chairs, division members, Distance Education faculty on assessment
• Training of faculty in course and program assessment

Teaching
• The Hawai‘i National Great Teachers Seminar (HNGTS), which is sponsored by Leeward CC, provides an annual opportunity for teachers from around the world to learn innovative ideas and teaching strategies. Three to five Leeward faculty members participate in this seminar and five Leeward faculty members staff this program.
• A one-day Convocation is held during the week prior to each semester to provide a forum to share new ideas, initiatives, and directions with all faculty and staff. Themes in previous years have included Service Learning, Writing Across the Curriculum, Assessment, Student Learning Outcomes, Reorganization of the College, and Discrimination and Harassment in the Workplace.
• In 2002, the Mid-Semester Assessment Program was instituted to provide faculty and lecturers with the opportunity to receive feedback from their students during the semester when changes can still be made.
• During Spring 2004, the Teaching Squares program was implemented to improve teaching and build community through a structured, non-threatening process of classroom observations and shared reflections. Each semester 15-20 faculty participate in this program.
• During Spring 2005, a new workshop series (Teaching Guidelines and Issues for Faculty, TGIF) has been developed to aid new faculty in their careers at Leeward.
• The Leeward CC Return to Industry Program sends faculty/staff to industry sites to maintain and hone their professional skills. These experiences help to create partnerships with industry, develop job opportunities for students, and generally impact the course curriculum in a positive way. This program was developed at Leeward and was expanded to include other campuses in Hawai‘i. This program was recently coordinated from Leeward CC and funded by Carl Perkins Funds.
• The college sends one or two faculty members to attend a Writing Across the Curriculum Seminar each year.
• Numerous workshops dealing with teaching with technology (WebFundamentals) and using computer programs are presented to faculty.
Resources (Funding) Programs:

- Individualized professional development opportunities are funded through various sources. All faculty, staff, and lecturers can request up to $50 per academic year to help defray registration fees for attendance at workshops, conferences, professional development courses and required books and materials.

- Small grants are also offered to support various staff development activities up to a maximum of $150 per event.

- Travel grants are available for faculty and staff, budget permitting. In 2003 and 2004, $10,000 was budgeted to support travel for 10-15 faculty, staff, and lecturers. Each request is allowed a maximum of $1500.

Other programs:

- New Hire Orientation, CPR/First Aid training, Tenure & Promotion workshops have been institutionalized and held regularly.

- Numerous workshops on such issues as health, meditation, stress relief, etc. for personal benefit

- Sabbatical leaves, for a semester at full pay or one year at half pay, are granted to faculty depending on budget.

- Tuition waivers for classes in the UH system and faculty exchanges are also available for faculty and staff.

- The Leeward CC College Colloquia is a monthly schedule of workshops and activities for faculty and staff. This monthly schedule is sent to each faculty, staff, and lecturer. Table 2 contains a schedule of these monthly colloquia.

- A one or two-day Leadership Retreat is held annually during the summer to bring campus leadership together to discuss and plan for the college’s future direction.

- Each year, Leeward designates the first Friday in March for staff and faculty development and renewal. In March 2005, A GIFT (Great Ideas For Teaching) Day was held for faculty and a Staff Development Day was held for Clerical, APT, Operations and Maintenance, and various Civil Service employees. In 2004, the faculty held an Innovations in Learning Day off campus while the staff held its full-day program on campus.

- Customer service training sessions are conducted each semester for new student assistants (Service 101). Each year in May a longer version (Service 102) is held for new staff, administrators and non-instructional faculty.

- Supervisory Skills Training was developed in Spring 2003. This program is held annually for all who supervise (including supervisors of student assistants)

- Sexual Harassment and Workplace Violence workshops are held regularly. In Spring 2005, the campus began a concerted effort to have the majority of the faculty and staff trained.

- Additional workshops and seminars are provided for staff and faculty as requested or as the need is identified. For example computer literacy workshops are held throughout the semester, as are workshops on teaching on the Internet.
I n s t i t u t i o n a l  C o m m i t m e n t s :  D o c u m e n t s  a n d  W e b s i t e s

S t a n d a r d  I

2007–09 College Plan
web http://emedia.leeward.hawaii.edu/cs/planning/budget/
print following Evidence List, page 462 of Self Study and Evidence Room

A n n u a l  R e v i e w  p r o c e s s ( 2 0 0 6 )
web http://emedia.leeward.hawaii.edu/cs/planning/
print Evidence Room

A c c r e d i t a t i o n  P r o g r e s s  R e p o r t ,  M a r c h  2 0 0 5
web http://emedia.leeward.hawaii.edu/cs/planning/reports/
print Evidence Room

A s s e s s m e n t  A n a l y s i s  R e p o r t ,  F e b r u a r y  2 0 0 5
web http://emedia.leeward.hawaii.edu/cs/planning/reports/
print Evidence Room

C o m m u n i t y  C o l l e g e  S u r v e y  o f  S t u d e n t  E n g a g e m e n t  ( C C S S E )  R e s u l t s  R e p o r t ,  2 0 0 5

C u r r i c u l u m  C e n t r a l
web http://emedia.leeward.hawaii.edu/central

H i g h  S c h o o l  S e n i o r  E x i t  S u r v e y
web http://arch.k12.hi.us/school/seps/seps.html

L e e w a r d  C C  I n s t i t u t i o n a l  S e l f  S t u d y  i n  S u p p o r t  o f  R e a f f i r m a t i o n  o f  A c c r e d i t a t i o n ,  S e p t e m b e r  1 ,  2 0 0 0
web http://emedia.leeward.hawaii.edu/cs/planning/reports/
print Evidence Room

L e e w a r d  C C  2 0 0 5 – 2 0 0 6  C a t a l o g
web http://www.lcc.hawaii.edu/catalog
print Evidence Room

L e e w a r d  C C  S t r a t e g i c  P l a n ,  2 0 0 2 – 2 0 1 0
web http://emedia.leeward.hawaii.edu/sp
print Evidence Room

O f f i c e  o f  C o n t i n u i n g  E d u c a t i o n  a n d  W o r k f o r c e  D e v e l o p m e n t
web http://www.lcc.hawaii.edu/ocewd/

O f f i c e  o f  C o n t i n u i n g  E d u c a t i o n  a n d  W o r k f o r c e  D e v e l o p m e n t  M i s s i o n
web http://www.lcc.hawaii.edu/ocewd/Mission.htm

P o l i c y  o n  P r o g r a m  R e v i e w s  ( 2 0 0 5 )
web http://home.lcc.hawaii.edu/docs/policies
print Evidence Room
Institutional Commitments

Report on Program Reviews & Support Area Reviews, Sept. 2004
print Evidence Room

Standard II
Accreditation Implementation Committee Reports
web http://www.lcc.hawaii.edu/ac2006/
Scroll down to Accreditation Implementation Committees

Annual Review process (2006)
web http://emedia.leeward.hawaii.edu/cs/planning/
print Evidence Room

Curriculum Central
web http://emedia.leeward.hawaii.edu/central

DocuShare site
web http://documents.leeward.hawaii.edu:8080/docushare/dsweb/HomePage

Leeward CC 2005-2006 Catalog
web http://www.lcc.hawaii.edu/catalog
print Evidence Room

Leeward CC Fact Book
web http://emedia.leeward.hawaii.edu/cs/planning/IR
print Evidence Room

Management and Planning Support (MAPS) documents
web http://www.hawaii.edu/iro/maps.htm

Office of Continuing Education and Workforce Development Course SLOs
web http://www.lcc.hawaii.edu/ocewd/
(Refer to the link on the website program pages.)

Policy on Curriculum Revision and Review
web http://home.lcc.hawaii.edu/docs/policies
print Evidence Room

Policy on Program Reviews (rev. 5/05)
web http://home.lcc.hawaii.edu/docs/policies/

Policy on Unit/Area Program Reviews adopted in May, 2003
web http://home.lcc.hawaii.edu/docs/policies/

Program Review Assessment templates
web http://documents.leeward.hawaii.edu:8080/docushare/dsweb/View/Collection-14
Program Review Objectives, Structure and Implementation, Timeline/flowchart
web http://emedia.leeward.hawaii.edu/cs/planning/reports/

Program Review Results
web http://emedia.leeward.hawaii.edu/cs/progReview/
print Evidence Room

Report on Program Reviews and Unit Area Reviews Sept 2004

Research Report on the Needs of Incoming Students Fall 2005, Rossi, 11/05
web http://emedia.leeward.hawaii.edu/cs/planning/IR
print Evidence Room

WebCT, the UH system’s online course management software
web http://webct.hawaii.edu/webct/public/show_courses.pl

Standard III

Academic Development Plan (ADP) 1996-2002
web http://documents.leeward.hawaii.edu:8080/docushare/dsweb/View/Collection-1020
print Evidence Room

Faculty Minimum Qualification Guidelines (revised), May, 2001
web http://www.hawaii.edu/offices/bor/policy/index.html Select Chapter 9, Personnel

Guidelines for Tenure and Promotion University of Hawai‘i Community Colleges 2005-06
web http://home.lcc.hawaii.edu/docs/faculty

Leeward Community College Strategic Plan 2002-2010
web http://emedia.leeward.hawaii.edu/sp
print Evidence Room

Long Range Development Plan (LRDP)
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ongoing institutional evaluation and improvement
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evaluation of student needs, college programs and services
evaluation informing college decisions
to better serve students
Evaluation, Planning and Improvement

The standards require ongoing institutional evaluation and improvement to help serve students better. Evaluation focuses on student achievement, student learning, and the effectiveness of processes, policies, and organization. Improvement is achieved through an ongoing and systematic cycle of evaluation, integrated planning, implementation, and re-evaluation. The planning cycle begins with evaluation of student needs and college programs and services. This evaluation in turn informs college decisions about where it needs to improve, and the college identifies improvement goals campus-wide. Resources are distributed in order to implement these goals. When resources are insufficient to support improvement goals, the college adjusts its resource decisions to reflect its priorities or seeks other means of supplying resources to meet its goals. Once improvement plans have been fully implemented, evaluation of how well the goals have been met ensues. Thus, the planning cycle is comprised of evaluation, goal setting, resource distribution, implementation, and reevaluation.
Standard I: Institutional Mission and Effectiveness

I.A.1 The institution establishes student learning program and services aligned with its purposes, character, and its student population.

Descriptive Summary
Leeward Community College’s mission statement describes the school’s educational purposes that address the needs of its student population. The College specializes in the effective teaching of remedial/developmental education, general education, and other introductory liberal arts, pre-professional, and selected baccalaureate courses and programs, with the goal of seamless system articulation and transfer. Leeward Community College works to “provide the trained workforce needed by the State,” “provide opportunities for personal enrichment, occupational upgrading and career mobility,” “contribute to and stimulate the cultural and intellectual life of the community,” and is committed to diversity in order “to prepare students for the global workplace.”

Self Evaluation
The College relies on wide variety of sources (see bulleted items below) that provide current and projected demographic and socio-economic data for the geographic region that it serves. This information is supplemented by assessment of all entering students’ goals, needs, and readiness in math and writing, obtained during the pre-registration period prior to each semester.

- U.S. Census Bureau
- Planning documents from the Hawai‘i State Government Department of Business, Economic Development, and Tourism (DBEDT)
- Planning documents from the City and County of Honolulu
- Management and Planning Support (MAPS) documents from the University of Hawai‘i’s Institutional Research Office
- University of Hawai‘i Strategic Plan
- University of Hawai‘i Community College System Strategic Plan
- High School Graduate Leaver surveys provided by the State Department of Education

The College analyzes this information and periodically updates its mission to accurately determine its student population and to help serve its students better.

Planning Agenda
- No changes are needed to address this standard.
I.A.3: Using the institution’s governance and decision-making processes, the institution reviews its mission statement on a regular basis and revises it as necessary.

Descriptive Summary
The College amended its mission statement in 2005 to emphasize the College’s commitment to achieving student learning. Prior to this addition, the mission statement for Leeward Community College was last revised in 2004. This revision was initiated by a memo sent from the former Provost/Chancellor on April 8, 2003, establishing the Mission Statement Revision Committee.

The Leeward CC Mission Statement Revision Chronology provides evidence of numerous opportunities for input by the campus community and illustrates how that input drove the mission revision. For example, input was gathered from the August 12, 2003 Leeward CC Leadership Retreat, followed by a September 23, 2003 open meeting for the entire campus. On November 14, 2003 the revised mission was e-mailed to the campus community and responses were sought.

On February 2, 2004 meetings with the Executive Committees of the Campus Council and Faculty Senate were held to discuss the mission statement. Changes were made to the draft at the Campus Council meeting of February 9, 2004. Changes were also made at the Faculty Senate meeting of February 18, 2004. Final changes were made to the mission statement by the former Provost/Chancellor on February 18-19, 2004. The Leeward CC College mission statement was approved by the Board of Regents at their March 19, 2004 meeting.
(See http://emedia.leeward.hawaii.edu/sp/evidence.htm)

As the campus began to organize its self-study to address the current accreditation standards, campus leaders realized that Leeward’s commitment to, and emphasis on student learning was not clearly reflected in its mission statement. The former Provost/Chancellor’s memo to the faculty and staff on February 16, 2005 acknowledged that omission. An amendment proposal was publicized to the campus at large and feedback was requested. The Campus Council and Faculty Senate approved the revision in 2005, and it is expected that the Board of Regents will approve this amendment in Fall 2006.

Self Evaluation
Leeward Community College reviews its mission statement and revises it as necessary. Faculty, staff, and administrators are involved in the revisions, and the Faculty Senate and Campus Council approve changes before the revision is submitted to the Board of Regents.

Planning Agenda
• The College will establish a regular review schedule of the College’s mission to ensure emphasis on achievement of student learning. Regular review will ensure that programs and services are aligned with the College’s purpose and intended student population.
I.A.4 The institution’s mission is central to institutional planning and decision making.

Descriptive Summary
The campus’ Strategic Plan 2002-2010 is derived from and driven by the College’s mission. The goals of the Strategic Plan are “broad statements that describe the direction that the college is headed. Goals come from and further describe the mission. Objectives provide a gauge of how the goals are to be accomplished within the framework of the mission statement. Action Plans are a commitment to achieve specific, measurable end results.” The five goals of the Strategic Plan closely parallel the six principles of the mission statement as demonstrated in the table below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strategic Plan Goals</th>
<th>Mission Statement Principles</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Goal A</strong> Provide opportunities for the pursuit of knowledge, personal enrichment and creativity.</td>
<td><strong>Access:</strong> to broaden access to postsecondary education in Hawai’i”.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Personal Development:</strong> to provide opportunities for personal enrichment, occupational upgrading, and career mobility”.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Work Force Development:</strong> to provide the trained workforce needed by the State.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Goal B</strong> Stimulate the cultural and intellectual life of the community by providing artistic, professional and enrichment opportunities.</td>
<td><strong>Community Development:</strong> To contribute to and stimulate the intellectual life of the community.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Goal C</strong> Improve educational effectiveness.</td>
<td><strong>Learning and Teaching:</strong> “to structure our programs in such a way that they reflect not only academic rigor but also student development learning outcomes and student goals.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Goal D</strong> Build partnerships, develop and strengthen local and global connections.</td>
<td><strong>Diversity:</strong> To prepare students for the global workplace</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Although Goal E: Acquire and manage resources efficiently (funding, recruiting and retaining highly qualified personnel, upgrading physical facilities) has no parallel mission statement, the mission of the College could not be carried out without adequate human and financial resources that this goal addresses.

During the first year of the current Strategic Plan, a series of open forums were held to update the campus community about the results of the action plans that were implemented and to invite input (http://emedia.leeward.hawaii.edu/sp/). Strategic Plan Assessment Reports for 2002-03, 2003-04, and 2004-05 (http://emedia.leeward.hawaii.edu/sp/evidence.htm) documented the impact of the action plans and provided feedback on the success of these plans in bringing about institutional improvement.
During the first revisit in the Spring 2003, priorities were established via campus-wide vote, and this information was used by the College's Administrative Team in budget decision-making. Beginning with the 2004 revisit, Divisions were also invited to submit to administration their listing of priorities, which would also be considered in the prioritization. This change was made in response to suggestions that a combination of the results of popular voting and Unit Head input would result in a more balanced and better-informed decision.

The revisit in 2005 incorporated additional changes. The first involved the requirement that all action plans be based on the assessment of student learning. This change was logical, as the entire College was actively engaged in program, Support Area, and course assessments. Action plans were divided into four categories, Capital Improvement Projects (CIP), Full Time Equivalent (FTE) and Administrative, Professional, & Technical (APT) positions, and non-recurring items and this broadened the impact of the SP on budget decisions. A popular vote was still used to obtained campus-wide input, and the final prioritization of the action items was decided by the administrative team after consultation with unit heads.

Self Evaluation
The College's mission is central to institutional planning and decision-making. Action plans that are implemented are tracked to assess their effectiveness and the results are reported to the College community. Each year, project directors provide an update on the status of action plans, including what was accomplished, what funds were used, what data was collected, and what impact the action had on student learning, program development, and/or institutional development. (http://emedia.leeward.hawaii.edu/sp/Evidence/SP/03Dear_PD-1.doc)

The Strategic Plan is revisited annually as a means of promoting ongoing analysis and continuous improvement. Until 2004, the campus community at large was asked to develop and submit action plans based on assessment. These were included in a spreadsheet document for campus review and subsequent voting (http://emedia.leeward.hawaii.edu/sp/2004_rev.pdf). Each year, action plan proposers presented their actions at a campus-wide forum open to the entire campus community.

The campus-wide prioritization by voting was replaced by the Annual Review process beginning in 2006. This process, designed be inclusive, data-based, and collegial, combines several College activities: self study and assessment to planning, and budgeting. Each Division and Support Area completes a template based on course and program SLO assessment, and includes perceived strengths, weaknesses, opportunities, and threats of the Division or Support Area. The template is used as a record of prioritized requests, initiatives, and budget needs as described in Standards I.B.2. and 1.B.3. below.

Planning Agenda
- No changes are needed to address this standard.
I.B.2 The institution sets goals to improve its effectiveness consistent with its stated purpose. The institution articulates its goals and states the objectives derived from them in measurable terms so that the degree to which they are achieved can be determined and widely discussed. The institutional members understand these goals and work collaboratively toward their achievement.

Descriptive Summary
The College articulates its mission through the goals, objectives, and action plans of its Strategic Plan, 2002-2010. This major planning document for the College represents the collective vision of faculty, staff, and administrators on how the College would address the needs of its community. More than a hundred action plans in the original document represent the diverse initiatives by which the mission-driven goals and objectives could be achieved and measured. These plans were presented to the campus via email and open forums, prioritized by a campus-wide vote, and forwarded to the College’s administrative team to guide their planning and budget decisions.

At the time of its adoption, the College also agreed that the Strategic Plan would be revisited annually as part of an ongoing evaluation of the College’s efforts and to implement changes as needed. In preparation for each annual revisit, the co-Coordinators of the Strategic Plan tracked and reported the findings from each action plan implemented, to inform the campus of the changes that were made for improvement. (See http://emedia.leeward.hawaii.edu/sp/Select 2002-2003, 2003-2004, and 2004-2005 Strategic Plan Assessment Report.)

Campus-wide involvement remained fairly constant during each successive revisit of the Strategic Plan. A major change occurred in the 2005 revisit, with the requirement that all action plans be based on the assessment of student learning. This change was prompted by the course, program, and Support Area assessments required by the implementation of its Program Review policy, and allowed campus leaders to educate the faculty and staff on the assessment-based process for determining campus priorities. Campus-wide discussions continued and intensified during ongoing revisions of the Program Review process and the subsequent implementation of the Annual Review process in Spring 2006.

Self Evaluation
The extensive and inclusive dialogue that occurred during the creation and subsequent revisits of the Strategic Plan provided all members of the College with information on how the College would achieve its mission. These dialogues marked the beginning of an evolving process of determining priorities and assessing efforts intended for improvement. The process has changed continuously to address concerns, primarily about the lack of assessment data to support proposed action plans and the method for prioritization.

As the College’s budget from the State remained virtually static during the past five years, there was very little opportunity to fund actions that required State General funds. However, the campus was able to implement many new initiatives intended to improve student learning by the reallocation of funds or by external grants.
The *Program* and *Annual Review* (see Standard I.B.3., below) processes require broad-based collaboration among all segments of the campus. Discussions, informed by SLO assessments and an analysis of the data leading to budget prioritization, promote an understanding of how the campus intends to address its mission.

**Planning Agenda**
- The College will evaluate its *Program* and *Annual Review* processes in determining appropriate goals and objectives and make changes as needed.

---

**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.

**Descriptive Summary**
Leeward CC demonstrates an ongoing effort to improve its effectiveness through a planning process that continues to evolve in response to ongoing evaluation. In Spring 2004, *Program Review* at Leeward consisted of SLO assessments of courses, programs (AA, AS, AAS and certificates), and Support Areas.
Based on the input of a consultant, the College broadened the scope of its Program Review model beginning in Fall 2004 as shown below. The revised model expanded the scope of the review process to include the following categories:

1. Program Overview
2. Student Learning and Achievement
3. Faculty and Staff
4. Curriculum
5. Support Issues
6. External Factors

Needs and initiatives derived from the assessment and analysis of these categories were to be combined with those of all Support Areas and Units, who had also conducted similar reviews. The combined input of program and Support Area reviews was then used to arrive at a list of budget priorities.

From Fall 2004 to Summer 2005, College leadership worked to better integrate evaluation, planning, and improvement, resulting in the Annual Review process. Intended to provide the College with a comprehensive planning process, Annual Review focuses on the analysis of data provided by the Program Reviews of student learning and institutional effectiveness from all Units within the College. In August 2005, the Chancellor presented a template for the process the Administrative Staff, the Assessment Team, participants in the College’s Leadership Retreat, and the campus as a whole at Convocation.
As the Annual Review Division Template and diagram on the following page show, the Divisions use the tool as a planning document for focused discussions. These discussions (1) occur in the same categories as the overall Program Review model; (2) have guiding questions that connect assessment with standards of good practice; (3) are filtered through a Strengths, Weaknesses, Opportunities, and Threats (SWOT) lens; (4) insist on the usage of SLO data and assessments, and (5) result in budget lists that are derived from dialogue among faculty, staff, and administrators. Together, the goal of the Program and Annual Review processes is the integration of assessment, planning, and budgeting as evidenced by the College’s 2007-2009 Biennium Budget proposal (See College Plan, page 462).

Self Evaluation

Many members of the faculty and staff are in the process of adapting to a change from past practices. As the Program and Annual Review processes are relatively new, a number of weaknesses must be addressed. These include the lack of student achievement data that directly correlates with student learning outcome assessments, continued professional development support for those involved in assessments, and timely dissemination of information that is used for the development of each Division/Unit’s planning list. However, these weaknesses will be addressed as the College continues to refine its assessment efforts. The campus response after its first experience with Annual Review has been positive as indicated by the result of an online survey.

The online survey was administered to faculty and staff from May 3–10, 2006, to help evaluate the new planning process. The survey utilized five Likert-scale response statements and two write-in comment questions. Seventy-nine respondents participated. The write in comments are being used to improve both the process and the forms.

An analysis of the survey shows a very positive response to the new process. Of the respondents, 75% agreed or strongly agreed that the new process was an improvement over previous methods, while only 8% disagreed or strongly disagreed. The statistical response to the statement, “The new process expands the sphere of involvement,” showed 75% agreeing or strongly agreeing and only 8% disagreeing or strongly disagreeing. (See detailed charts in theme Appendix A).

Recurring items in the write in comments included the need for more time for the process and requests for a simpler, shorter form for the Annual Review. Changes are being made to increase the time for completion and to simplify the form.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>New planning process:</th>
<th>Strongly Agree/Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree/Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Improvement over previous methods</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expands sphere of involvement</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Student Learning and Achievement**

Describe major actions taken as a result of assessments. (IIA.2.e, f) What has been learned from assessments? What plans are there for changes in the future?

What evidence do you have that students actually are achieving your stated learning outcomes?

Discuss the success of your students when they transfer and the degree to which your division is meeting the learning and employment needs of students (IIA.1a, b).

Discuss how the division approaches class scheduling to meet student needs and the level of student demand for course offerings. (IIA1a, b)

---

### ANNUAL REVIEW

Institutional Research Data and Assessment Data provided

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Student Learning</th>
<th>Faculty and Staff</th>
<th>Curriculum</th>
<th>Support Issues</th>
<th>External Factors</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Strengths</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Weaknesses</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Opportunities</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Threats</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

**PLANNING LISTS**

- Academic Plan
- Student Services Plan
- Academic Support Plan
- Institutional Support Plan
- College Plan
The second phase of the Annual Review process focuses on the continued assessment and refinement of planning and budgeting activities. To involve more of a cross section of the campus, the second phase calls for the creation of Phase II committees that focus on areas such as: Space Allocation and Use, Staffing, Information Technology, External Issues, and Equipment.

These committees will consider the planning lists resulting from Program Reviews and will recommend priorities, based on their area of expertise. The prioritized lists will be submitted to the Executive Planning Committee, composed of the Faculty Senate and Campus Council Executive Committees, the Deans of Arts and Sciences, Career and Technical Education, and Academic Support, and the Director of Administrative Services and Vice Chancellor.

**Planning Agenda**

- The College will evaluate its Program and Annual Review processes to determine their effect in supporting the achievement of its stated goals and make changes as needed.

**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.

**Descriptive Summary**

The Strategic Plan 2002-2010 states the goals and objectives of the College and serves as the catalyst for the creation of measurable action plans from the entire campus. The results of these plans have been reported annually since 2003 in the Strategic Plan Assessment Report for 2002-2003, 2003-2004, and 2004-2005. With the initiation of Program Review in 2003, the outcomes of program and area assessments were reported to the campus via a Report on Program Review and Support Area Reviews (September 2004, www.lcc.hawaii.edu/docs) provided by the College’s Institutional Research Officer, and the Assessment Analysis Report, 2004 by members of the Assessment Analysis Team. Assessment templates completed by programs and Support Areas are currently posted on the College’s website. (http://documents.leeward.hawaii.edu:8080/docushare/dsweb/View/Collection-14)
Each annual revisit of the Strategic Plan provided all members of the campus an opportunity to propose initiatives for the improvement of the College’s efforts to meet the needs of its students and community. The assessments of courses, programs, and Support Areas prompted by the Policy on Program Reviews gained increased significance with the stipulation, in the 2005 revisit, that all action plans be based on the assessment of student learning. This requirement moved the College closer to the goal of assessment-based budgeting and allocations of funds to support student learning. The implementation of the Annual Review process in Spring 2006 is an attempt to realize this goal.

The College believes in shared governance and all decisions that have campus-wide impact are made in the consultation with the Campus Council and Faculty Senate. Together, these governance organizations represent every segment of the campus, ensure that planning and resource allocation are broad-based, and provide an additional source of oversight in the decision-making process.

The process described above has resulted in a number of changes for improvement including those listed below.

- The request for and approval of the Director of Planning, Policy and Assessment (DPPA) position. The director and his staff will be responsible for ensuring that the results of assessment are integrated into the College’s Strategic Plan and its budget priorities.
- A reallocation of a percentage of its yearly budget to provide support for instructors and staff engaged in SLO assessments and to ensure measurable improvements in student learning.
- Approval and funding the College’s Associate in Arts Teaching degree, including an Instructional Developer.
- The 2007–09 Biennium Budget proposal was based entirely on the College Plan, the compilation of data-driven requests based on Annual Reviews.

Self Evaluation
Since the adoption of its Strategic Plan, the College has demonstrated an ongoing effort to improve upon its planning, budgeting, and resource allocation processes. These are intended to provide multiple pathways for input for every member of the campus. The processes have evolved as a result of continuous re-assessments that have pointed out parts in need of change. The implementation of the Program and Annual Review processes are intended to improve these past practices. Program Review provides the College with assessment data on the impact of its courses, programs, and Support Areas on student learning. The Annual Review process is intended to provide a rational planning process based on assessment results from every Division/Area in the College. The Annual Review prompts extensive discussions within, and among, Units and is intended to be a transparent and collegial process, resulting in a College Plan that guides decision-making and budgeting process.

Planning Agenda
- As with previous prioritizing process, the Annual Review process will be assessed and changes for improvement made as needed.
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.

Descriptive Summary
Rising costs and a flat budget during the past decade have challenged the College to constantly evaluate and improve its planning and budgeting processes.

The institution has responded in several ways. Annual revisits of its Strategic Plan are followed by an evaluation of the process, resulting in improvement in each subsequent revision. The need to improve the College’s courses, programs, and services resulted in the current Annual Review process. The ongoing analysis of student achievement and demographic data that is provided by its Institutional Research Officer provides the campus with qualitative and quantitative information on socioeconomic trends and student achievement. The need for more data concerning student achievement has prompted a collaborative effort involving institutional researchers from each campus to access additional information housed in the UH Banner System, which stores comprehensive records of all students within the University System.

In addition to assessing academic performance via student learning outcomes, the College’s review of degree programs includes an assessment of trends in the academic fields, facility needs, community issues, student transfer rates, student needs assessment, staffing levels, professional development, and other indicators that provide a comprehensive picture of the performance and the needs of our degree programs.

Self Evaluation
Ongoing changes in the College’s planning and allocation processes have resulted in a number of changes for improvement in addressing the learning needs of its students, as described in Standard I.B.4. The limited success of the College’s planning and budgeting process prompted the ongoing changes, leading to the current combination of Program and Annual Review.

As these processes have just been implemented, the College has just begun to evaluate their effectiveness. However, the College community is beginning to accept these changes and is moving toward a planning and budgeting cycle based on a systematic assessment of its efforts.

Planning Agenda
• The College will evaluate the effectiveness of its Program and Annual Review processes and makes changes for improvement.

(Appendix B on page 186 illustrates the components of the AA Program Review: institutional research data, program SLO assessments, and Division reviews.)
I.B.7  The institution assesses its evaluation mechanisms through a systematic review of their effectiveness in improving instructional programs, student support services, and library and other learning support services.

Descriptive Summary

Leeward CC initiated a regular and systematic assessment of student learning outcomes (SLOs) in all of its courses, degree programs, and Support Areas with the implementation of the policies on Curriculum Revision and Review and Program Reviews. (http://home.lcc.hawaii.edu/docs/policies/).

The Policy on Curriculum Revision and Review mandates a six-year cycle for evaluation of all courses by faculty. With the assistance of the Course Assessment Coordinator, faculty identify the SLOs to be assessed, develop the assessment instruments, collect data, and develop a plan to improve student achievement of the SLO during the first phase of assessment. In the second phase, plans for improvement are implemented and data is analyzed, and results are reported, including an evaluation of the process. At the completion of the second phase, faculty continue their efforts with other course SLOs, in an ongoing cycle of evaluation, planning, and improvement. The results of course SLO assessments are currently available from the Course Assessment Coordinator and will be available for review on Curriculum Central (http://emedia.leeward.hawaii.edu/central ) during the 2006-2007 academic year.

The Policy on Program Reviews (rev. 2005) outlines the process for assessing the effectiveness of instructional programs and all Units within its student support services. At Leeward CC, programs are defined and identified as “instructional degrees and certificates” and include the following:

• Associate in Arts (AA) Degree, including Academic Subject Certificates
• Associate in Science (AS) Degree including certificates
• Associate in Applied Science (AAS) Degree
• Office of Continuing Education and Workforce Development (OCEWD)

Assessments in the AS and AAS areas focused on selected program SLOs. The AA degree assessment focused on how well students meet the General Education core requirements. For the AA degree, six committees were formed and given the task of assessing the general education SLOs within the following areas: abstract thinking, critical thinking, information retrieval and technology, oral communication, written communication and quantitative reasoning. The results of the committees’ efforts may be found at http://documents.leeward.hawaii.edu:8080/docushare/dsweb/View/Collection-14 and at http://emedia.leeward.hawaii.edu/cs/ProgReview/.

Additional information is provided in the response to Standard II.A.1.c. of this theme.

The Policy on Program Reviews also mandates systematic reviews of the effectiveness, on an annual basis, of the following Support Areas: Student Services; Academic Support, and Administrative Services, conduct. Most Units within each of these Areas have completed one round of assessment, analyzed their efforts, and have made plans for needed improvements. The results of their efforts may be found at http://documents.leeward.hawaii.edu:8080/docushare/dsweb/View/Collection-14.
Additional information is also provided in the Student Learning Outcomes Theme response to Standard II.B. (See SLO Standard II.B.1, II.B.3.c, II.C.2.)

Program Review at Leeward also involves the collection and analysis of other data that significantly impact student learning and institutional effectiveness that were described in Standard I.B.3. and I.B.6. Career and Technical Education (CTE) programs use the Perkins Vocational Educational (insert official title) Program Health Indicator (PHI) Report to identify the programs and areas in which students are under-performing and to make improvements. These initiatives are funded to target success measures such as graduation rate and employment. The initiatives and improvement strategies are revisited annually with the renewal of the Perkins grant.

To assess the College's noncredit offerings, the Office of Continuing Education and Workforce Development (OCEWD) uses student evaluations for noncredit course content, delivery, and student learning objectives. The results help identify areas needing improvement or changes. Instructors also evaluate the relevancy of the course(s) they teach from an industry perspective.

Another source of information that provides the College with information on its effectiveness is the Community College Survey of Student Engagement that is administered by the Institutional Researcher. The results of the latest assessment were published online in November 2005 at http://documents.leeward.hawaii.edu:8080/docushare/dsweb/Get/Document-431/Reports.htm.

Self Evaluation

The second cycle of assessment of program student learning outcomes used new templates developed to improve the assessment process and reflect the revised Policy on Program Reviews (rev. 2005). This information is currently available for review on Leeward's DocuShare site at http://documents.leeward.hawaii.edu:8080/docushare/dsweb/View/Collection-14.

The College is, for the most part, still struggling to address the question of how to assess SLOs on an ongoing basis, and the effort has been an uneven one. However, some results have been used to make changes. Two examples from course SLO assessment include the following:

- Speech 251 developed a common audience analysis form for students to complete, after initial assessment indicated only 36% of students identified/analyzed their intended listening audience. Competency level rose to 65% in the subsequent (Spring 2005) assessment of this SLO.
Accounting 201 agreed to use a common set of questions for assessing SLOs dealing with accounting concepts and payroll transactions. The first assessment indicated a 72% achievement rate. Accounting faculty met to discuss the importance of teaching the basic concepts, and requested accounting tutors from the Learning Resource Center. The second assessment in Spring 2005 indicated 75% of students met the SLOs.

While complete assessment results are available from the Course Assessment Coordinator, the College has not yet been unable to implement its plan to have complete assessment results, including changes, available on Curriculum Central. Once that is implemented, faculty will be able to see and easily discuss what other Disciplines are doing in this area, and extend successful examples of improvement into their own disciplines.

Programs have also been challenged to develop appropriate assessment tools and the results of their efforts have also been uneven. However, some progress has been made. As an example of the College's assessment of AA General Education SLOs, in Fall 2005, the Writing Assessment Committee developed an online method of writing assessment that in its first trial appeared both effective and efficient. In a Spring 2006 System meeting on program assessment, the College's online Writing Assessment Project was presented, and some of the other community colleges expressed interested in the project, even to the extent of volunteering to participate as readers for Leeward CC's next writing assessment.

The Fall 2005 Writing Assessment Project was a test of a classroom strategy introduced to address a problem with student writing that had been consistently documented in previous writing assessment: statement and development of a main idea or thesis. Some of the classes assessed (an Experimental Group) were asked to use a graphic organizer to assist students, while in other classes (Control Group) no changes were made. Use of graphic organizers proved relatively effective in helping students identify, state, and develop main ideas or theses. In the Experimental Group 57.5% of papers were rated as acceptable for second-year college writing, compared to 52% of Control Group papers. This result, if verified by a future assessment, will provide enable the Writing Assessment Committee to provide specific recommendations to the College to improve achievement of the written communication SLOs.

The implementation of the data-based Annual Review process has prompted every segment within the College to systematically gather evidence of their effectiveness to justify their needs. However, as both the Program and Annual Review processes are relatively new, there is currently a lack of evidence that can be used to unequivocally substantiate the effectiveness of the College’s programs and services. This situation will change as the campus community continues to refine its assessment efforts with continued professional development support.

**Planning Agenda**

- The College will evaluate the effectiveness of its Program and Annual Review processes and the professional development needs of faculty and staff in improving programs and services and make changes for improvement.
**Standard II: Student Learning Programs and Services**

**II.A. Instructional Programs**

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

**Descriptive Summary**

The Discipline faculty, in a process involving dialogue and consensus, primarily determine delivery and modes of instruction. Faculty assume the responsibility for determining these aspects of teaching in appropriate ways that facilitate the achievement of the student learning outcomes for the course.

A variety of core outlines across the curriculum in diverse disciplines and programs can be examined for identification of delivery and modes of instruction. Approved core course outlines can be viewed on Curriculum Central.

Generally, courses employ the following modes of instruction:

- Lecture
- Discussion
- Student group assignments
- Independent reading, research, special writing/oral assignments
- Classroom activities
- Oral/written drills
- Lab activities
- Group facilitation/presentations
- Instructor model presentations

Delivery systems include use of equipment and activities such as:

- Overhead projections
- Distance Education (including WebCT, Cable TV, and hybrid courses)
- Video
- Film
- Slides
- Power Point
- Audio-visual materials
- Hands-on demonstrations
- Workshops
- Rehearsals

As part of the course assessment process mandated in the *Policy on Curriculum Revision and Review* (2003) (http://home.lcc.hawaii.edu/docs/policies/), Discipline faculty are to indicate
the discussions that have occurred regarding the effectiveness of the methods of instruction used in the course. For courses that have completed this part of the assessment process, the information is available on the core course outline in Curriculum Central.

In addition, faculty teaching Distance Education (DE) courses were required, during the 2005-2006 academic year, to provide information as to how the specific delivery system used (WebCT, Cable TV, etc.) supports meeting the learning outcomes of the course. This information is also available in the core course outlines in Curriculum Central. Faculty who use one or more forms of Distance Education are also engaged in dialogue on the success of the delivery systems used. This dialogue takes place via email, in Distance Education meetings, and as part of the various DE workshops, including summer WebFun sessions. In summer 2006, for example, the WebFun II sessions (for more advanced WebCT users) focused on podcasting, including a pedagogical discussion on various ways this technology could be used to enhance student learning.

As a second part of course assessment, faculty are required to begin assessing course SLOs, and this data is used as a basis for evaluating the effectiveness of modes of instruction used for the course. During the 2006-2007 academic year, all SLO assessment data will be entered into Curriculum Central; it is currently (July 2006) available as a document from the Coordinator for Course SLO Assessment. In some disciplines (e.g. English, Anthropology), faculty have discussed and implemented modifications of the modes of instruction to better facilitate student mastery of SLOs. General Education SLO assessment of written communication has also indicated that teaching the use of a graphic organizer is more helpful to our students than the traditional written, linear outline. A complete description of this assessment, and how it can be used to improve student achievement of General Education SLOs, is found in Standard II.A.1.c.

Divisions, as part of the Annual Review process, have started (Spring 2006) to use the data from course SLO assessment to evaluate the effectiveness of the various delivery systems and modes of instruction as they pertain to Division priorities and the College’s mission. In part, Divisions are basing budget requests for 2006-2007 on course SLO assessment results.

Self Evaluation:
Faculty receive feedback regarding the effectiveness of their delivery methods/modes of instruction through peer evaluations, in which evaluators are asked to comment on “techniques and methods used to present subject matter (innovative, imaginative, versatile, interesting).” Faculty members and their evaluators often engage in discussions of teaching effectiveness after class visits, and improvements are made as needed. Students also complete course evaluations that provide feedback for improvement.

Faculty are beginning to use SLO achievement data to assess the appropriateness of modes of instruction and delivery systems. By 2009, all courses should will completed the course assessment process. As data becomes available, and as it is incorporated into Division Annual Reviews, the College will be better able to determine the effectiveness of its delivery systems and modes of instructions in meeting the objectives of the curriculum and the needs of the students.
The results of the available summaries of the first Annual Review (Curriculum) indicate that some Disciplines have indeed used SLO assessment to modify their modes of instruction. The assessment process should also provide data on the academic success of students in one mode of instruction/delivery system versus another mode/delivery system, as is currently the case with the written communication assessments, described in detail in Standard II.A.1.c below. The new Program and Annual Review processes are designed to allow for and encourage these kinds of assessments and observations.

Planning Agenda
• The College will continue to collect and analyze data on student achievement of SLOs and make changes as needed to insure that its delivery systems and modes of instruction are appropriate and effective.

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.

Descriptive Summary
Student learning outcomes for courses are established and measured by the Discipline faculty, placing responsibility entirely on the expertise of these faculty. Generally, faculty align their student learning outcomes with similar level courses taught at four-year institutions, other community colleges, and guidelines established by professional organizations. In addition, for courses that are part of a Career and Technical Education (CTE) program, community advisory committees may also assist in the development of course SLOs. The student learning outcomes for each course can be found in the core course outlines, available on Curriculum Central (http://emedia.leeward.hawaii.edu/central/), and on the instructor’s course syllabi.

All credit courses are reviewed on a regular six-year review cycle established by the March 2003 Policy on Curriculum Revision and Review (http://home.lcc.hawaii.edu/docs/policies/). As a course comes up for review, Discipline faculty are required to begin the process of course SLO assessment. These assessments began in Spring 2005 and are still in their early stages; however, faculty have started to make changes to their courses based on the assessments. This data is available through the Course Assessment Coordinator, and some of this information is also contained in the Spring 2006 Annual Reviews for the Arts and Humanities, Social Sciences, Math and Sciences, Language Arts, Business, and Vocational Technical Divisions. (Currently the 2006 Division Annual Reviews are available as documents but are not accessible online.)

All Leeward Community College degree and certificate programs have student learning outcomes established by faculty, assisted by professional organizational standards and by local advisory committees. The student learning outcomes for all programs can be found as part of the program descriptions in the 2005-2006 Catalog, pages 30-63.

The College’s Policy on Program Reviews, (2003, revised 2005) both defines programs and mandates the review of their student learning outcomes. Programs are defined and identified as “instructional degrees and certificates” and include the following:
Programs
(agreed upon by the Faculty Senate, Campus Council, and Administration) are as follows:

- Associate in Arts Degree
  (Academic Subject Certificates* reviewed with the AA Degree)
  AA Degree Program Student Learning Outcomes:
  Abstract Thinking
  Critical Thinking
  Information Retrieval & Technology
  Oral Communication
  Quantitative Reasoning
  Written Communication

- Associate in Science Degree
  (Substance Abuse Counseling Certificate reviewed with the AS Degrees)
  Accounting
  Business Technology
  (Business Foundations Certificate reviewed with the Bus Tech AS Degree)
  Digital Media
  Information and Computer Science
  Television Production

- Associate in Applied Science Degree
  Automotive Technology
  Food Service
  Supervisory Management
  (E-Commerce Certificates reviewed with the Superv Management AAS Degree)

- Office of Continuing Education and Workforce Development (OCEWD)

The new Associate of Arts in Teaching (AAT) Program will be added to this list.

*Academic Subject Certificates and certificates of 12 credits or fewer will be reviewed via course assessment and student achievement data.

The first cycle of program review under the 2003 policy, including the review of the AA degree general education SLOs, took place in 2004. A summary of results was published in the Report on Program Reviews and Support Area Reviews, September 2004 (Rossi) and for most programs, assessed results are available online on the DocuShare website, http://documents.leeward.hawaii.edu:8080/docushare/dsweb/View/Collection-14
The second cycle of assessment of program student learning outcomes used new templates developed to improve the assessment process and reflect the revised Policy on Program Reviews (rev. 2005). This information is currently available for review on Leeward’s DocuShare site at http://documents.leeward.hawaii.edu:8080/docushare/dsweb/View/Collection-14

Both cycles of Program Review include specific action plans that require program coordinators to answer the question “What changes do you propose to improve student learning (for the student learning outcomes assessed)….” If the proposed action has a budgetary impact, then the budget request is considered for inclusion in the annual budget planning as shown in the diagram below, which reflects the integration of the cycle of assessment, evaluation, and planning.

![Integration of Assessment, Evaluation and Planning Cycles](image)

Writing communication is one of the six broad areas in General Education for the Associate of Arts degree, and provides an excellent example of how the College uses the above cycle of evaluation, planning, implementation, and re-evaluation. The assessment of SLOs in written communication has been ongoing since 1999, and the College has struggled to create an appropriate rubric and a workable process. The co-coordinators for written communication assessment (a sociology faculty member and the College’s Information Technology (IT) specialist) recently designed an online assessment process that has proven very effective in the Fall 2005 assessment of selected SLOs. The SLOs assessed under written communication include the following:
“5. Express a main idea as a thesis, hypothesis, or other appropriate statement.

6. Develop a main idea clearly and concisely with appropriate content.” (Leeward CC 2005–2006 Catalog, p.61)

Previous assessment had indicated that a significant number of students, in a sample taken mostly from writing intensive classes, failed to achieve both these SLOs. The Fall 2005 assessment was used to test a solution to improve student achievement. For half the classes assessed (the experimental group), instructors presented a graphic outline method for students to use in organizing their paper. In the remaining classes (the control group), instructors presented the more traditional written, linear outline as the method to organize papers. The results are illustrated in the table below, with a Yes rating indicating that at least two of the three faculty/staff readers of the paper rated it as satisfactory in meeting the stated SLO.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Total Number Of Papers</th>
<th>Percentage Rated Yes for SLO #5</th>
<th>Percentage Rated Yes for SLO #6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Control Group</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>56%</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Experimental Group</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>72.5%</td>
<td>57.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Combined</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>63.33%</td>
<td>53.33%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Ida Yoshinaga and Therese Nakadomari: Short Data Report of Writing Assessment Project Online, Fall 2005. (3/31/06) The Information is also available in the Annual Review for Written Communication.

Based on one semester of evaluation, the use of a graphic organizer clearly improves student writing. The co-coordinators of written communication assessment plan to validate the above results using papers collected in Spring 2006, again from two types of classes, one using the experimental approach and the other the traditional approach. If the results are validated, the College will develop a plan to improve student writing across the curriculum via the use of graphic organizers. While at this point the assessment planning agendas are incomplete, evaluation will lead to a specific college-wide plan to improve student writing.

**Self Evaluation**

The College has a thorough and complete process in place for evaluating course and program SLOs, including General Education SLOs. The assessment process is the centerpiece for the revised Program Review process, and therefore the campus is waiting to see the results of this year’s process. The practice of using course and program SLO assessment results to make improvements is still evolving, in part due to lack of data. Only some of the course and program SLOs have been assessed at this point, but already the information is being used to guide budget prioritization and to improve student learning. As the practice continues and more program and course SLO assessments are incorporated into Annual Reviews, the College’s will have a data-based, rational, and collegial planning process designed to improve student learning.
Planning Agenda

- The campus’ Executive Planning Committee and the Assessment Team will evaluate the Annual Review process used this academic year to determine to what extent assessment was used to make decisions. These groups will also assess the degree to which data is being housed in a manner that makes decision making transparent.

II.A.2 The institution assures the quality and improvement of all instructional courses and programs offered in the name of the institution, including collegiate, developmental, and pre-collegiate courses and programs continuing and community education, study abroad, short-term training courses and programs, programs for international students, and contract or other special programs, regardless of type of credit awarded, delivery mode, or location.

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.

Descriptive Summary

The College offers collegiate programs in Liberal Arts and in various Career and Technical Education areas, as well as courses in developmental education. Collegiate programs are listed in the Leeward CC 2005–2006 Catalog on page 15 and described in subsequent pages. The needs of international students are served by the English Language Institute within the Language Arts Division, rather than by a separate program. Non-credit, short-term training and study abroad program are under the Office of Continuing Education & Workforce Development (OCEWD), with information on specific courses available on the OCEWD website (http://www.lcc.hawaii.edu/ocewd/).

Credit courses campus-wide are developed by an instructor/faculty member in a process that includes consultation by Discipline peers. Faculty members within each Discipline meet to agree on the student learning outcomes for each course, based on outcomes from other schools for similar courses, as well as comparisons to industry and/or national standards (especially for Career and Technical programs). The instructor then inputs the proposal into Curriculum Central, where it must receive approval from the following:

- Division and Division Chair
- Subcommittee of the Curriculum Committee
- Entire Curriculum Committee
- Faculty Senate
- Dean and Chancellor

All approved credit courses can be found on Curriculum Central.
All new programs must go through an “authorization to plan” procedure to justify its need and viability. This process includes an in-depth study of the new program to be offered and an approval process involving the respective Division, Curriculum Committee, Chancellor, and Board of Regents. The Board of Regents must approve all credit courses, regardless of type of credit awarded, delivery mode, or location, including associate degrees and certificates of achievement.

These procedures and policies ensure that courses and/or programs that are proposed are heavily scrutinized at all levels before approvals are given. Templates for program proposal can be found on Curriculum Central. The College plans to have all program proposals, including revisions resulting from review and assessment, available on Curriculum Central; currently, however, only very recent program modification proposals, as well as the 2006 AS program in Digital Media Production, are available on Curriculum Central.

The College uses its policies on Curriculum Review and Program Review (http://home.lcc.hawaii.edu/docs/policies/) to evaluate its existing courses and programs. These policies were developed to ensure that all of the instructional courses and programs are of high quality.

The purpose of the Policy on Curriculum Revision and Review (2003) is to assure academic rigor and integrity in all courses, and the continued appropriateness of content, instructional methods, course activities and objectives, and student learning outcomes.

Each Academic Division is responsible for determining which courses are reviewed each year, so long as all courses are reviewed over a six-year cycle. Each discipline reviews its own courses, ensuring the accuracy of the core outlines, their academic rigor, integrity, currency, and the continued articulation of the courses with system colleges, should that be the case. As part of the course review process, discipline faculty are required to answer three questions that were added to core course outlines in the 2004-2005 academic year, addressing sequencing, depth, breadth, rigor, and appropriateness of modes of instruction. The modified core course outline must be approved at the Division level, and is then sent to the Curriculum Committee for review. The discipline representative may be present at the Curriculum Committee meeting to present the rationale, etc., for the changes. Upon approval by the Curriculum Committee, the course review and new core outline must be approved by the Faculty Senate, as well as the Dean of Arts and Sciences or Career and Technical Education as appropriate.

Once approved, the core course outline contains standard information that becomes the first page(s) of each course syllabus to ensure that course alpha and number, title, credits, prerequisites, description, goals, and student learning outcomes are presented uniformly regardless of the instructor. Also on the first page(s) of an instructor's course syllabus are the fields for the instructor's personalized information: name, office, office hours, phone number, email address, course section number, classroom, course meeting days and times, and requisite textbooks and supplies. Additional pages of the syllabus reflect the individuality, style, and creativity of the instructor. Each Discipline/Division compares the core outlines of the revised courses with the individual syllabi of the faculty within the current semester. If the syllabi do not reflect the required elements of the core outline, the discipline, along with the division chair, works with the faculty to correct the discrepancies within the current semester.
At the same time each course comes up for review, faculty begin the assessment of the course SLOs. With the assistance of the Course Assessment Coordinator, Discipline faculty develop assessment instruments, collect data, develop a plan to improve student achievement of the SLO, implement the plan, and then reassess. As mentioned earlier, results of ongoing course SLO assessment will be entered into Curriculum Central in the 2006-2007 academic year; currently they are available from the Course Assessment Coordinator.

The Policy on Program Reviews (rev. 2005) provides the College with a formal and systematic method for obtaining valuable feedback that is instrumental in the decision-making process for all academic programs and Support Areas. Program Review establishes a system of continual evaluation that is integrated into the planning and budgeting cycle. Programs are directed to continually assess their SLOs.

Current Program/Support Area Assessment Templates (completed in 2005-2006) have been uploaded to the following DocuShare along with templates from the first assessment cycle (2004). Passwords are not required for viewing these templates. DocuShare: http://documents.leeward.hawaii.edu:8080/docushare/dsweb/View/Collection-14

Course and program SLO assessments provide data for the new Annual Review process, which began in the Spring of 2006. As part of this process, each Division uses the course SLO assessment data to evaluate the curriculum offered by the Division. The results of the most recent AA degree program SLO assessment and evaluation were also reported via the Annual Review process.

As stated earlier, the Assessment Team comprised of the Vice Chancellor/Chief Academic Officer (VC/CAO), the Director of Policy Planning and Assessment, the Accreditation Liaison Officer, the Institutional Researcher, a representative from the Faculty Senate, and others as selected by the VC/CAO is charged with overseeing, and ultimately evaluating, the review process for the College.

The Office of Continuing Education and Workforce Development (OCWED) is evaluated as a program under the Policy on Program Reviews (rev. 2005). All OCEWD courses come under a program coordinator who develops course SLOs in consultation with industry experts, advisory committees, and state or national certification standards for specific areas. Program coordinators and faculty via a course student evaluation conduct evaluation of OCEWD course SLOs.

**Self Evaluation**

The policies and procedures in place for course and program assessment are appropriate in design and are intended to ensure the quality of programs offered at the College. In the case of course SLO assessment, an assessment procedure has evolved that is not included in the Policy on Curriculum Revision and Review (2003). Faculty have the key role in the development and assessment of all courses and programs. However, the policies and procedures for review are new to the College and are just beginning to yield results. Not all faculty are, as yet, involved in the course SLO evaluation process, and faculty involved in both the course and program SLO evaluation process are often struggling with the question of how to evaluate SLOs. It is clear, however, that the College now has in place policies and procedures to continually evaluate its courses and programs, to make necessary changes, and to re-evaluate, based on the results. This is the critical step to insure the high quality of all courses and programs at the College.
Planning Agenda
• Faculty will develop a written policy on course SLO assessment as part of the review of the
  Curriculum Revision and Review Policy.

II.A.2.c. High-quality instruction and appropriate breadth, rigor, sequencing, time to
  completion, and synthesis of learning characterize all programs.

Descriptive Summary
Questions at the course level were added to the course proposal/modification form in
Curriculum Central to address breadth, depth, rigor, sequencing, and currency (These
edu/central/) As new courses are proposed, faculty must answer these questions.

Part of the course assessment required by the 2003 Policy on Curriculum Revision and Review
requires faculty to discuss and address these questions for each course when it is up for review.
Some form of evidence must be provided that the course has appropriate breadth, depth,
rigor, currency, and internal sequencing. Because specific courses must be taken as the core
requirement for degree programs, the programs themselves should have these same qualities.

Programs may address the questions of breadth, depth, rigor, sequencing, time to completion,
and synthesis of learning as part of the Policy on Unit/Area Program Reviews (2003, rev. 2005).
The Annual Review process, which began in Spring 2006, also requires Divisions and programs
to consider these questions, including an analysis of strengths, weaknesses, opportunities and
threats.

Other mechanisms used to ensure the quality of instruction include student evaluations,
peer evaluations, division chairperson evaluations, contract renewals, tenure and promotion
evaluations, and senior faculty evaluations.

Self Evaluation
In the development and implementation of the Curriculum Revision and Review and Program
Review policies, the College has committed to assessing whether courses and programs are
of appropriate breadth, depth, rigor, and sequencing. Criteria that programs use include
commonality with similar courses around the state or country, industry standards, and
certification standards. The words rigor, breadth, etc. are not used in the College’s Policy on
Program Reviews (2005), but they should be specifically stated so that faculty do not fail to
address all of these issues. Since much of the program and course review process has just been
implemented, it is difficult at this time to assess improvement in student learning that has
occurred as a result of these policies.

Planning Agenda
• The College will revise the Policy on Program Reviews to specifically require analysis of appropriate
  breadth, depth, rigor, and sequencing as part of the program review process.
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.

**Descriptive Summary**

Evaluation and review of College courses is covered by the *Policy on Curriculum Revision and Review* (2003). This course assessment process follows a 6-year cycle that would have begun in Spring 2004 and been completed by Fall 2009. However, course assessment did not actually start until Spring 2005. The delay was needed to clarify definitions and requirements of the process; as a result of this delay, programs/disciplines had to play catch-up to meet the proposed 6-year cycle.

The review and assessment process involves the following steps:

1) Disciplines compare core outlines with individual syllabi to make sure that required elements of the core outline (including SLOs) are included and that essential elements are standardized. Course content and SLOs are reviewed by the discipline for relevance and appropriateness, as well as depth, breadth, rigor and currency.

2) Course Modification Procedure in Curriculum Central: The discipline or program reviews core outlines and answers assessment questions regarding depth, breadth, rigor, relevancy, and currency (#8, 13, 16, and 27).

3) Assessment of course SLOs (at least 2 per course)--Phase 1 (Planning stage). After submitting a course assessment plan to the Assessment Team, the proposer receives feedback, as needed, regarding the appropriateness of the assessment tool. Then, after carrying through on the assessment, the proposer and colleagues complete Phase 1 by analyzing the SLO assessment data.

4) Reporting on results [Phase 2 (action plans)]. The proposer and colleagues make course changes based on the information gathered in Phase 1. Data is collected and analyzed again to measure changes in student learning.

5) Course Assessment data from Phase 1 and 2 is collected by the Course Assessment Coordinator and will be transferred into Curriculum Central, under SLO Assessment, in the 2006-2007 academic year.

Divisions use data from the assessment of course SLOs as part of the new *Annual Review* process. As faculty provide evidence that specific changes are needed to improve SLO achievement, any requirements (including budget items) needed to implement these changes can be included in the Division's plans and statement of needs.

Assessment of degree programs is based on the *Policy on Program Reviews* (rev. 2005), which calls for ongoing SLO data collection and review to “provide evidence that each area of the College is providing quality support of student learning and related student outcomes.” Program
faculty are required to provide examples of assessment processes that include assessment plans, data collection, data analyses, plans of action, and budget implications. In addition, programs must prepare comprehensive program reviews based on a schedule listed in the Policy. The categories covered, along with the types of data expected, are listed below, and are found on pages 4-5 of the College’s Policy on Program Reviews (2005).

- Program Overview: General Description of Program and College Mission (Do the Program objectives align or support the College Mission?)
- Student Learning Outcomes: Program (Program/Support Area Assessment Template, Appendix C) & Course Assessment (SLO module in Curriculum Central)
- Student Achievement Data: (Demographics; Student Needs; Enrollment Data; Transfer Numbers and Efficiency; GPA; Course & Program Completion; Retention & Persistence Rates, etc.) Common data elements will be collected annually by the institutional researcher.
- Faculty and Staff: Response to Mission, Professional Development  (Faculty/Student ratios, levels of degrees, number of tenured vs. untenured and classifications)
- Curriculum: Innovations, Challenges, Issues, Trends
- Support: (Changes in technology, Library & Learning Resources, Facilities, Marketing, Equipment, and other resources such as Academic Support, Administrative Services, Student Services, and Chancellor’s Office, that are needed to improve student learning)
- External: Advisory Boards, Community Input, Job Outlooks, National Standards, Specialized Accreditation

A Program Assessment Coordinator is in charge of organizing and compiling the information obtained in the assessment of Academic Programs and Support Areas. Program/Support Area Assessment documents from the AY 04-05 (completed under the 2003 Policy on Unit/Area Program Reviews) are located on DocuShare. Assessment documents from all cycles of assessment can be viewed on the DocuShare site: http://documents.leeward.hawaii.edu:8080/docushare/dsweb/View/Collection-14.

Program and Annual Review processes make use of several kinds of data, including program and course assessment results and information on Division/Support Areas’ strengths, weaknesses, opportunities, and threats. The data obtained are used in overall College budgeting and planning, as indicated in the Program Review Model diagram on page 146.

Self Evaluation
Course Assessment has completed its first year of the process, and Disciplines and/or programs have a better understanding of the components in the process. By the end of the Spring 2006 semester, 161 courses were to have completed the course review process (including approval by the Curriculum Committee of changes in the core course outline) and were also to have started
SLO assessment. At least 126 courses (78%) began the core course outline review, though only 70 courses (43%) were able to gain Curriculum Committee approval for the changes. Of those 126 courses, 91, or 56% of those scheduled, submitted the first phase of SLO assessment; 28 courses (17%) submitted information indicating that improvements had been made and reassessing was in progress. Hopefully with the experience gained, more progress can be made in the coming year to meet the required schedules so that all courses will have been reviewed, and be involved in course SLO assessment, by 2009.

In the first Division Annual Review (Spring 2006), most Divisions discussed courses that have modified teaching methodologies as a result of assessment. These include courses in history, philosophy, psychology, anthropology, economics, foreign languages, English, and Information and Computer Science (ICS). In many cases, a follow-up assessment had not been done as yet to evaluate the success of the changes. However, the cycle of evaluation and improvement, followed by re-evaluation, has clearly begun.

Program reviews and assessment of SLOs, including the General Education SLOs, are also just beginning and are incomplete. In addition to the accomplishments of the written communication SLO assessment (discussed in II.A.1.c above), other programs have made changes and improvements in response to assessment. For example, the Accounting program has developed a plan to emphasize basic techniques in the classroom, and to utilize accounting tutors very early in the semester for students who appear to have trouble. Improvement as a result of this change is still being assessed. Further examples can be found on the DocuShare website cited above.

Planning Agenda

• The Executive Planning Committee and the Assessment Team will evaluate this year’s process to assess the quality and usefulness of the process and the data collected.

• Course assessment policies and procedures will be documented in the revised Policy on Curriculum Revision and Review.

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.

Descriptive Summary

The College now has policies in place mandating the ongoing, systematic evaluation of course and program student learning outcomes. Courses are evaluated via the March 2003 Policy on Curriculum Revision and Review. (http://home.lcc.hawaii.edu/docs/policies/). As courses come up for evaluation during the six-year cycle, the Discipline is required to discuss and answer questions regarding currency (as well as depth, breadth, rigor and sequencing), and are also required to begin assessing course SLOs. Course SLO assessment data are available from the Course Assessment Coordinator, and will be available via Curriculum Central sometime in the 2006-2007 academic year. All courses will have completed their first cycle of review and
assessment by Fall 2009. Available course SLO assessment data was used by Divisions in Spring 2006 as part of the Annual Review process, part of the College’s integrated planning cycle.

Program SLO evaluation is required by the College’s Program Review Policy (rev. 2005). In this Policy, program coordinators are to be continually involved in SLO assessment. Results from the most recent cycle of Program Review can be found at http://emedia.leeward.hawaii.edu/cs/ProgReview. Completed assessment templates can be viewed at http://documents.leeward.hawaii.edu:8080/docushare/dsweb/View/Collection-14

The information gathered at the course and program levels are collected and reviewed annually. Results of assessments determine priorities that are part of the Annual Review.

Self Evaluation
Course Assessment has completed its first cycle, and Divisions now have a better understanding of the components of the process. Program/Support Area Assessments have also completed at least a year’s cycle, and results have been included in the Annual Review process. The College has committed to an integrated approach where assessment and other elements of review are linked directly to the budgeting and planning process.

While most Program Review information is available on the DocuShare site, Division Annual Reviews were inconsistent in approach and evidence was posted only briefly for the campus to view. The information is available in hard copy format but is not widely available. While information from the Annual Review was used to develop the supplementary budget request and the 2007-2009 biennium budget, the budget process has not been as transparent as intended. Although a review of the first years’ process will be reported to the campus by Fall 2006, improvement is needed in making all information widely available, so that all can see the tie between assessment, planning, and budget requests and allocation.

Planning Agenda
• The Executive Planning Committee and the Assessment Team will review results to insure that quality data has emerged from assessment processes, that changes were instituted, and that budget items were put forward as a result. All information and any modifications will be provided to the campus in a timely manner.

• The College will clarify the role of the Director of Planning, Policy, and Assessment, including his role in collecting data on course and program assessments and improvements made. This assessment information will be made available to all faculty, staff, and administrators, with summaries/interpretations provided, and will be used in subsequent Program and Annual Reviews and revisits of the Strategic Plan.
II.A.2.g. If an institution uses departmental course and/or program examinations, it validates their effectiveness in measuring student learning and minimizes test biases.

**Descriptive Summary**

Some programs require certification upon completion of the program, but the exam(s) may or may not be given at Leeward Community College. Programs that require a certification exam are listed below:

- **Food Services**: Three certification exams are given by the program. The exams are created, disseminated, and graded by the National Restaurant Association. Leeward’s Food Services faculty members are responsible for proctoring the exams. These exams are given at the end of FSER 21 – Food Service Sanitation, FSER 41 – Dining Room & Beverage Operations, and FSER 74 – Food Service Supervision. All validation is done by the national organization. See [http://www.nraef.org/faq/faq_exams.asp?flag=lcd&level1_id=6&level2_id=4](http://www.nraef.org/faq/faq_exams.asp?flag=lcd&level1_id=6&level2_id=4) for more information.

- **Digital Media**: The Digital Media Program at Leeward prepares students for two certifications: Web Technician and Web Master. These certifications are offered by the National Association of Communication Systems Engineers (NACSE). As these exams are given off-site by NACSE, all validation is done by this national organization. See [http://www.nacse.com/Certifications/Default.aspx](http://www.nacse.com/Certifications/Default.aspx) for more information.

- **Information & Computer Sciences**: There are national exams that students can take at the end of two networking certificates of completion programs: 1). NANS (NACSE Associate Network Specialist) and 2). NSNS (NACSE Senior Network Specialist). The exams are taken voluntarily if the student wants the certification. Currently all military students take these tests and about a third of their regular students take these. The exams are developed by a national board and are not vendor specific. See [http://www.nacse.com/Certifications/Default.aspx](http://www.nacse.com/Certifications/Default.aspx) for more information.

- **The Automotive Technology is certified by the National Institute for Automotive Service Excellence (ASE) under the National Automotive Technicians Education Foundation (NATEF)**. NATEF was founded in 1983 as an independent, non-profit organization with a single mission: To evaluate technician training programs against standards developed by the automotive industry and recommend qualifying programs for certification (accreditation) by ASE, the National Institute for Automotive Service Excellence. Programs can earn ASE certification upon the recommendation of NATEF. Students from programs certified by ASE scored significantly higher on a standardized test of knowledge of automotive repair than students from similar non-certified programs. Leeward has two Master NATEF/ASE certified programs offering an AAS Degree. See [http://www.natef.org/about/achieving_ase_cert.cfm](http://www.natef.org/about/achieving_ase_cert.cfm) for more information.
There are two other types of exams that do not fall under the certification area. The ICS department assesses all of its ICS 100, ICS 101 and ICS 184 classes with an anonymous course exam. This exam is used for course assessment purposes only. The ICS department uses questions provided by the national certification board and faculty input. Entire classes are randomly selected from all sections to take the assessment. Someone other than the instructor gives the assessment. The course exam has been shown to be valid using statistical results each semester. There is also an expectation that students perform at or above 70% competency.

Self Evaluation
Departmental and/or course exams given at Leeward rely on national standards for validation and minimizing of test biases. This seems to be an appropriate method for ensuring effectiveness of departmental and/or course exams.

Planning Agenda
• No changes are needed to address this standard.

II.A.2.i. The institution awards degrees and certificates based on student achievement of a program’s stated learning outcomes.

Descriptive Summary
Leeward Community College currently awards degrees and certificates to students who have earned credits by satisfactorily passing required courses for the degree or certificate.

All Leeward programs have stated learning outcomes developed by program faculty. In the case of Career and Technical (CTE) programs, advisory committees have assisted in the development of program SLOs. Required courses for the program are designed to insure that a student completing the required courses for the program will have also completed the stated learning outcomes for the program.

The College is working to establish the extent to which our graduates meet the stated learning outcomes for their degree/certificate programs. The Policy on Program Reviews (rev. 2005) requires program coordinators to engage in ongoing program learning outcome assessment and to create action plans based on this assessment. This includes coordinators for each of the General Education outcomes for the Associate of Arts degree.

At least some portion of each General Education outcome for the AA degree has been assessed once, and a few, such as the written communication outcome, have had several cycles of assessment. The AA degree is in the process of establishing a Curriculum Grid, where all courses meeting AA degree requirements will be evaluated as to which general learning outcomes are addressed in the course, and at what level they are addressed. Twenty-one courses have been identified as those most commonly taken by our AA graduates. By the end of May 2006, faculty teaching those courses will have identified which General Education outcomes are met by the course, how they are met, and at what level (Introductory, Practiced, or Demonstrated) they are met. Eventually, the grid should contain all courses meeting AA degree requirements.
Self Evaluation
Assessment of program graduates in terms of SLO achievement has been done in cases where national certification standards or state testing standards are required, as in certain Career and Technical programs. Other degrees and certificates have been awarded to students who have earned credits by passing courses at a satisfactory level. There has been an assumption that students have met the program SLOs if they have passed the required courses for that degree or certificate. The continued assessment of program SLOs will hopefully validate that assumption. The establishment of a Curriculum Grid for the AA degree is a good first step toward verifying that the AA degree SLOs are indeed met by the series of courses required for the degree.

As more program student learning outcomes are assessed, the College will also have more available data as to the extent to which program graduates achieve the program SLOs.

Planning Agenda
• The College will develop a plan to assess the extent to which graduates achieve program SLOs.

• The Curriculum Grid will be extended to include all courses that satisfy the AA General Education core.
II.B: Student Support Services

II.B.3. The institution researches and identifies the learning support needs of its student population and provides appropriate services and programs to address those needs.

Student Support Services has been engaged in ongoing evaluation, planning, and improvement since 2003. Units within Student Services have, or are in the process of, developing and assessing student learning outcomes; some Units, like Admissions and Records, Counseling and Advising, and Financial Aid, have implemented changes as a result of the SLO assessments. Specific examples of the cycle of evaluation, planning, and improvement are presented below.

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.

Descriptive Summary

Leeward CC’s Student Services include Admissions and Records, Counseling and Advising, Financial Aid, Career Development/Job Prep Services, Campus Health Center, and Student Activities. Services are provided at the main campus and the Leeward CC-Wai’anae satellite campus, as follows:

As the Admissions and Records Office works with new, returning, and transfer students throughout the year, the office determines needs of students through in-person contact, email, phone conversations, mail, and the Leeward Community College’s Student Satisfaction Survey. Applications, transcript requests, change of residency, change of home institution, and responses to frequently asked questions are available on the Leeward Community College website.

Throughout the year, Counseling and Advising distributes evaluations following daily appointments, transfer workshops, and Orientation, Advising and Registration (OAR) sessions. The objective is to obtain feedback and suggestions from students for planning of future events and workshops. During Spring 2004, the Counseling Office merged the previous evaluation with its student learning outcomes assessment and determined that information about financial aid information was needed. A series of workshops was organized to better inform counselors of general financial aid information and the online application process.

The Financial Aid Office at Leeward Community College determines support needs for students through student comments, review of financial aid applications, and an annual internal office evaluation of the financial aid process and procedures. As many students verbally share their ideas and frustrations, the Financial Aid staff identifies methods to make applying and receiving awards more efficient. To support student needs, flyers and brochures are available to answer commonly asked questions and the Free Application for Federal Student Aid (FAFSA) and workshops provide financial aid information. The Leeward Community College website provides easy access to information.
During the 2003-2004 school year, the Financial Aid Counselor created the Satisfactory Academic Progress Program (SAPP) that allows the counseling staff to review policies, identify resources, and consider alternative options for financial assistance for students who are on academic probation or suspension. SAPP’s comprehensive format is helpful in identifying student needs.

The Leeward CC Campus Health Center serves Leeward students, faculty, staff, and community. To track the numbers served, all patients are asked to sign in and to complete a survey. Student support needs at the Health Center are reviewed regularly, and results of in-house surveys have prompted follow ups such as flier distribution regarding services provided at the Health Center, information posted on the website and increased awareness regarding specific health topics. The Health Center is a site for nursing student on-site training, and nursing students assist in identifying additional student needs.

Job Prep Services, a part of the Career Development Services, posts listings for the campus on a bulletin board and on the web. Students are able to view job opportunities in the community, identify necessary qualifications, and understand the job market. The office provides resources such as computer with Internet access, job applications, career preparation material, and an in-house Job Developer who assists with application completion, resume writing, interview preparation, and other job readiness skills. The office works closely with the community to understand job outlook and current demands and trends. Since the office works with a range of students, the Job Prep staff keeps close attention to student support needs.

In addition to Student Services, the Educational Media Center’s Kāko’o ‘Ike (KI) Office and the Women in Transition (WIT) and Upward Bound (UB) programs provide access and support for student needs.

At orientation, students are informed of support services for those with hearing or visual impairment, learning disability, or orthopedic impairment. The Kāko’o ‘Ike Office offers students with disabilities assistance in the form of appropriate accommodations and modifications. The office provides appropriate support and accommodations based on the specific disability, including equitable access and compliance to ADA Laws.

The Women in Transition and Upward Bound programs at the College are designed to focus on specific populations. WIT recognizes the challenges faced by many women returning to school and provides a positive support system. Upward Bound targets high school students from underprivileged groups and provides them with college readiness skills. WIT students are usually self-identified or referred by others, while UB students must meet specific criteria while in high school to participate. The student support needs for the groups are assessed by the program coordinators. For WIT participants, concerns are identified through one-on-one dialogue or group discussions. WIT students often enroll in SSCI 101, which focuses on understanding self, values, interests, and possible careers. Upward Bound students are provided with an array of services, ranging from one-on-one counseling to on-campus tutoring.

**Self Evaluation**

In Student Services and programs like KI, Women in Transition, and Upward Bound, student needs for services are assessed and responded to appropriately. These services are assessed through survey, one-on-one counseling sessions, and statistical evidence, as part of the College's
Program and Annual Review processes. Leeward CC informs students, the campus community, and the general public about types of services offered and delivery methods via email, phone, and online services.

Planning Agenda
• No changes are needed to address this standard.

II. B.3.b. The institution provides an environment that encourages personal and civic responsibility, as well as intellectual, aesthetic, and personal development for all of its students.

Descriptive Summary
Leeward provides numerous avenues for students to develop and demonstrate personal and civic responsibility outside of the classroom, each with specific SLO that are assessed and improvements made by the Units involved. The Student Activities Office facilitates co-curricular learning experiences via student participation in clubs, campus events, and student governing boards. Seventeen chartered campus clubs, an Associated Student Government, and two student publications enrich students’ personal and professional development, civic responsibility, teamwork skills, and leadership development.

Leeward also has an active Service Learning Program that promotes civic and social responsibility through partnerships with the local community. Some examples include the following:

• Students enrolled in a writing course worked with non-profit agencies on projects such as writing manuals and brochures, website design, and grant writing.

• Students in math courses provided parents with support for involvement in their children’s math education. Projects included designing and hosting a Family Mathematics Night, producing a variety of age-appropriate mathematics activities for families, and developing integrated mathematics and literacy activities for families.

• Biology students gathered water samples from various locales for the purpose of testing and gathering vital statistics. These were then forwarded to the State Department of Land and Resources, who appreciated the service that would not have been possible otherwise.

• During the “tax season,” students in accounting have offered regularly scheduled tax preparation services to the campus community and the public.

Each semester, the Learning Resource Center (LRC), a unit under Academic Support, offers a series of Success Connection Workshops presented by faculty volunteers for students. The workshops promote development of successful study, computer literacy, and life skills.
The Office of Continuing Education and Workforce Development provides an array of courses and workshops to provide life-long personal development opportunities for students and community members. The Leeward Theatre is well known in the State for bringing world-class performers to its stage for the personal enrichment of our student body and the surrounding community.

**Self Evaluation**

The Student Activities Office has a mission statement and student learning outcomes for the activities it oversees. The Student Activities Coordinator, a full-time faculty member, evaluates the program objectives each year as part of the campus-wide Program and Annual Review processes. Data on achievement of the unit’s student learning outcomes is gathered through focus groups and surveys. The results are then analyzed and program planning and changes implemented.

The student publications, a newspaper and a literary magazine, are submitted each year for national college publication review. They are rated against publications of peer institutions with regard to the various elements of the publications. The student magazine, Harvest, has won several national awards. For samples of past Harvest issues, see [http://emedia.leeward.hawaii.edu/harvest](http://emedia.leeward.hawaii.edu/harvest). Samples of Ka Mana’o, the student newspaper, are available at [http://emedia.leeward.hawaii.edu/kamanao](http://emedia.leeward.hawaii.edu/kamanao). Both publications are products of courses offered through the Language Arts Division, and student learning outcomes associated with the publications are evaluated each year through the campus-wide Program and Annual Review processes. Data is collected and analyzed on whether the students have achieved the stated SLOs. Course changes, modifications, improvements and planning are informed by the results of the data collection and review.

The Service Learning Program integrates community service into course curriculum through community partnerships. Students volunteer at a community-based organization and perform activities that allow them to apply theories and skills learned in the classroom. The community agency, in essence, becomes an extended classroom, providing students with other opportunities to learn. In addition to the stated student learning outcomes that are measured through the Program and Annual Review processes, the program coordinator conducts student and faculty surveys to determine the level of satisfaction with the program. More information can be found at [http://emedia.leeward.hawaii.edu/servicelearning/](http://emedia.leeward.hawaii.edu/servicelearning/).

The Success Connection workshops in the Learning Resource center are offered twice a week and topics range from “Procrastination: How to Get Things Done on Time” to “Writing a Resume to Get a Job.” For a full listing of workshops offered, see [http://emedia.leeward.hawaii.edu/lrc/sc.html](http://emedia.leeward.hawaii.edu/lrc/sc.html). The workshops are evaluated on an ongoing basis, utilizing participant feedback forms and attendance data. Planning for future workshops is based on information gathered from the feedback forms while striving to offer a combination of technology, study and life skills workshops.

The Office of Continuing Education and Workforce Development offers a variety of non-credit courses for the lifelong learners and personal enrichment. See the catalog at [http://www.lcc.hawaii.edu/ocewd/](http://www.lcc.hawaii.edu/ocewd/). Click on image of the publication. Data on the SLOs is collected and analyzed, and results are used to modify and improve courses. Community needs are considered in the planning of course offerings.
The Leeward CC Theatre brings culture and art to the community. (See website at http://LCCTheatre.hawaii.edu) To evaluate the performances of the Theatre, an online audience survey is conducted on an ongoing basis on its website. Feedback from the online surveys is used to evaluate the Theatre services and performance goals and to plan for future events and improvements.

**Planning Agenda**
- No changes are needed to address this standard.

**II.B.3.c.** The institution designs, maintains, and evaluates counseling and/or academic advising programs to support student development and success and prepares faculty and other personnel responsible for the advising function.

---

**Descriptive Summary**
Just as Leeward faculty must satisfy hiring requirements, so do members of the Counseling staff. Each counselor must have a Master's degree in Counseling (or related field), or at minimum, a Bachelor's degree and three years experience. Counselors regularly attend and present at conferences of the National Academic Advising Association (NACADA) and National Career Development Association (NCDA). To maintain currency, counselors read professional journals and engage in dialogue with their peers.

Critical components of Student Services’ program review process were the creation of (1) a mission statement, (2) department goals, and (3) detailed student learning outcomes, both for counseling services in general and by unit. In discussing appropriate SLOs, Counseling Service personnel reviewed previously collected Program Health Indicators and references such as Bloom’s Taxonomy and the Book of Professional Standards in Higher Education (see 9/9/04 Progress Report to ACCJC, page 11 at http://emedia.leeward.hawaii.edu/cs/planning/reports/). They also worked directly with Leeward’s Institutional Researcher, Andy Rossi. (For the detailed list of SLOs, see Student Services 2004 Assessment Report at http://emedia.leeward.hawaii.edu/cs/planning/reports/).

To find out what students wanted/needed and how well those desires were met, the Counseling and Advising unit created a counselor evaluation survey. The survey went through several drafts (see pages B5-14 of above-mentioned report), with considerable thought given to what the Assessment Team needed to know and how best to obtain that information.

The designed survey was given to students before their scheduled appointment, but completed afterwards, anonymously and privately. Of the 1378 students who signed up for appointments between February and April, 2004, 42% completed the survey, a more than adequate data base. The report includes graphs that show student answers to the evaluation questions and a comprehensive record of student comments.

**Self Evaluation**
Before the survey was administered, the hoped-for response was that 80% of the students would indicate they were satisfied with the information and counseling they had received. In actuality, 96% were satisfied with information received, and 100% satisfied with the counseling itself. However, in the Annual Review process, some concerns have been expressed by Academic Divisions regarding the academic advising services received by students.
Based on the information from the survey, counselors have determined that the delivery of accurate advising and transfer information, knowledge of program requirements, and the ability to help students with what they might consider to make career/life choices and meaningful decisions about their educational plans are important fundamentals for counselors to know. The data also provides information on professional development needs in the areas of Financial Aid workshops, career counseling techniques and instruments, and graduation and transfer information updates.

**Planning Agenda**

- Academic Divisions and Student Service Division will collaborate to address concerns raised in the *Annual Review* process regarding counseling and advising.

---

**II.B.3.d.** The institution designs and maintains appropriate programs, practices, and services that support and enhance student understanding and appreciation of diversity.

**Descriptive Summary**

Understanding and appreciation of diversity is promoted and supported through course offerings, programs, clubs, and events, each of which involves assessment of specific SLOs. The College offers a variety of courses that focus on the culture and language of Asian, Pacific Island, and European countries. Study abroad programs support travel and study to Europe, Southeast Asia, Mexico, South America, and Cuba.

Student clubs promote understanding of cultural diversity. For example, the Bantaba Dance and Drum Club educates and informs the public about African culture through drum and dance, while the International Club promotes awareness of other cultures and intercultural friendships.

Each spring the College presents the Leeward CC International Festival, a three-day event exploring facets of other cultures and regions. The festival focuses on one international region each year, with 2006’s focus on the Philippines, to coincide with the celebration of 100 years of Philippine presence in Hawai’i.

Campus workshops and presentations educate faculty, staff, and administrators on a broad range of diversity-related topics such as disabilities, sexual harassment, and workplace violence.

**Self Evaluation**

The courses and programs offered at Leeward that promote understanding of cultural diversity are evaluated via the stated student learning outcomes for those courses and programs. As part of the *Program and Annual Review* processes, data is collected, analyzed, and improvements made as a result of this review process.

The Student Activities Office, which oversees the student clubs on campus, is also engaged in the Program Review process and conducts ongoing assessments of its stated learning objectives for all its activities, including the clubs. These assessments become part of the Student Services’ *Annual Review* template.
Planning Agenda

- The Program and Annual Review processes will be evaluated to determine their effectiveness in enhancing student understanding of diversity.

II.B.3.e. The institution regularly evaluates admissions and placement instruments and practices to validate their effectiveness while minimizing biases.

Descriptive Summary

Leeward CC admits any applicant who is a high school graduate or is at least 18 years old. Given this “open door” policy, the College has devoted a considerable amount of effort to ensure that all new students are evaluated prior to registering for courses to determine whether they had the prerequisite reading, writing, and math skills. Prior to 1998, the Nelson-Denny Reading Test was the primary instrument used to place students into reading and writing courses. A math placement test, which was developed and field-tested by system-wide representatives, was used for the placement of new students into mathematics courses. The impact of these placement instruments extends far beyond mathematics and English, as many other disciplines within the College use the test scores or courses in math, reading, and writing as prerequisites. Because of this the College has continuously monitored the effectiveness of these instruments over the years.

The math placement and Nelson-Denny tests were replaced by the COMPASS (Computerized-Adaptive Placement Assessment and Support System) test, as directed by the Community College Chancellor’s Office in 1998. This was done to ensure that all campuses within the system would use a standardized placement instrument and common cutoff scores for those math, reading, and writing courses that were articulated on a system-wide basis. (Articulated courses include ENG 21, 22,100,102, and MATH 24, 25, 27, 100, 103, 135, 140).

For the relatively small population of non-native speakers of English, Leeward uses a placement instrument developed and field-tested by the English Language Institute (ELI) of the University of Michigan. This test is designed to assess the reading and writing ability of non-native speakers. In addition to the test, students are given the option of submitting writing samples for a more accurate placement into courses. Faculty from Leeward’s English Language Institute and English as a Second Language Program meet periodically to evaluate the effectiveness of this instrument and to determine if any improvements are needed.

COMPASS is a nationally normed test that meets the qualifications for federal financial aid. Additionally, COMPASS was chosen by the UH Community College System because ACT, the organization that produces the test, had taken measures to minimize cultural and linguistic biases including the following:

- An internal review of all test questions by ACT’s staff for fair portrayal and balanced representation of societal groups and for use of nonsexist language.

- An external review of the test items by consultants and representatives from five different focus groups—African Americans, Asian Americans, Hispanic Americans, Native Americans, and Women. Input from these groups was used to examine the fairness and sensitivity of COMPASS test questions.
The institution of COMPASS testing in Fall 1998 resulted in an increase in the number of students being placed into remedial and developmental courses and a decrease in students placing into college-level courses, especially in writing. This forced the English and math disciplines to redirect significant resources toward meeting the increased demand at the lower levels, even though mathematics and English instructors were given the option of waiving students into higher courses. This downward shift in student placement caused considerable concern and discussions about the accuracy and validity of the test’s interpretations and cut-off scores at the campus. As Leeward has a more extensive prerequisite system compared to the other community college campuses, students with low English and math placement scores were severely limited in the selection of courses they could take. This, in turn, adversely impacted their financial aid and full-time status and extended the time spent in achieving their educational goals.

Leeward CC’s concerns, along with those of its sister campuses, were communicated to the Community College System Office, which coordinated a system-wide effort to evaluate COMPASS soon after its implementation. However, such an effort required several years worth of data to be considered valid. This situation was noted in the College’s 2000 Self Study and resulted in the recommendation from the Accrediting Commission that the “college review the changes in placement scores that resulted from the institution of COMPASS and develop appropriate response strategies in student services and instructional areas to ensure that students achieve their educational goals in a timely and efficient manner as possible.”

To respond to the Commission recommendation, English and math faculties at Leeward implemented the following strategies, while information from ACT regarding validity and cut-off scores became available.

- Upon completion of the COMPASS test, every student received a one-on-one interview by testing/counseling staff member to help students understand their test scores and to address any concerns about the testing experience. Those who indicated they had anxiety or difficulties with the test were given the opportunity to retake the test.

- Both English and math disciplines developed waiver systems to accommodate students who felt that the COMPASS test did not place them accurately. In English, students were allowed to write an essay and/or to retake the reading test. In math, students could request an interview with department members and to have their high school transcripts reviewed, or, they could be retested using the aforementioned placement test. In addition, for the math portion of the COMPASS test, the order of questions was changed, to place the most appropriate questions first, building student test-taking confidence over the course of the test and minimizing the negative effects of test anxiety.

- Both English and mathematics developed new courses (MATH 22, ENG 18/19) to provide a bridge between remedial and developmental courses.

- The College also made a number of changes to its marketing and outreach efforts to inform prospective students about assessment testing.
Beginning in Spring 2003, the University of Hawai‘i Community College System staff and campus faculty representatives of English and mathematics met periodically to review ACT’s analysis of course placement test accuracy and made recommendations for adjustments. However, during the period of time required for the completion the study, several curriculum changes had already been made in both English and math courses, rendering some of the analyses obsolete.

In English, dialogue about ACT’s analysis of the data involved all the Deans of Instruction (currently Chief Academic Officers) and selected faculty from the reading and writing disciplines. The faculty felt that ACT’s study was too narrow, as it did not consider the course content of the revised developmental English courses. However, a recommendation to lower the Eng 102 cut-off score was made by the Community College System Office based on ACT’s analysis. This recommendation was opposed by most English faculty, and after some controversy, the Chancellors of each campus agreed to keep the Eng 21 and 102 cut-off scores unchanged pending further study. After much discussion and review, the English faculty and the System Office came to the following agreements:

- The reading component of the test will no longer be used to place students in writing classes. However, Leeward was allowed to use ENG 21 as a pre- or co-requisite for ENG 22 and as a prerequisite for ENG 100.

- English faculties would review the ACT analysis of data from 1998-2002 and 2002-2005 to validate COMPASS reading placement test score cutoffs between ENG 21 and ENG 102 and make recommendations to the Chief Academic Officers by Fall 2006.

- The UHCC System Office also agreed to work with faculty in designing and conducting a pilot study to determine whether successful completion in ENG 21 significantly improves student performance in ENG 22 or ENG 100. A report of the findings of this analysis will be presented to the Council of Chancellors in Fall 2006 with implementation of any resulting changes for students registering occurring in Fall 2007.

Ongoing evaluation of the COMPASS Math tests since its institution resulted in the change of a number of cutoff scores. Those scores used by the UH System Office were replaced by those unanimously recommended by math faculty, except for Pre-calculus: Elementary Functions (MATH 135). Disagreements among the campus representatives concerning pre-algebra and algebra courses (MATH 24, 25) led to current system-wide discussions over MATH 24/25/103 and Leeward’s introduction of MATH 73/83 to better align the College with its sister campuses. A system-wide meeting concerning the alignment of MATH 24/25 could not fully resolve the issue concerning course content. A subsequent meeting is scheduled for the Fall 2006, with the goal of producing a uniform curriculum within the System by Fall 2007 by allowing for a revamping of the sequence of concepts in existing courses and/or creating new courses, if needed.
**Self Evaluation**

As described above, the institution of a common, system-wide placement instrument has been problematic at Leeward CC and its sister campuses. This caused the English and math faculty throughout the system to address its impact on students and study its effectiveness. The effort, which was initiated as soon as COMPASS was implemented and is ongoing, is appropriately focused on the systematic evaluation of the accuracy and validity of COMPASS for each campus, which serves distinctly different populations.

The English faculties reviewed ACT’s analysis of the data but rejected the Community College System Office's recommendation to lower the ENG 102 cut-off score, as it would severely impact the number of students in ENG 21 who would be better prepared for ENG 22, 100, or 102 by taking this developmental offering. This action prompted the System to prolong its validation study and delay its recommendation until Fall 2006. Also, concerns have been raised about the pilot study to validate the prerequisite requirements involving ENG 21, 22, and 100 because of the many independent variables involved.

Disagreement that involves two different but equally valid pedagogical approaches in the way the developmental algebra courses, MATH 24/25, are taught is the major stumbling block toward a common developmental math sequence on a system-wide basis. It is anticipated that the next system-wide meeting of math faculty in Fall 2006 will resolve this issue.

The evaluation of the effectiveness of the system-wide placement instrument has taken much longer than expected. However, the College has been able to sustain its commitment to the process. With regard to the temporary measures implemented in 2004, the College has not collected data on the effectiveness of its outreach efforts to inform prospective students about resources available in preparing for the test, or the effects of interviews after students have taken the test.

**Planning Agenda**

- The College will continue to work with its sister campuses in evaluating COMPASS and make changes for improvement.
Standard III: Resources

III.A. Human Resources

III.A.1.b. The institution assures the effectiveness of its human resources by evaluating all personnel systematically and at stated intervals. The institution establishes written criteria for evaluating all personnel, including performance of assigned duties and participation in institutional responsibilities and other activities appropriate to their expertise. Evaluation processes seek to assess effectiveness of personnel and encourage improvement. Actions taken following evaluations are formal, timely, and documented.

Descriptive Summary

Every College employee is evaluated systematically and periodically to assess effectiveness and to determine areas of possible improvement as summarized below.

- In accordance with BORP Section 9-14, Part IV (Conditions of Service), the University President establishes the criteria and procedures for evaluating Executive/Managerial (E/M) personnel. All E/Ms undergo an annual evaluation by their supervisors during the March-June timeframe for performance and accomplishments. In addition, the Office of Human Resource (OHR) requires of all E/M personnel a “360 Assessment,” an anonymous survey completed by the E/M’s peers, subordinates, and constituents (other individuals with whom the E/M works or supports) that rates an E/M on leadership, relationships, planning, decision-making, problem solving, and organizational abilities, as well as EEO/AA and safety. The assessment is consolidated and forwarded by OHR to the E/M for review and self-evaluation. After the completion of the “360 Assessment” process, E/M personnel discuss the outcomes with their immediate supervisor or President of the University system.

- In general, faculty members submit information regarding the nature and extent to which they meet the stated criteria for their rank. The subsequent formal evaluation by the appropriate Division Chair, Division Personnel Committee, or Tenure and Promotion Review Committee, depending on the assessment action being considered, is to assess the faculty member’s strengths, weaknesses, overall performance, and candidacy for advancement. Non-tenured faculty members are evaluated annually and meet with their respective Division Chairs each year to discuss their annual performance. Recommendations for improvement serve as the basis for goals to be achieved by that individual for the next evaluation period. These annual evaluations provide a record of the individual’s achievements, continuous improvement, and professional growth.

Students may periodically provide individual faculty members with course evaluations regarding instructional style, achievement of stated course objectives, and other considerations. Done anonymously, the surveys are summarized by the College and are provided to the faculty member as classroom feedback.
• Performance expectations based on the APT’s position description and projected activities are established between the APTs and their supervisors in November of each year. The yearly performance standards are then entered on the University’s on-line APT system and referred to and modified as needed to gauge performance throughout the year. At the end of the rating period (October of the following year), online assessment of competency, quality, and productivity is made by the APT’s supervisor.

Performance rating is used to determine whether an employee has been able to meet expected standards and is eligible for continued employment. These ratings also afford an opportunity for an APT’s immediate supervisor to recognize an individual’s excellent performance and nominate that person for awards in accordance with administrative procedures.

• For Civil Service employees, the evaluation procedure is similar to that of the APT, under the Civil Service Performance Appraisal System. At the beginning of the performance appraisal period, supervisors meet with employees to discuss job duties, expectations/requirements, and methods of evaluation. The employee is monitored, coaching is provided if improvement is needed, and achievements are noted. At the end of the annual evaluation period, employees are rated in terms of quality, quantity, and timeliness of work; reliability and initiative; relationship with others; and safe use of equipment.

**Self Evaluation**

Leeward CC assures the effectiveness of its personnel by evaluating them periodically and systematically via the following:

E/M personnel are required to submit self-evaluations as part of the 360 Assessment process. Depending on the level of the E/M individual, the evaluation is discussed thoroughly with his/her immediate supervisor or with the President of the University.

Addressing the guidelines for tenure and promotion is part of the faculty evaluation process. These documents outline the College’s expectations and values and provide a format for faculty members to present their applications. By mid-October, the Chancellor’s office receives all applications, which are passed on to the Division Personnel Committee (DPC) for review and assessment. In mid-November, they are forwarded to the appropriate Division Chair, who submits his/her recommendations to the Program Dean by early December. All dossiers are available to the Tenure/Promotion Review Committee (TPRC) by early January. The TPRC recommendations are due to the Chancellor by mid-February. The Board of Regents reviews the tenure/promotion applications and forwards its recommendations to the Chancellor, who notifies the applicant by mid-June.

The College establishes written criteria for non-tenured faculty members through its contract renewal process that assesses their performance and encourages improvement. The guidelines require a detailed description of faculty teaching abilities with respect to the courses being taught and a review of their students’ and peers’ evaluations as well as statements of goals/objectives for the upcoming academic year. After faculty members prepare the contract renewal
documents, they are reviewed by the appropriate departmental and administrative personnel. Contract renewal applications for probationary faculty are due to the appropriate Division Chair in November. The DPC reviews the applications, makes suggestions for improvement, and recommends continuation or termination of contracts in early December. In January, after the Program Dean reviews the recommendations, the Chancellor notifies the faculty member of the contract renewal status.

APT and Civil Service evaluations help to facilitate supportive supervisor-employee discussions relative to their work performance. When evaluations reveal significant changes in duties or responsibilities, supervisors can initiate revisions to position descriptions in accordance with Administrative Procedures, so classifications and compensations can be adjusted accordingly.

**Planning Agenda**

- No changes are needed to address this 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.

Guidelines for the evaluation of faculty are documented through system-wide guidelines that are distributed to all faculty members. The *UHCC Contract Renewal Suggested Guidelines* (2005–2006) recommend that the following information be included:

“A statement on your teaching ability that includes:
   a) A self-assessment of your teaching ability with respect to courses you have taught, including a discussion of your effectiveness, learning outcomes, and student responses to your approach, etc. “

However, the *Guidelines for Tenure and Promotion, University of Hawai‘i Community Colleges* 2005–2006 do not contain any specific reference to producing student learning as a measure of the effectiveness of an instructor. Additionally, each Academic Division has developed lecturer evaluation guidelines. A review of these guidelines shows that some Divisions are recommending a self-assessment on the lecturer’s ability to demonstrate effectiveness in producing student learning outcomes for his/her particular course. For example, the Arts & Humanities Lecturer Evaluation guidelines ask lecturers to provide in their dossier a “self evaluation narrative which includes a discussion of student evaluations, student comments, pertinent self-improvement activities and techniques employed to effectively meet student learning objectives.” The Math & Sciences Division requires a brief self-evaluation narrative that includes “how you are able to demonstrate effectiveness in producing the Student Learning Outcomes (SLO) for your particular course.” Senior Faculty (i.e., post-tenure review) guidelines also require continuing self-assessment, including information on teaching activities, as a basis for review of discipline-related activities and their specific outcomes.
With the implementation of Leeward CC’s Policy on Program Reviews, faculty have engaged in thinking and discussions to create appropriate SLOs for each course. For courses that have started SLO assessment, faculty have designed assessment instruments and have used the results to redesign the instrument or to change teaching methods. Although the faculty and the College are in the early stages of assessing all course and program SLO’s, results of these assessments have already produced changes in course requirements, content, sequence of topics, and instructional strategies. Examples of Disciplines where SLO’s have been assessed, and changes in methodology made or planned, include English, ESL, ELI, Speech, Japanese, Hawaiian, Tagalog, ICS, Oceanography, Anthropology, Psychology, Literature, Philosophy, and Religion.

The practice of using course and program SLO assessment results to make improvements in student learning has been reinforced by the adoption and implementation of the Annual Review process. Faculty have been prompted to think about how well their students are learning and have engaged in serious discussions of ways to improve this learning.

**Self Evaluation**

The College is committed to course and program SLO assessment as part of the Program and Annual Review processes, and to using these processes to make improvements in student learning. However, the policies governing these processes are still evolving, particularly regarding the extent to which student learning outcomes factor into faculty evaluations. This has resulted in some controversy at the College, prompting the Faculty Senate to recommend continued discussions to determine the extent and manner in which student learning outcomes will be used in faculty evaluations.

**Planning Agenda**

- The College will continue the dialogue resulting in the development of a common understanding of the definition, development, and assessment of student learning outcomes and their place in faculty evaluation.

- The College will work with the system-wide Human Resources Office to recommend revision of the guidelines for contract renewal and tenure and promotion to reflect an emphasis on producing student learning outcomes.

- The College will revise and standardize lecturer evaluation guidelines and include references to effectiveness in producing student learning outcomes.
III.A.5.b. With the assistance of the participants, the institution systematically evaluates professional development programs and uses the results of these evaluations as the basis for improvement.

**Descriptive Summary**

The College ensures meaningful evaluation of professional development activities in the following ways:

- Analyses of session attendance and category of attendees. For example, fewer lecturers were attending programs and activities than expected, so adjustments were made to accommodate them.

- Written evaluations for many professional development programs and activities. Satisfaction ratings are calculated (1-5 rating scale) and responses to open-ended questions are summarized. Evaluations have led to improvements of professional development programs. For example, the evaluations of the “Connections” and “Partners” program led to the development of customer service training tailored to the needs of the College (e.g. low-rated video portion of the training was replaced with high scoring activities.

- The efforts of the Innovation Center for Teaching & Learning Advisory Committee, composed of 12 members from faculty and staff from across the campus. This Committee oversees all activities, programs and operations; keeps track of money spent; and makes choices as well as recommendations.

**Self Evaluation**

Currently, effectiveness of professional development activities is assessed by feedback received from participants, number of attendees, requests for additional activities, and written evaluations. Summary evaluations indicate that participants were very satisfied with particular workshops/activities.

The College has demonstrated conscientious commitment to evaluating professional development programs and using the results of those evaluations as a basis for improving those activities, thus meeting the needs of its personnel more effectively. However, the feedback on the effectiveness of professional development activities is for specific sessions. An overall campus measure of the effectiveness of various activities in meeting all needs, especially professional development needs in the area of assessment, as well as to develop indicators of success, would be useful.

**Planning Agenda**

- The Innovation Center for Teaching and Learning will develop indicators of success for professional development activities relating to achievement of student learning outcomes.
III.A.6. Human resource planning is integrated with institutional planning. The institution systematically assesses the effective use of human resources and uses the results of the evaluation as the basis for improvement.

**Descriptive Summary**

The process by which Leeward CC systematically and regularly assesses the effectiveness of its employees has been described in the response to Standard III.A.1.b. of this theme. The College has recently refined these evaluative processes to better address the change in emphasis of its mission prompted by the increased focus on student learning outcomes of the current accreditation standards.

Beginning in 2003, the former Provost/Chancellor worked through both the Campus Council and Faculty Senate to develop a process for campus reorganization. This initiative was intended to address the College’s history of administrative instability as well as to place the College in a position to more effectively promote student learning. The proposal placed all Instructional Divisions, Academic Support, Student Services, and non-credit programs under the position of the Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs (VCAA). This change coordinates and integrates institutional planning among all College Divisions and Units that contribute to student learning. A major part of this proposal included the creation of the Office of Planning, Policy, and Assessment directly under the Chancellor to coordinate and sustain a comprehensive and objective program of planning and assessment.

The implementation of Program and Annual Review processes that are described in Standard I.B.3. was intended to ensure that the College systematically and regularly assesses the use of its human resources, makes changes for improvements, and that human resource needs are met effectively. As described previously there are a number areas within these processes that need to be improved. However, some of these weaknesses will be addressed as the College continues to collect and analyze the assessment data and make revisions as it initiates a second phase of the Annual Review process. This second phase calls for the creation of Phase II committees, including a committee devoted to the overall staffing needs of the College. This committee will consider the planning lists resulting from Program Review and will recommend priorities, based on their area of expertise.

**Self Evaluation**

The College has been challenged by recent changes at the administrative levels within the University of Hawai‘i and the Community College System, and more significantly, by the shift to a culture of evidence prompted by current accreditation standards. These changes have, in part, contributed to the turnover rate of its administrative staff that was attributed to excessive workload and unclear lines of authority and communication. The instability at the uppermost levels of the College has at times hindered the campus effort to improve the quality in its programs and services. This situation was noted by Commission in the last self-study effort and eventually resulted in Leeward CC being placed on Warning.

The College responded by initiating an administrative reorganization and by implementing a systematic and comprehensive review of all of its programs and services. A part of the reorganization proposal requesting an additional executive/managerial position, as well as changes in titles for existing administrative levels, caused a controversy at the College that was
eventually resolved by the efforts of a Reorganization Committee made up of members from all major constituencies on campus during the Fall of 2004. This committee worked with the administrators toward a solution, and the campus was given ample opportunity to provide input based on two hearings and two votes, first by Campus Council and second, by Faculty Senate. The modified proposal by these campus governance organizations is scheduled to be submitted to the Board of Regents in Fall 2006. The reorganization, if approved, will facilitate and institutionalize evaluation and planning among all College Divisions and Units that contribute to student learning.

The College has taken a significant step away from past practices and toward a culture of evidence by implementing its Program and Annual Review processes.

These data-based mechanisms provide a comprehensive evaluation of the College effort and to ensure that human resource needs are integrated with institutional needs and plans for improvement.

Planning Agenda
• The College will assess the effectiveness of the Program and Annual Review processes in identifying and meeting staffing needs.

III.B.2.a. Long-range capital plans support institutional improvement goals and reflect projections of the total cost of ownership of new facilities and equipment.

Descriptive Summary
Leeward Community College’s Long Range Development Plan (LRDP) which was adopted in 1996 is one of the driving forces behind physical resource planning. It establishes functional relationships, space requirements, and space allocations based on the College’s long-term goals and planned activities. The cost and involvement of a number of administrative levels (within the Community College System and University of Hawai‘i) required for the development of LRDP precludes frequent revisions. When it was approved in 1996, the College lacked Capital Improvement Project (CIP) Funds with which to construct and/or renovate its facilities, and funds for equipment were severely limited by budget constraints. However, the LRDP has provisions by which the College may submit requests for funding of capital improvement projects (CIP) based on health and safety needs, compliance to governmental regulations, and long-range expansion.

Leeward CC’s physical configuration has not changed significantly since the last self-study report in 2000. The College has attempted to accommodate the increase in enrollment and the expansion of programs by renovating its existing structures. However, classroom, meeting, and conference facilities continue to be in short supply, and the lack of sufficient office space continues to be reported by nearly all Divisions. Space is also limited in the LRC, Library, and EMC, especially during peak hours. The College has been working with the Facilities Planning Office since 2000 to justify the expansion of its facilities, as well as to address a backlog of renovations and repairs. Since 2004, Leeward has received approximately $10 million in appropriations for the repair and renovation of its aging facilities on the basis of health and safety reasons. In summer 2006 the College received an appropriation of $1.3 million for design of its newest physical facility that was part of the original LRDP in 1996.
Due to the lack of funds required to implement the LRDP up until this year, the annual revisits of Strategic Plan (SP), described in response to Standard I.A.4. of this theme, provided the College with the only other formalized process to address its immediate needs, including facilities and equipment needs. The revisit of the SP provided an important pathway for all members of the campus community to present action plans to support their efforts. The revisiting process was constantly evaluated, revised, and refined. In Spring 2005, the annual revisit stipulated that all action items be based on the assessment of student learning outcomes as a means of linking the College’s Program Review process with the planning and budgeting process and included a category for CIP requests. All faculty, staff, and administrators were again invited to present their respective action items at an open forum prior to prioritization by campus vote. The prioritized list of actions, in addition to the direct input of Division/Unit Heads, was submitted to the Administrative Team and served as a basis for the College’s budget requests.

Ongoing evaluation of this process prompted the campus to assess and refine its planning and budgeting cycles to clarify the role of assessment and analysis in its Program Review model, resulting in the Annual Review process. This process served as the basis for planning and budgeting decisions in the creation of the Colleges 2007-2009 biennial budget proposal. A planned second phase of the Annual Review process will involve Phase II committees that focus on number of areas, including facilities and equipment needs and usage, with the Phase II committee recommending priorities, based on its area of expertise.

Self Evaluation
The current budget planning process has significantly changed since the last self-study. Its development and implementation depended on ongoing dialogue, beginning with a small group of individuals and gradually evolving to include the entire campus community. The current Annual Review process invites everyone to submit data-based requests and integrates the Program Review and Strategic Planning processes. It ensures that staff/faculty, Units, Divisions, Administrative Units, and administrators engage in considerable dialogue to determine how the budget may be allocated to best support student learning. The process will continue to undergo revisions as the College attempts to change past practices that have been reactionary rather than data driven.

Planning Agenda
• The College will evaluate the effectiveness of its Program and Annual Review processes in developing long-range capital plans and make changes for improvement.
III.B.2.b. Physical resource planning is integrated with institutional planning. The institution systematically assesses the effectiveness use of physical resources and uses the results of the evaluation as the basis for improvements.

**Descriptive Summary**
As described in the section above (III.B.2.a.) the College has relied on inclusive dialogue that includes faculty, staff, students, and administrators to prioritize its needs when making decisions concerning physical facilities and purchase of equipment. The College uses this input in an ongoing evaluation of its processes to make changes for improvement. Since 2004, this process has resulted in Leeward CC’s receiving approximately $10 million dollars in appropriations, primarily aimed to address safety and access issues including the following:

- Re-roofing
- New railings
- ADA compliancy: expanded parking stalls on main level
- Maintenance and acquisition of equipment
- Electrical/network project
- Lighting improvement of parking and building corridor areas

The development and implementation of the *Program Review* and *Annual Review* processes were intended to improve the College’s previous planning processes and practices. *Program Review* moved the College from relying on past practices to an assessment based mechanism as a means of providing quantitative and qualitative data that could be used for planning purposes. To further integrate physical resource planning with institutional planning the current Chancellor appointed the Auxiliary Officer to head a Space Utilization Committee in Spring 2005. The charge of this committee, comprised of representatives from the entire campus, was to assess utilization and to reallocate spaces as needed to support the College’s *Strategic* and *Long Range Development Plans*. The second phase of the *Annual Review* process incorporates and formalizes the role of this committee in providing additional input toward the use of physical.

**Self-Evaluation**
With the implementation of the College’s *Program* and *Annual Review* processes, ongoing dialogue is based on the assessment of programs and services and is used to integrate physical resource and institutional planning. This, in addition to the assessment of existing campus infrastructure and space utilization, will ensure that long-range capital plans support institutional improvement goals serve as the basis for the revisions to the *LRDP*.

**Planning Agenda**
- The College will evaluate the effectiveness of its *Program* and *Annual Review* processes in assessing physical resource needs and makes changes for improvement.
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.

Prior to 2000, Leeward Community College had created a line item in its budget for campus technology infrastructure and software. This fund, which is now known as the Technology Fund (Tech Fund), was intended to support technology needs that affected the entire campus, such as the networking infrastructure, Operating System and Office software, and server infrastructure. In addition to the Tech Fund, Instructional Divisions were allocated general funds that were supplemented by Summer Session earnings. Each Division is given the autonomy to spend and prioritize the use of these funds, which may be used for Division computers that are not paid for by the Technology Fund.

Although the College had designated up to $100,000 and supplemented this amount with Division funds to meet its technology needs, it lacked a cohesive expenditure plan. This was noted in Leeward CC’s 2000 Self Study report and resulted in the recommendation that the College “clearly communicate plans regarding information and learning resources to faculty and staff.”

An Accreditation Implementation Committee (AIC) on Planning of Technology, Information/Learning Resources was charged in Spring 2002 to “formalize planning procedures in the areas of technology and information and learning resources.” Although this committee was plagued by unclear direction and high committee membership turnover, it was able to initiate an evaluation and planning process for information and learning resources for each unit that comprised Academic Support. These Units, the Library, Learning Resources Center, Educational Media Center, and Information Technology Group, began data collection to assess the services provided. Additionally, each Academic Support Unit developed 3-year plans based on the data collected. The assessment data and the 3-year plans were used for annual budget requests for funding beyond the annual base allocation. (These plans were included in September 9, 2004 Progress Report to ACCJC as Appendix D. The compiled report is available online at the following address: http://emedia.leeward.hawaii.edu/cs/planning/reports/)

The AIC also recommended that each division develop a 3-year plan of their own for acquiring, maintaining, and upgrading their technology.

However, the AIC was unable to develop an overall campus plan for acquiring, maintaining, and upgrading technology. Due in part to the section of the Accreditation Midterm Report this committee submitted, the College was placed on Warning by ACCJC in January 2004. As a result, the former Provost/Chancellor created the Committee for Learning Resources and Information Technology (CLRIT). The charge of the committee was to develop a college-wide long-range plan for Technology and Information and Learning Resources for Leeward Community College. (Charge document, minutes, and recommendations from the committee may be found at http://emedia.leeward.hawaii.edu/clrit/)
A large committee made up of constituents from across campus, CLRIT was subdivided into groups with the following focus areas:

- Teaching, Learning, and Students
- Administrative and Student Services
- Communications and Network Services
- Space and Facilities
- Faculty and Staff Support
- Information, Technology, and Learning Resources

The committee adopted the *University of Hawai‘i Strategic Plan for Information Technology 2002-2010* ([http://www.hawaii.edu/spit/spit2000.pdf](http://www.hawaii.edu/spit/spit2000.pdf)) with minor changes. Each subcommittee was charged with modifying the *UH Strategic Plan for Information Technology* for their area and drafting an appropriate plan.

On October 3, 2005, prior to completing the college-wide long-term plan and presenting it to the campus, the committee was disbanded by the Chancellor. In lieu of the CLRIT’s plan, the *Annual Review* process was developed to address, in part, college-wide long-term planning for technology, information/learning resources.

**Self Evaluation**

The *Program* and *Annual Review* processes described under Standard I.B.3. are intended to address the weaknesses of the College’s previous efforts to develop an overall campus plan for acquiring, maintaining, upgrading technology and to integrate technology planning with institutional planning. An analysis of the assessments of student learning outcomes in courses and programs conducted by Instructional Divisions are intended to result in planning lists including the technology needs of the academic areas. These needs, along with those derived from the assessments done by each Academic Support and Administrative Service Unit, will result in a prioritized planning list for technology that will be used to improve the College’s technology resources.

**Planning Agenda**

- Both the *Program* and *Annual Review* processes will be assessed in their effectiveness with technology planning and changes for improvement made as needed.
II. D. Financial Resources

III.D.1.a. Financial planning is integrated with and supports all institutional planning.

Descriptive Summary

Financial planning at Leeward Community College has been guided by a number of long-term documents and from three levels within the University of Hawai‘i System. The two major documents that integrate financial planning and institutional planning at Leeward Community College are the Academic Development Plan (ADP) 1996-2002 and the Long Range Development Plan (LRDP), adopted in 1996. These plans are driven by the College’s mission and are aligned with two other planning documents: the University of Hawai‘i System Plan 1997-2007 and the University of Hawai‘i Community Colleges Strategic Plan 1997-2002. Together, these plans state the long-range goals, provide the direction, and set the guidelines and priorities for the University of Hawai‘i, UH Community Colleges, and Leeward Community College.

Beginning in 2001, the College began the process of replacing its Academic Development Plan to conform to revisions of the University of Hawai‘i System Strategic Plan 2002-2010 and the University of Hawai‘i Community Colleges Strategic Plan 2002-2010 that occurred concurrently. This college-wide effort resulted in an updated plan that was approved by the Board of Regents as the Leeward Community College Strategic Plan 2002-2010. The goals, objectives, and specific action plans that comprise the Strategic Plan are derived from the College’s mission and serve as both a short-term and long-term planning document.

Given a relatively flat budget for the past decade, the College has worked to achieve its goals by reallocating funds and positions among Disciplines and programs. This was done through an annual revisit of its Strategic Plan since 2003. During each revisit, new action plans that are intended to improve institutional effectiveness are proposed and prioritized by campus vote. The following list of improvements shows how the College has managed to make improvements through the reallocation of existing funds and federal grants.

- Conversion of an existing classroom/lab facility into a biotechnology laboratory facility, providing students with hands-on access and learning with the latest biotechnology techniques.
- Construction of a shade house facility for plant propagation, with the following goals:
  - provide hands-on experience for students in botany and horticulture
  - preserve endangered Native Hawaiian species
  - serve as an education center for community groups
  - support the Hawaiian Studies Program (need to verify this)
  - provide in-service training for the College’s grounds crew
- Expansion of computer labs to support courses and programs in digital media and digital art
- Renovation of one of its buildings to support Hawaiian Studies
- Conversion of 8 classrooms to SMART classrooms and the acquisition of a Classroom on Wheels (COW) to enhance teaching.
• Assigned time for research intended to improve student learning in the areas of Written and Oral Communication
• Approval of a position for Planning and Assessment
• Approval and funding for an AA degree in Teaching (AAT)

The College has continued to revise its financial and institutional planning process and is currently engaged in an Annual Review, as described under standards I.B.3. and III.B.2.a. as well as in III.D.1.b. below.

**Self Evaluation**
The College completed the first cycle of its Annual Review process that integrates assessment, planning, and budgeting. A planning list derived from discussions among all the institution's major organizational units was used as a basis to develop the College's biennial budget proposal and presented to the University of Hawai'i System for approval. Information concerning the effectiveness of this assessment-based process in providing the College with sufficient funds to make improvement is not available at this time.

**Planning Agenda**
• The College will assess the effectiveness of the Annual Review process in integrating financial planning with institutional planning.

III.D.1.b. Institutional planning reflects realistic assessment of financial resource availability, development of financial resources, partnerships, and expenditure requirements.

**Descriptive Summary**
The College's operating budget is primarily derived from the State's general fund, appropriated by the Legislature. The availability of these funds is based on biennial legislative appropriations subject to the Governor's allocation. By law, the Governor is required to allocate funds based on projections by the State's Council of Revenues. Should revenues not materialize, restrictions may be imposed by the Governor to balance the State's budget.

Leeward Community College has followed a process that attempts to widely disseminate financial information concerning the allocation and use of financial resources. Since the Governor of the State of Hawai'i allocates general funds based on legislative appropriations and the Council of Revenue projections, Leeward's budget is not fixed from year to year. Each year the Administrative team develops an Operational Expenditure Plan (OEP) (http://emedia.leeward.hawaii.edu/cs/planning/reports/) that details how the College's annual allocation is to be expended. This information is presented to members of the Campus Council for their input and recommendations. The Operational Expenditure Plan, along with the College's annual budget allocation, is also shared with the entire campus at the beginning of each academic year during the College's annual Leadership Retreat and Convocation. Expenditures are continuously monitored and discussed during regularly scheduled meetings of the Administrative Team and Division/Unit heads conducted by the Chancellor during each fiscal year.
The institutional and financial planning process continues to evolve. Beginning in Fall 2004, the College implemented the assessment of its courses, programs, and Support Areas, as stipulated by its Policy on Unit/Area Program Review. In 2005, most of the action items in the revisit of the Strategic Plan were generated through data derived from assessments and connected to the Strategic Plan goals. An evaluation of this process prompted the campus to refine its planning and budgeting cycles to clarify the role of assessment and analysis in its Program Review model. To get a full accounting from all Instructional Divisions and other areas subsumed within the overall Program Review document, a planning tool, the Annual Review, was developed and is now in place in the academic units and support areas.

The template for the Annual Review brings together several activities required by current accreditation standards: ongoing assessment of student learning, planning, and budgeting that includes the entire College. All operational units of the College have begun an assessment of their effectiveness; analyzed their strengths, weakness, opportunities, and threats; and engaged in dialogue that has resulted in a prioritized planning list that is used to construct the institution’s budget.

**Self Evaluation**

The State’s legislative budget process minimizes opportunities for significant changes to the College’s budget, as the College is a small part of the State’s annual and long-range financial plan. Despite this restrictive budgetary climate, the College has worked to improve the process that allows it to achieve its goals. The completed first cycle of the Program and Annual Review processes has had flaws primarily related to the lack of access to appropriate student achievement data, as well as with the with the various assessments tools that were used. However, campus leaders are committed to the new processes and to a sustained effort in changing past practices.

**Planning Agenda**

- In addition to assessing its Annual Review process’ effectiveness in integrating financial planning with institutional planning, the College must continue working with the Community College and UH Systems so that campus needs are met. Collaboration with our sister campuses is essential to make a significant impact on decision-making at the University level.
Standard IV: Leadership & Governance

IV.A. Decision-Making Roles and Processes

IV.A.5. The role of leadership and the institution’s governance and decision-making structures and processes are regularly evaluated to assure their integrity and effectiveness. The institution widely communicates the results of these evaluations and uses them as the basis for improvement.

Descriptive Summary
The College’s administration and the recommending governance bodies of the Faculty Senate and Campus Council are the major leadership structures on campus. The Faculty Senate serves as the policy-recommending and advisory body of the faculty, while the Campus Council functions as the recommending and advisory body of the College in matters relating to the priorities of the College. The Council makes recommendations on behalf of the various constituencies of the College. The Charters and By-Laws of the Faculty Senate and Campus Council may be found at [http://home.lcc.hawaii.edu/docs/govern/](http://home.lcc.hawaii.edu/docs/govern/)

The University of Hawai’i President establishes the criteria and procedures for evaluating all Executive/Managerial (E/M) positions, according to BORP Section 9-14, Part IV, Conditions of Service. All E/M personnel undergo annual evaluation by their supervisors during the March to June timeframe for performance and accomplishments. The annual 360 Assessment/Evaluation for administrators is another formal process for the evaluation of the College’s administrators.

Self-Evaluation
The College does not have a formal process to evaluate the effectiveness of the Faculty Senate or the Campus Council. Although all Executive/Managerial personnel undergo annual evaluations by their supervisors, these evaluations, including the 360 Assessment, and evidence of any improvement in performance, are not communicated to the faculty and staff.

Planning Agenda
- The College will formalize evaluative processes for the Faculty Senate and the Campus Council.
  - The College will also develop a process that informs the campus of improvements made by these governance bodies and by administrators in response to assessments of their performance. This process shall be incorporated within the Annual Review process that is designed to allow all members of the campus to assess what they do and to provide input for change that leads to improvement.
IV.B.3. In multi-college districts or systems, the district/system provides primary leadership in setting and communicating expectations of educational excellence and integrity throughout the district/system and assures support for the effective operation of the colleges. It establishes clearly defined roles of authority and responsibility between the colleges and the district/system and acts as the liaison between the colleges and the governing boards.

IV.B.3.g. The district/system regularly evaluates district/system role-delineation and governance and decision-making structures and processes to assure their integrity and effectiveness in assisting the colleges in meeting educational goals. The district/system widely communicates the results of these evaluations and uses them as the basis for improvement.

Descriptive Summary
The newly reorganized Community College System is compiling best practices and processes into policies that are posted to the community college website. UHCC Policies (http://www.hawaii.edu/offices/cc/policies.html). Written policies are aligned with BOR and system executive level polices and provide for regular review and assessment of the policies.

The VPCC and the Chancellors have agreed to and made public a functional roadmap Functional Roadmap. (http://www.hawaii.edu/vpaa/system_aa/accreditation/UHCC_Map_of_College-System_Functions_05_08_06.pdf) One of the system’s first polices (UHCCP 1.102 Community College Council of Faculty Senate Chairs) delineates the role of faculty governance and defines its advisory role to the VPCC. UHCCP 1.102 (http://www.hawaii.edu/offices/cc/docs/policies/UHCCP_1.102_CC_Council_Fac_Sen_Chairs.pdf)

A draft policy on Strategic Academic Planning (4.101) (http://www.hawaii.edu/offices/cc/policies.html, select 4.101) is under review by the Chancellors with final approval by the VPCC expected in June 2006. The policy provides for a process and establishes the community colleges Strategic Planning Council (SPC) as the primary body for assuring system-wide participation in the UHCC strategic planning process. The policy identifies roles and responsibilities and includes the relationship to and responsibility of campus academic planning.

Self Evaluation
The current system is in the early stages of developing and defining role-delineation and governance and decision-making structures and processes to assure their integrity and effectiveness in meeting educational goals.

Developing system-wide policies, making the policies public, and providing for regular review and assessment of the policies are seen as good progress toward meeting the standard.

Planning Agenda
• The College and the OVPCC will continue to develop, make public, and regularly review structures, policies, and procedures for improvement.
Planning Process Survey

Samples from Survey on Planning Process
(1-5 scale: 1 = strongly disagree; 5 = strongly agree)

Q.1. I have a good understanding of the planning process.
   Average response: 4.01

Q.5. The new planning process is an improvement over previous methods.
   Average response: 4.10
Appendix B

Components of AA Degree Program Review

Area/Unit Review:
In the event that a review unit/area requests a change or adjustment to this review policy, the Provost (Chancellor) and the administrative team will become the Program Review Oversight Committee. Units/areas should contact their immediate supervisors through the College hierarchy until the request reaches the Dean/Director of the Area/Unit. The request for policy change would become an agenda item on the regularly scheduled meeting of the administrative team (Policy, 2003, p. 4).

Report on Program Reviews & Support Area Reviews:
It is important to note that the (academic) Program Review process forces the integration of instructional issues with the other planning areas as well as the budget. Program Reviews of the degree/certificate programs drive all of the other reviews, studies, and action plans on campus so that they are launched first in the cycle. As a result, while separate Support Area Reviews are also conducted, assessment of these support activities is still conducted within the framework of academic program reviews. The separate Support Area Reviews are a sort of triangulation of data, or assessment of the support activities from a different perspective (Rossi, 2004, p. 3).

The approach to program assessment for the AA, AS and AAS degrees includes an incremental, rotating cycle of SLO assessment, as indicated in the following table. A similar model will be developed for Continuing Education and Workforce Development (Rossi, 2004, p. 4).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year 1</th>
<th>Year 2</th>
<th>Year 3</th>
<th>Year 4</th>
<th>Year 5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SLO #1</td>
<td>SLO #1</td>
<td>SLO #3</td>
<td>SLO #5</td>
<td>SLO #7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SLO #2</td>
<td>SLO #2</td>
<td>SLO #4</td>
<td>SLO #6</td>
<td>SLO #8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SLO #3</td>
<td>SLO #3</td>
<td>SLO #5</td>
<td>SLO #7</td>
<td>SLO #1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SLO #4</td>
<td>SLO #4</td>
<td>SLO #6</td>
<td>SLO #8</td>
<td>SLO #2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Incremental Assessments of instructional program SLOs
(note: number of SLOs vary by degree program or AA Gen Ed Outcome)
Source: Report on Program Reviews and Support Area Reviews

In addition to assessing academic performance (student learning outcomes), our review of the degree programs includes an assessment of trends in academic fields, facilities adequacies, community issues, transfer rates of our students, student needs assessment, staffing levels, grants, professional development and other indicators that help give us the complete picture of the performance and the needs of our degree programs (Rossi, 2004, p. 4).

The areas of review are as follows (Rossi, 2004, p. 4):
• Program Overview: General Description and Mission
• Student Learning and Achievement: Program & Course SLOs Assessment; Demographics; Student Needs; Enrollment Data; Transfer Numbers and Efficiency; GPA, Course & Program Completion; Retention & Persistence Rates
• Faculty and Staff: Response to Mission, Professional Development
• Curriculum: Innovations, Challenges, Issues, Trends
• Support: Technology, Library & Learning Resources, Facilities, Marketing, Equipment, Other Resources (Academic Support, Administrative Services, Student Services, Chancellor’s Office)
• External: Advisory Boards, Community Input, Job Outcomes, National Standards, Specialized Accreditation
• Summary
• Action Plan

The Schedule timeline for Program Reviews are as follows (Rossi, 2004, p. 4):

• Program SLOs for all degrees will occur every year in an incremental manner
• Course assessments will occur on a rotating basis involving 17% of the curriculum per year
• Support Area Reviews will occur annually
• Comprehensive Program Reviews will occur every 4 years to match up with budget cycles (every other biennium)

The team effort to produce Program Review is as follows (Rossi, 2004, p. 5):

• Course Assessments: Division Chairs (to DPPA/IR)
• General Education SLOs: Faculty Senate Program Review Committee Chairs (to DPPA/IR)
• Program Review: Division Chairs, IR/DPPA, CAO, Chancellor

The Program Review Model insures (Rossi, 2004, p. 5):

• linkages between reports, budgets and planning
• smooth and clear pathways for data collection
• dynamic triangulation between assessment data and other contextual data
• democratic integrity for interpretation and authoring

Excluded from the program review, support area review process are the programs or activities that receive special funding through grants. Examples of these are: Title III, Ka Hanauna Project (Native Hawaiian Program); the Carl Perkin’s Vocational and Technical Education Act; and the Housing and Urban Development (HUD) Wai’anae Coast Telecommunications Institute. These grants/projects are unique in that they have different reporting/evaluation timetables, different reporting format requirements, and have mandated outcomes measures. In effect, the assessment processes for these unique programs are mandated by the granting agency. Therefore, while assessment of these programs is important, these reviews are viewed as separate initiatives and are not included in [the Report on Program Reviews & Support Area Reviews] (Rossi, 2004, p. 5)
Evaluation, Planning and Improvement
Documents and Websites

Standard I

2004 Support Areas’ Assessment Results
  web  http://documents.leeward.hawaii.edu:8080/docushare/dsweb/View/Collection-14
  print Evidence Room

2005 Assessment Templates
  web  http://documents.leeward.hawaii.edu:8080/docushare/dsweb/View/Collection-14
  print Evidence Room

2007–09 College Plan
  web  http://emedia.leeward.hawaii.edu/cs/planning/budget/  
  print following Evidence List, page 462 and Evidence Room

Annual Review process (2006)
  web  http://emedia.leeward.hawaii.edu/cs/planning/  
  print Evidence Room

Community College Survey of Student Engagement (CCSSE) Results Report, 2005

Curriculum Central
  web  http://emedia.leeward.hawaii.edu/central

Leeward CC 2005-2006 Catalog
  web  http://www.lcc.hawaii.edu/catalog
  print Evidence Room

Leeward CC Strategic Plan, 2002-2010
  web  http://emedia.leeward.hawaii.edu/sp
  print Evidence Room

Mission Statement Approval by the Board of Regents at their March 19, 2004 meeting
  web  http://emedia.leeward.hawaii.edu/sp/evidence.htm  See “Silliman BOR Approval.”
  print Evidence Room

Mission Statement Revision Charge
  print Evidence Room

Mission Statement Revision Chronology
  web  http://emedia.leeward.hawaii.edu/sp/evidence.htm  See “MS Revision Chronology.”
  print Evidence Room
web http://home.lcc.hawaii.edu/docs/policies
print Evidence Room

Policy on Program Reviews (2005)
web http://home.lcc.hawaii.edu/docs/policies
print Evidence Room

Report on Program Reviews & Support Area Reviews, Sept. 2004
print Evidence Room

Results of the Assessment Committees' efforts
web http://documents.leeward.hawaii.edu:8080/docushare/dsweb/View/Collection-14

Strategic Plan Assessment Reports for 2002-03, 2003-04, and 2004-05
web http://emedia.leeward.hawaii.edu/sp/
print Evidence Room

Strategic Project Action Plan Proposals, 2004

Standard II
2004 and 2005 Assessment Templates
web http://documents.leeward.hawaii.edu:8080/docushare/dsweb/View/Collection-14
print Evidence Room

Annual Review process (2006)
web http://emedia.leeward.hawaii.edu/cs/planning/
print Evidence Room

Curriculum Central
web http://emedia.leeward.hawaii.edu/central

web http://home.lcc.hawaii.edu/docs/policies
print Evidence Room

DocuShare site
web http://documents.leeward.hawaii.edu:8080/docushare/dsweb/HomePage

Harvest student magazine
web http://emedia.leeward.hawaii.edu/harvest
print Evidence Room
Ka Mana'o, the student newspaper,
web  http://emedia.leeward.hawaii.edu/kamanao
print  Evidence Room

Learning Resource Center workshops
web  http://emedia.leeward.hawaii.edu/lrc/sc.html

Leeward CC 2005-2006 Catalog
web  http://www.lcc.hawaii.edu/catalog
print  Evidence Room

Leeward CC Theatre
web  http://lccTheatre.hawaii.edu

NATEF/ASE Certified Programs for Automotive Tech AAS degree
web  http://www.natef.org/about/achieving_ase_cert.cfm

National Association of Communication Systems Engineers (NACSE)

National Restaurant Association
web  http://www.nraef.org/faq/faq_exams.asp?flag=lcd&level1_id=6&level2_id=4

Office of Continuing Education and Workforce Development (OCEWD) SLOs
web  http://www.lcc.hawaii.edu/ocewd/

OCEWD non-credit courses catalog
web  http://www.lcc.hawaii.edu/ocewd/ Click on image of catalog

web  http://home.lcc.hawaii.edu/docs/policies
print  Evidence Room

Policy on Program Reviews (2005)
web  http://home.lcc.hawaii.edu/docs/policies
print  Evidence Room

Report on Program Reviews & Support Area Reviews, Sept. 2004
print  Evidence Room

Service Learning
web  http://emedia.leeward.hawaii.edu/servicelearning/

Student Services’ 2004 Assessment Report and SLOs
web  http://emedia.leeward.hawaii.edu/cs/planning/reports/
print  Evidence Room
Standard III

Academic Development Plan (ADP) 1996-2002
web  http://documents.leeward.hawaii.edu:8080/docushare/dsweb/View/Collection-1020
print  Evidence Room

Accreditation Implementation Committee (AIC) on Planning of Technology, Information/ Learning Resources September 9, 2004 Progress Report to ACCJC, Appendix D
web  http://media.leeward.hawaii.edu/cs/planning/reports/

Accreditation Midterm Report
web  http://www.lcc.hawaii.edu/ac2006  Scroll down to “Reports”

BORP Section 9-14, Part IV (Conditions of Service)
Guidelines for Tenure and Promotion, University of Hawai’i Community Colleges 2005-2006
web  http://www.hawaii.edu/offices/bor/policy/index.htm  Select Chapter 9, Personnel

Guidelines for Tenure and Promotion University of Hawai’i Community Colleges 2005-06
web  http://home.lcc.hawaii.edu/docs/faculty

Committee on Learning Resources and Information Technology (CLRIT)
web  http://emedia.leeward.hawaii.edu/clrit

Leeward CC Strategic Plan, 2002-2010
web  http://emedia.leeward.hawaii.edu/sp
print  Evidence Room

Long Range Development Plan
print  Director of Administrative Services Office

Operational Expenditure Plan (OEP)
web  http://emedia.leeward.hawaii.edu/cs/planning/reports/
print  Evidence Room

University of Hawai’i Community Colleges Policies
web  http://www.hawaii.edu/offices/cc/policies.html

University of Hawai’i Community College Council of Faculty Senate Chairs
web  http://www.hawaii.edu/offices/cc/policies.html  Select UHCCP 1.102

University of Hawai’i Community Colleges Functional Roadmap
web  http://www.hawaii.edu/vpaa/system_aa/accreditation/UHCC_Map_of_College_System_Functions_05_08_06.pdf

University of Hawai’i Community College Contract Renewal Suggested Guidelines (2005–06)
web  http://home.lcc.hawaii.edu/docs/faculty
print  Evidence Room
University of Hawai‘i Community Colleges Strategic Plan 1997-2002.
print Evidence Room

University of Hawai‘i Community Colleges Strategic Plan 2002-2010.
web http://emedia.leeward.hawaii.edu/cs/planning/reports/

University of Hawai‘i System Strategic Plan, 1997-2007
print Evidence Room

University of Hawai‘i System Strategic Plan 2002-2010
web http://www.hawaii.edu/ovppp/stratplansys.html

Standard IV
360 Assessment/Evaluation
print Evidence Room

BORP Section 9-14, Part IV, Conditions of Service
web http://www.hawaii.edu/offices/bor/policy/index.htm Select Chapter 9, Personnel

Charters and By-Laws of Faculty Senate and Campus Council
web http://home.lcc.hawaii.edu/docs/govern/
print Evidence Room

University of Hawai‘i Community Colleges Functional Roadmap
web http://www.hawaii.edu/vpaa/system_aa/accreditation/UHCC_Map_of_College System_Functions_05_08_06.pdf

University of Hawai‘i Community Colleges Strategic Academic Planning (4.101)
web http://www.hawaii.edu/offices/cc/policies.html Select 4.101

University of Hawai‘i Community Colleges Policies
web http://www.hawaii.edu/offices/cc/policies.html
demonstrating effectiveness
assessing how well learning is occurring
changing to improve learning and teaching
placing student learning outcomes at the center of the institution’s key processes and allocation of resources
to improve learning and teaching
**Student Learning Outcomes**

The development of Student Learning Outcomes is one of the key themes in these standards. The theme has to do with the institution consciously and robustly demonstrating the effectiveness of its efforts to produce and support student learning by developing student learning outcomes at the course, program, and degree level. This demonstration of effectiveness requires that learning outcomes be measured and assessed to determine how well learning is occurring so that changes to improve learning and teaching can be made. It requires that faculty engage in discussions of ways to deliver instruction to maximize student learning. It requires that those providing student support services develop student learning outcomes and evaluate the quality of their policies, processes, and procedures for providing students access and movement through the institution. And it requires that student learning outcomes be at the center of the institution's key processes and allocation of resources. Ultimately, this theme requires that an institution engage in self-analysis leading to improvement of all that it does regarding learning and teaching.
Standard I. Institutional Mission and Effectiveness

I.A.1. The institution has a statement of mission that defines the institution’s broad educational purposes, its intended student population, and its commitment to achieving student learning.

Descriptive Summary
Leeward Community College’s commitment to its students and its community is described in its mission. The College’s educational purposes are guided by the following principles: access, opportunity and affordability, student-centered learning and teaching, workforce development, and responsiveness to community needs. The College recognizes and embraces the diversity and dignity of its students and believes in their potential to learn.

The College revises its mission periodically to ensure that its purpose and efforts are appropriate to the changing demographics and socio-economic conditions of its rapidly growing service areas. Leeward Community College’s mission was revisited beginning in Fall 2003. The revisions that resulted from an inclusive campus-wide process broadened its outreach and were incorporated and approved by the University of Hawai‘i’s Board of Regents in Spring 2004.

As the campus began to organize its self-study to address the current accreditation standards, campus leaders realized that the College’s commitment to, and emphasis on, student learning needed to be clarified in its mission. The former Chancellor’s memo to the faculty and staff on Feb. 16, 2005 acknowledged that the mission statement failed to explicitly clarify the College’s commitment to student learning. An amendment proposal was publicized to the campus at large and feedback was requested. The Campus Council and Faculty Senate approved the revision in 2005, and it is expected that the Board of Regents will approve this amendment in Fall 2006.

Self Evaluation
The College’s mission is a statement of purpose that guides institutional action.

Since Spring 2004, the campus has demonstrated its commitment to student learning by implementing and carrying through a systematic assessment of student learning outcomes in its courses, programs, and Support Areas. Through intentional and broad-based dialogue, the College has created or re-shaped existing organizational structures to support its assessment efforts to prompt meaningful changes in its practices. Since the implementation of Program Review, the College has continuously revised its processes in response to input from the campus community and discoveries made from its efforts. A sustained effort during the past two years has resulted in a process, the Annual Review, that integrates assessment, planning, and budgeting and justifies the statement in the amended mission statement that “The College is committed to the achievement of student learning.”

Planning Agenda
• No changes are needed to address this standard.
I.B. Improving Institutional Effectiveness

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

Descriptive Summary
At Leeward Community College efforts to “help students learn” have always been based on dialogue. Faculty who teach these courses engage in discussions about improvement of student learning. Courses are organized into Disciplines headed by Discipline Coordinators. When appropriate, Discipline meetings are held to discuss the needs, concerns, and activities of the Discipline. In the campus course assessment process, Disciplines are responsible for coming to consensus on the student learning outcomes of each course. This consensus requires that all faculty who teach the same course engage in dialogue. If course modifications are necessary, the discussions continue at Division meetings, the Curriculum Committee, and the Faculty Senate.

With the initiation of Program Review at Leeward CC, dialogue has been focused on student learning outcome (SLO) assessments of courses, degree programs and related certificates, and Support Areas.
Discussions that were held among campus leaders and with a consultant broadened the scope of its Program Review model after the first semester of its implementation, beginning in Fall 2004. The revised model expanded the categories of the review process to include the following:

1. Program Overview
2. Student Learning and Achievement
3. Faculty and Staff
4. Curriculum
5. Support Issues
6. External Factors

Program Review Model

Needs and initiatives derived from the academic assessments were to be combined with those of all support areas and units, who had also conducted reviews of their respective activities. The combined input of program and Support Areas were then used to arrive at a list of priorities representing the College's annual budgetary needs.

College leaders worked continuously from Fall 2004 to Summer 2005 to develop a more comprehensive approach to integrate assessment, planning, and budgeting, resulting in the Annual Review process. In August 2005, the current Chancellor presented a template for the process to the Administrative Staff, the Assessment Team, participants in the College’s Leadership Retreat, and the campus as a whole at Convocation. The Annual Review process is intended to provide the College with a comprehensive planning process that is inclusive, data-based, and collegial. Annual Review focuses on the analysis of data provided by the program and course assessment of student learning and institutional effectiveness from all Units within the College.
As the *Annual Review* Division Template and diagrams on the following page show, Divisions use the tool as a planning document to have focused discussions. These discussions are guided by questions derived from ACCJC standards and are based on analysis of SLO and student achievement data. Each Division/Unit, after analyzing its strengths, weaknesses, opportunities, and threats, derives a Unit planning list including budget priorities for improvement. These planning lists are consolidated during discussion of the four major Units of the College: Instruction, Student Services, Academic Support, and Institutional Support, resulting in a *College Plan* that serves as the basis of the Institution’s Budget Proposal.

Under the provisions of the current *Program and Annual Review* processes, faculty must come to agreement through informed discussions on the assessment tools and rubrics to be used to assess student learning outcomes. The assessment of a course often entails groups of faculty working together to evaluate a collection of their students’ work, fostering collegial and self-reflective dialogue. Similar procedures are in place for program assessment, which involves cross-disciplinary discussions focusing on student learning outcomes for degree programs and related certificates. Through the *Program Review* process, Support Areas also engage in assessments of student learning in the review of their effectiveness. The results of course and program assessment are reviewed by the Assessment Team, where further dialogue takes place and feedback is given to Divisions, Disciplines, Program Coordinators, and individual faculty.

In addition to the institutional process of course modifications and assessment, the College has other opportunities for dialogue about the improvement of student learning. Every semester begins with a Convocation where faculty, staff, and administrators gather for informal conversations and large and small group meetings on various subjects, including student learning. The monthly College Colloquia schedule lists workshops and staff development sessions on diverse topics. Annual Leadership Retreats deal with action items leading to improvement of student learning and institutional processes.

**Self Evaluation**

Formal and informal dialogue has resulted in significant improvement in the way the College identifies, supports, and improves student learning and in achieving its mission. Faculty are now interested in talking about the improvement of student learning. Through the *Program and Annual Review* processes, members of the campus, including staff in support services, work together with faculty in the development and carry through of action plans that are designed to improve student learning and institutional effectiveness. The completion of the first *Annual Review* cycle was used as the basis of the College’s Budget Proposal for FY 2007-2009. The diagram below graphically depicts the planning process, with the resulting *College Plan* (http://emedia.leeward.hawaii.edu/cs/planning/budget/) available online.

**Planning Agenda**

- The College will assess the effectiveness of the *Program and Annual Review* processes in improving student learning and institutional processes.
Student Learning and Achievement

Describe major actions taken as a result of assessments. (IIA.2.e, f) What has been learned from assessments? What plans are there for changes in the future?

What evidence do you have that students actually are achieving your stated learning outcomes?

Discuss the success of your students when they transfer and the degree to which your division is meeting the learning and employment needs of students (IIA.1a, b).

Discuss how the division approaches class scheduling to meet student needs and the level of student demand for course offerings. (IIA1a, b)
Standard II. Student Learning Programs and Services

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 needs of its students.

Descriptive Summary

Instruction is delivered through a combination of classroom lectures, demonstrations, live hands-on tutorials and laboratory activities, class and group discussions, guest lectures, field trips, multimedia presentations (audio, video, PowerPoint), and interactive computer projects, among others. The delivery systems and modes of instructions vary among courses, but often multiple modes of delivery are used by an instructor to meet the curriculum objectives, and to suit student learning styles. For example, a total of 173 courses in Spring 2005 and 219 courses in Fall 2005 used WebCT, the UH system’s online course management software, to deliver all or part of their content (http://webct.hawaii.edu/webct/public/show_courses.pl) and many instructors use their own web pages to supplement classroom instruction.

The College understands that learning takes place in many different ways and that students need options when trying to balance busy personal and professional lives with obtaining a college education. The College reaches these students through Distance Education (DE) courses, which include Internet and Teleweb course offerings. Distance Education courses are delivered through cable TV, the Internet, and Interactive Television. In Fall 2005, 50 courses were offered entirely through the Internet (WebCT) and 11 courses were listed as Teleweb Classes (http://emedia.leeward.hawaii.edu/de/).

The College is committed to defining, supporting, and measuring student learning. The Policy on Curriculum Revision and Review has been established (http://home.lcc.hawaii.edu/docs/policies/2003/Policy_Curriculum_Revision_and_Review_030318.pdf), which mandates the review of each course on a six-year cycle. Leeward’s commitment to measure and support student learning is evidenced, for example, in the course modification process required of all Distance Education courses. All DE courses must specify what methods will be employed to ensure timely and effective interaction between faculty and students, and student to student. Information about the technological skills needed by a student to succeed in the course and the appropriateness of the curriculum’s rigor and must be provided by the instructor.

Self Evaluation

Through its policies and procedures for curriculum revision and review, Leeward strives to insure that its delivery systems and instructional methods are appropriate to its curriculum and to student needs. Instruction is delivered through a variety of means to address these needs, including face-to-face instruction, multimedia presentations, and distance learning. Course SLOs are assessed and changes made if indicated. Currently, there is little data that shows how effective delivery systems and modes of instruction are in facilitating student learning. Policies and procedures are being refined, dialogue is taking place within Disciplines, and systems for collecting data are being created. The implementation of the Annual Review process provides an additional incentive, as all change for improvements are tied to SLO assessment.
Planning Agenda

- The College will continue to collect and analyze data on student achievement of SLOs and make changes as needed to insure that its delivery systems and modes of instruction are appropriate and effective.

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.

Descriptive Summary

The College requires that all courses and programs (degrees/certificates) have explicitly stated student learning outcomes. A procedure is in place for assessing student achievement of those outcomes and using those results to make improvements.

Course Student Learning Outcomes

Each core course outline contains the student learning outcomes for the course.

Student learning outcomes are created by Discipline faculty, often after consultation with peers at other UH System colleges, or after consultation with advisory committees in the case of Career and Technical Education (CTE) programs. Core course outlines can be viewed on Curriculum Central at http://emedia.leeward.hawaii.edu/central/. The student learning outcomes for each course can also be found on the instructor's syllabi, available from the appropriate Division Office, the Dean's Office, or the Library.

Each course is on a timeline to be assessed on a six-year cycle, according to the Policy on Curriculum Revision and Review (2003), available at http://home.lcc.hawaii.edu/docs/policies/2003/Policy_Curriculum_Revision_and_Review_030318.pdf. As each course comes up for review, discipline faculty must begin the assessment of the course SLOs. Using the following template, Discipline faculty submit the required information for each SLO assessed. The College Assessment Team reviews the course assessment plans to ensure that appropriate methods are used.

Course Student Learning Outcome (SLO) Assessment Template

Course Alpha and Number:
Course Title:
Name(s) of Instructor(s):
Division:
Date:
What Student Learning Outcome was assessed?

Phase I

A. Describe the assessment tool (test, survey, rubric, etc.) used. Cut and paste your tool below if possible.
B. Who was the data collected from? How many were collected?
C. What were the results of the assessment?
D. What changes are needed based on your assessment?
Phase 2
E. What changes were implemented as a result of your initial assessment?
F. What were the results of those changes?
G. What will be done for the next assessment of this course?

Results of course assessments to date are available from the Course Assessment Coordinator, and will be available on Curriculum Central.

Program/Degree Student Learning Outcomes
Student learning outcomes for programs are designed by the program faculty. For the Associate of Arts (AA) degree, SLOs and competencies were designed by representative committees of faculty from the seven UH community college campuses. The College also offers several Academic Subject Certificates (ASC) listed in the Leeward CC 2005-2006 Catalog on pages 18-25. ASCs are considered part of the AA degree, and do not have separate student learning outcomes. For Career and Technical Education (CTE) programs, SLOs are designed by faculty in consultation with advisory committees, with reference to industry standards. (CTE degrees and Certificates include the Associate of Science (AS) and the Associate of Applied Science (AAS) degrees, the Certificate of Achievement (CA), and the Certificate of Completion (CC). Student learning outcomes for all programs are published in the Leeward CC 2005–2006 Catalog on pages 30-65.

Leeward’s Policy on Program Reviews (rev. 2005) requires the on-going assessment of all AA, AS and AAS program SLOs with comprehensive program reviews scheduled once every four years (timeline found in the Program Review Policy). The policy is available online at http://home.lcc.hawaii.edu/docs/policies/. The questions in the Program/Support Area Assessment Template are the basis for program SLO assessment:

Program/Support Area Assessment Template
Date Submitted:
Submitted by:
Assessment Team Date:

1) Program/Support Area
2) Mission/Purpose (Reference Leeward CC Mission):
3) Leeward CC Strategic Plan (Reference Goals/Objectives):
4) Goal/Objective (Reference Program Goal/Objective):
5) Outcome Measure (What is being counted or measured?)

6) Definition of Data Sample (Where or from whom will data be collected?)
   (When will data be collected?)
   (How many data samples are intended to be collected?)
   (Why is this appropriate data?)

7) Method of Data Collection (How will data be collected and by whom?):
   (Describe assessment tool (survey, rubric, etc.) to be used; attach if possible)
8) Actual Level of Results (How many samples were collected?):
   (What actual data (numerical results such as total count, percentages, averages, etc.)
   were collected?)

9) Analysis (What have you learned, both in terms of the assessment process and student
   achievement of SLOs, as a result of this assessment?):

10) Plan of Action (What changes do you propose to improve student learning (for the
    student learning outcomes assessed) or to improve the support area?):

11) Budget Impact (How much will the action cost?):
    (How could the proposed plan be funded?)
    (If a grant will fund the proposal, how will long-term funding be carried through?)

All OCEWD courses are required to have course SLOs that are listed on the OCEWD website
(http://www.lcc.hawaii.edu/ocewd). SLOs are evaluated on the Student Course Evaluation
forms at the end of each course. Due to the constantly changing needs for non-credit courses,
course reviews are not done on a regular schedule—only when the course needs updating or
when course evaluation forms indicate that changes are needed.

**Self Evaluation**

The College has developed a policy for program assessment that is centered on published
student learning outcomes. Faculty and staff are participating in the assessment of student
achievement of SLOs in courses and programs. The different courses and programs are at
various stages of collecting data, making plans of action, implementing those plans, and
evaluating the results. Documentation of course SLO assessments and resulting changes are
available from the Course Assessment Coordinator, and will be placed on Curriculum Central
sometime in the 2006-2007 academic year. Some of these results and changes can also be
found in the Division’s Annual Reviews. The most recent program assessments and changes
can be found at the College’s DocuShare site at http://documents.leeward.hawaii.edu:8080/
docushare/dsweb/View/Collection-14

As an example of improvements made due to SLO assessment, the Oral Communication
Committee (assessing the AA general education SLO in oral communication) identified a
student problem in audience identification. An audience analysis form was introduced as a
teaching methodology, and achievement of this SLO increased from 36% to 68%. Complete
results of program SLO assessments can be found in the DocuShare site noted above.

The College’s budget is linked to SLO assessment of courses and programs, with data used in
the cycle of Program and Annual Reviews that drive the planning process. All faculty need to
become aware of SLO assessment results, and how they have been used to improve student
learning, as well as their significance in terms of the budget process.
The second phase of the Annual Review process will involve a wider cross section of the campus, through the creation of Phase II committees that focus on areas such as space allocation, staffing, information technology, and equipment. These committees will consider the planning lists resulting from Program Reviews and will recommend priorities, based on their area of expertise. The prioritized lists will be submitted to the Executive Planning Committee, composed of the Faculty Senate and Campus Council Executive Committees, the Deans of Arts and Sciences, Career and Technical Education, and Academic Support, and the Director of Administrative Services and Vice Chancellor. This group will determine the budget priorities of the College.

Planning Agenda

- The campus’ Executive Planning Committee and the Assessment Team, comprised of the Vice Chancellor/Chief Academic Officer; the Director of Policy Planning and Assessment (position to be established); the Accreditation Liaison Officer; the Institutional Researcher; a representative from the Faculty Senate, and others as selected by the VC/CAO, will evaluate the Annual Review process used this academic year to determine to what extent assessment was used to make decisions. These groups will also assess the degree to which data is being housed in a manner that makes decision making transparent.

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.

Descriptive Summary

Faculty are responsible for developing course student learning outcomes. To determine the appropriate set of SLOs, this development involves dialogue between Division colleagues and colleagues at other colleges, and for Career and Technical Education courses, dialogue with advisory committees. Each course is required to have a core outline in the Curriculum Central database. These outlines are reviewed and approved by the Division, Division Chair, Curriculum Committee, Faculty Senate, and Chief Academic Officer. This procedure is outlined in the 2003 Curriculum Revision and Review Policy. See (http://home.lcc.hawaii.edu/docs/policies/2003/Policy_Curriculum_Revision_and_Review_030318.pdf). The core outline includes student learning outcomes that are standard in every section of the course.

The Policy on Curriculum Revision and Review (2003) also requires that all courses be reviewed in a six-year cycle. By 2009, the entire curriculum will have been reviewed via this process. The policy requires Discipline faculty to review course content and SLOs for relevancy, sequencing, currency, depth, breadth and rigor, and to submit the results of this review through Curriculum Central for review by the Division, Division Chair, Curriculum Committee, Faculty Senate, and Dean of Arts and Sciences or Career and Technical Education. At the same time, as part of this process, faculty teaching the course must begin assessing the SLOs of the course. This involves dialogue among faculty as to suitable assessment techniques, as well as analysis of the results of this assessment. Action plans developed from course SLO assessment become
part of the Division Annual Review under the Annual Review process, and if faculty request budgetary items to improve achievement of SLOs, such items will be included in the budget prioritization.

Career and Technical Education programs are proposed and developed by faculty, with consultation from advisory committees. Faculty are responsible for the design of the program and for establishing student learning outcomes. Programs. Programs are proposed via Curriculum Central, and reviewed by the proposing Division, the Curriculum Committee, the Faculty Senate, the Chief Academic Officer, and must also be approved by the Chancellor and the UH Board of Regents.

The Associate of Arts degree program has agreed-upon General Education student learning outcomes (skill standards) designed by the UH Community Colleges in 1997. For the Academic Skill Standards which resulted from the UH General Education Project, see the relevant memo dated March 17, 1997 relating to the UH System wide General Education Academic Skill Standards at [http://www.hawaii.edu/ovppp/gened/gedwww.htm](http://www.hawaii.edu/ovppp/gened/gedwww.htm). The General Education SLOs include written and oral communication, critical thinking, quantitative reasoning, and information retrieval and technology. Leeward faculty added abstract thinking to the student learning outcomes for the AA degree.

The Leeward CC Policy on Program Reviews (2003, rev. 2005) establishes the current procedures to review all programs. This Policy can be found online at [http://home.lcc.hawaii.edu/docs/policies/](http://home.lcc.hawaii.edu/docs/policies/). Under this Policy, program faculty and the program coordinator must continually be engaged in some aspect of program assessment, and must undertake a comprehensive review every four years. Due to the complexity of the AA degree, program coordinators are assigned for each of the six General Education SLO areas, and committees of interdisciplinary faculty have been established to assess SLOs in these six areas.

**Self Evaluation**

The College has established procedures to design and identify learning outcomes for courses and programs. Faculty play a central role in establishing the quality and improving courses and programs. Some faculty have been given assigned time to coordinate and to accomplish the tasks of course and program assessment. A schedule has been established for regular review of programs.

The AA degree has been defined as a program with six areas (critical thinking, quantitative reasoning, written communication, information retrieval and technology, oral communication, and abstract thinking). Committees have started work on assessment of SLOs in each of the six areas. The results of the 2004 and 2005 assessment activities can be found on the Leeward CC DocuShare site: [http://documents.leeward.hawaii.edu:8080/docushare/dsweb/View/Collection-14](http://documents.leeward.hawaii.edu:8080/docushare/dsweb/View/Collection-14)

As an example of the College’s assessment of AA General Education SLOs, in Fall 2005 the Writing Assessment Committee developed an online method of writing assessment, which in its first trial appeared both effective and efficient. In a Spring 2006 System meeting on program assessment, the College’s online Writing Assessment Project was presented, and some of the other community colleges expressed interested in the project, even to the extent of volunteering to participate as readers for Leeward’s next writing assessment.
The Fall 2005 Writing Assessment Project was also a test of a classroom strategy introduced to address a problem with student writing that had been consistently documented in previous writing assessment: statement and development of a main idea or thesis. Some of the classes assessed (an Experimental Group) were asked to use a graphic organizer to assist students, while in other classes (Control Group) no changes were made. Use of graphic organizers proved relatively effective in helping students identify, state, and develop main ideas or theses. In the Experimental Group of papers 72.5% were rated as acceptable for second-year college writing in terms of the expression of a thesis, compared to 56% of Control Group papers. For the development of a main idea or thesis, 57.5% of the papers in the Experimental Group were rated acceptable, as compared to 52% in the Control Group. These results, if verified by a future assessment, will enable the Writing Assessment Committee to provide specific recommendations to the College to improve achievement of the written communication SLOs.

As another example, changes have been made to the Certificate of Achievement in Accounting as a result of program SLO assessment. Initial assessment indicated a 72% success rate in selected classes in the performance of basic accounting techniques. In faculty discussion of the results, it was decided that the goal should be 100% achievement of the stated SLO. Faculty agreed upon strategies to emphasize basic techniques in the classroom, and to utilize accounting tutors for students who continued to have difficulty. Further examples can be found on the DocuShare website cited above.

Course assessment has begun, but there is no published policy in place. The current plan is to expand the 2003 Curriculum Revision and Review policy to include details on course assessment. The results of course assessment, including changes made, will eventually be available via Curriculum Central.

A list of courses that have modified teaching methodologies as a result of assessment was included in the first Annual Review reports (Spring 2006). These include courses in history, philosophy, psychology, anthropology, economics, foreign languages, English, and ICS. In some cases, a follow-up assessment has not yet been done to evaluate the success of the changes; in other cases, the follow-up assessment has not been reported.

**Planning Agenda**

- Faculty will develop a written policy on course SLO assessment as part of the review of the Curriculum Revision and Review Policy.
II.A.2.b. The institution relies on faculty expertise and the assistance of advisory committees when appropriate to identify competency levels and measurable student learning outcomes for courses, certificates, programs including general and vocational education, and degrees. The institution regularly assesses student progress towards achieving those outcomes.

**Descriptive Summary**

The course and program assessment process begins with faculty. Faculty in the Discipline, in consultation with colleagues at the Discipline, Division, and College levels, determine the appropriate student learning outcomes for courses, certificates, programs, and degrees. Student learning outcomes are also based on national and professional standards.

College Advisory Boards have been established for programs in Accounting, Automotive Technology, Business Technology, Digital Media, Food Service, Information & Computer Science, Management, Substance Abuse Counseling, and Television Production. (Members of the Advisory Boards are listed on p. 179 of the *Catalog*.) Advisory Boards assist in the development of program SLOs.

Courses, and the course student learning outcomes, are designed to meet the learning outcomes of the programs of which they are a part. Students who complete the required courses in a program should therefore have met the SLOs of the program. To clearly establish this relationship for the AA program, the College is working to establish a Curriculum Grid indicating which AA courses address which AA program student learning outcomes. Twenty-one courses have been identified as those most commonly taken by our AA graduates. By the end of May 2006, faculty teaching those courses will have identified which program student learning outcomes are met by the course, how they are met, and at what level they are met (Introductory, Practiced, or Demonstrated). Eventually, the grid should contain all courses meeting AA degree requirements.

Student learning outcomes are in the process of being assessed for both courses and programs. As courses come up for review under the 2003 *Policy on Curriculum Revision and Review*, they are required to begin assessing their SLOs. This assessment is done by the Discipline faculty and monitored by the Course Assessment Coordinator.

The Assessment Team reviewed some of the course assessment plans to ensure that the assessment tool is appropriate for the SLO. The Assessment Team will continue to review samples of course SLO assessments, and will request periodic status reports (from the Curriculum Central database) of those courses that have completed phases I and II of SLO assessment. This review will be used as a diagnostic tool to gauge course SLO assessment on a campus-wide scale, measure the progress and effectiveness of assessment processes, highlight areas that require further training, and cite model examples and best practices. Periodic status reports will be made to the Curriculum Committee and the Faculty Senate. Course SLO assessments will be available in Curriculum Central for campus view. Course assessment plans that require funding will be incorporated into the Division *Annual Reviews*.

Programs are required to continually assess SLOs by the *Policy on Program Reviews* (rev. 2005). These assessments are carried out by program faculty, and submitted to the program assessment...
Student Learning Outcomes Standard II

The Assessment Team reviews program assessment plans to ensure that the assessment tool is appropriate for the SLO, meets with program faculty to discuss assessment results and assessment process improvements, and supports the design of planning items for the budget and allocation process. Current program assessment results have been posted on DocuShare for campus view, and program assessment plans that required funding were incorporated into planning lists in Program Annual Reviews.

Self Evaluation

The College has established procedures to identify competency levels and measurable student learning outcomes, and to assess student achievement of those outcomes. The implementation of the Policy on Program Review (2005) has just started, but a clear process for SLO assessment of both courses and programs has been established, as well as the primary role of faculty in assessment and the connection between SLO assessment and budget and planning. The Assessment Team is in place, but a possible weakness to the plan may be that no administrative office has been assigned the permanent responsibility of course and program assessment.

Planning Agenda

• The responsibilities of the Assessment Team will be permanently assigned to an administrative office in order to ensure that policies continue to be followed.

• As part of its assessment of the Program and Annual Review processes, the College will evaluate the effect of its Program Review Policy on improvement of student learning. Because Program Review focuses on the assessment and improvement of student learning outcomes, this plan will improve student learning.

II.A.2.c. High-quality instruction and appropriate breadth, depth, rigor, sequencing, time to completion, and synthesis of learning characterize all programs.

Descriptive Summary

When courses come up for review in the College’s six-year cycle, the faculty who teach these courses must provide evidence that they are of appropriate breadth, depth, rigor, sequencing, relevancy, and currency. This information is put into the core course outline in the Curriculum Central database (http://emedia.leeward.hawaii.edu/central/) and is reviewed through the regular course modification process.

Programs can address the questions of breadth, depth, rigor, sequencing, etc. as part of the continual review and assessment required by the Leeward CC Policy on Program Reviews (2005).

The determination of whether a course or program has the appropriate breadth, depth, rigor, sequencing, time to completion, and synthesis of learning is done by faculty during deliberate dialogue with Discipline peers. Faculty also compare course content and sequencing to that of comparable institutions, both within and outside the UH System. Comparisons are also made with various college textbooks used for the subject. When the Curriculum Committee evaluates courses up for review, it assesses the appropriateness of the responses with the assistance, if needed, of the campus Assessment Team.
Self Evaluation
All courses and programs are making progress in addressing breadth, depth, rigor, sequencing, time to completion, and synthesis of learning. The words rigor, breadth, etc., are not stated in the Leeward CC Policy on Program Reviews (2005), but are implied and probably should be stated. Courses make up the programs, and depth, breadth, rigor etc. are definitely covered by during the course assessment process.

Planning Agenda
- The College will revise the Policy on Program Reviews to specifically require analysis of appropriate breadth, depth, rigor, and sequencing as part of the Program Review process.

II.A.2.d. The institution uses delivery modes and teaching methodologies that reflect the diverse needs and learning styles of its students.

Descriptive Summary
The College meets the diverse needs of its students by offering courses and programs of General Education, Career and Technical Education, and continuing education on and/or off campus. These courses and programs range from traditional, on-campus class sessions and teleweb/video/Internet-based courses, to short-term non-credit programs for the community and industry.

The College’s on-campus classes help students learn on a regular, face-to-face, interactive basis. Innovative as well as traditional teaching methods are utilized to insure achievement of student learning outcomes. These methods include, but are not limited to, lectures, slides, videotapes, PowerPoint presentations, class discussions, field trips, and lab drills. The adoption of particular methodologies depends on the nature of the subject matter and on the auditory, visual, or kinesthetic needs of the students. Various methods of instruction can be found in the response to Question #27 for each course at the Curriculum Central web site, http://emedia.leeward.hawaii.edu/central/.

For students who cannot come to campus, Distance Education courses deliver the education they need to reach their college goals. Distance Education, through various media and methods of communication, offers Televised/Teleweb courses, 2-way interactive video courses, and Internet courses. Televised courses are first videotaped in a studio or a classroom, and then telecast on certain cable channels. Students watch televised courses at the time of broadcast and can videotape the lectures that they want to view at other times. Teleweb courses are also delivered via television. However, students not only view the televised lectures but also use the Internet for additional course material and communication. Two-way interactive video enables students to take courses from other campuses across the state by attending “live-real time” interactive video classes on the Leeward campus. Internet courses allow students to do the course work and conduct teacher-student communication entirely over the Internet. DE courses are listed on the Distance Education at Leeward Community College web site, http://emedia.leeward.hawaii.edu/de/.
The College’s Office of Continuing Education and Workforce development (OCEWD) offers a variety of programs designed to meet the needs of people of all ages and interest. The programs provide short-term training in technical skills required by various occupations or needed for life-long development. Programs such as “Business/Health,” “Computer/Technology,” “Motorcycle Safety,” “Native Hawaiian Community Based Learning,” and “Occupational Safety and Health Administration,” deliver education in a flexible, customized, hands-on style. OCEWD’s programs and courses are listed in the Leeward CC 2005–2006 Catalog and on the web site http://www.lcc.hawaii.edu/osewd/.

Self Evaluation
Although a variety of teaching delivery methods are used to support student learning, the College does little formal assessment of student learning styles and does not schedule ongoing faculty training in the topic.

Planning Agenda
• The College will make available to all students a quick survey assessment of learning style, either as part of new student orientation/counseling, or as a voluntary service for students. In addition, an annual workshop on learning styles will be offered, perhaps as part of new faculty orientation.
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.

Descriptive Summary

Leeward Community College’s Policy on Curriculum Revision and Review was formally adopted in March 2003 and can be found at http://home.lcc.hawaii.edu/docs/policies/2003/Policy_Curriculum_Revision_and_Review_030318.pdf. The policy sets procedures for the periodic review of core outlines, with the goal of assuring academic rigor and integrity in all courses and programs and the continued appropriateness of curriculum content, instructional methods, course activities and objectives, and student competencies.

The implementation process includes the following steps:

Each Division has established which courses will be reviewed each year, over a six-year cycle. Each Discipline reviews its own courses, ensuring the accuracy of the core outlines, their academic rigor, integrity, currency, the continued articulation of the courses with System colleges, and future needs and plans. In the process of this review, faculty may converse with peers within the UH System, and compare course content with similar courses in comparable colleges in Hawai’i and in other areas of the U.S. The core course outline, as modified, is then entered on Curriculum Central and follows the normal Division, Curriculum Committee, and Faculty Senate approval process. At the same time, faculty must begin to assess the course student learning outcomes. Assessment workshops at Leeward CC provide an opportunity for interdisciplinary discussion of what it means for a course to be relevant, appropriate, and current, and how the student learning objectives can be assessed.

The College’s Policy on Program Reviews (rev. 2005) determines the procedures for the review of all programs, including the program student learning outcomes. This policy can be found at http://home.lcc.hawaii.edu/docs/policies/. As part of program review, each program is required to do the following:

1. Discuss how the program objectives support the College mission.
2. Assess program and course student learning outcomes
3. Review student achievement data, such as enrollment data, transfer numbers, course and program completion, retention and persistence rates, etc. (data to be provided annually by the institutional researcher).
4. Examine faculty issues, such as faculty/student rations, professional development of faculty, etc.
5. Discuss issues relating to curriculum, including trends, innovations and challenges.
6. Discuss issues relating to support, including changes in technology, marketing, equipment, and other support services needed to improve student learning.
7. Provide information from external sources such as advisory committees, job outlook, national standards or accrediting bodies.

The results of Program Reviews along with Division and Support Area Annual Reviews, are incorporated into the College annual budget and planning process.
Non-credit courses offered by OCEWD also have stated SLOs. (Refer to the link on the website program pages, accessed via http://www.lcc.hawaii.edu/ocewd/). However, data is not formally collected on SLO achievement as it relates to future improvements in the course.

**Self Evaluation**
The College is continuing to refine procedures to evaluate all courses and programs. The numbers of courses assessed from each Division from Spring 2004 to May 2006 are listed below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Division</th>
<th>Courses Scheduled for Assessment (rev. S2006) (1)</th>
<th>Assessment Info in Core Course Outline (1)</th>
<th>Core Outlines Approved by Curriculum Committee (2)</th>
<th>Completed SLO Phase 1 (1)</th>
<th>Completed SLO Phase 2 (1)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Social Science</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business Technology</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Math and Science</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Language Arts</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Services</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vocational / Technical</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arts and Humanities</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTALS</strong></td>
<td><strong>161</strong></td>
<td><strong>126</strong></td>
<td><strong>70</strong></td>
<td><strong>91</strong></td>
<td><strong>28</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Course Assessment Progress

(1) Source: Course Assessment Progress Report 5/17/2006
(2) Source: Curriculum Committee Report to Faculty Senate May 10, 2006
Comments: The “Courses Scheduled” was revised by Divisions to eliminate courses that are currently not being taught, or in rare instances because of other concerns. For “Completed SLO Phase 2,” in many cases, phase 2 was completed but not submitted because of technical problems.

Core outlines state the expected SLOs and can be reviewed in Curriculum Central. Assessment results of those SLOs already assessed (see chart above) will be put into Curriculum Central. If SLO assessment indicates that a particular SLO is not being achieved, the faculty who teach the course engage in dialogue to propose changes that they will implement and assess when the course is next taught.

The most recent assessment of program SLOs can be found on the DocuShare site at http://documents.leeward.hawaii.edu:8080/docushare/dsweb/View/Collection-14

Examples of changes to courses and programs as a result of SLO assessment can be found in II.A.2.a.above.
Planning Agenda

- The Executive Planning Committee and the Assessment Team will evaluate this year’s process to assess the quality and usefulness of the process and the data collected.

- The Course Assessment Coordinator and faculty will revise the Policy on Course Revision and Review to incorporate course SLO assessment. Course assessment policies and procedures will be documented in this Policy.

II.A.2.f. The institution engages in on-going, 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.

Descriptive Summary

The Leeward Community College Policy on Program Reviews (rev. 2005) describes the systematic evaluation of programs (degrees with related certificates). Comprehensive Program Reviews are required every four years. The timetable for annual assessment of program student learning outcomes is published in the campus calendar. The Assessment Team (composed of the Chief Academic Officer, Accreditation Liaison Officer, Assessment Coordinators, Institutional Researcher, and chair of the Faculty Senate Program Review Committee) evaluates the results of program and course assessments and gives feedback to the faculty and staff involved.

The Assessment Team also meets to discuss and decide upon policies, procedures, and implementation methods. Evaluation and planning to monitor achievement of student learning outcomes begins with this group. Information is disseminated to the campus via the Faculty Senate, Division Chairs, Discipline Coordinators, and numerous meetings and workshops for faculty and staff.

Student learning outcomes for certificates (including the stand-alone Human Services/Substance Abuse Counseling Certificate) are assessed during the program assessment process (with their related degrees) and during individual course assessments. Certificates of twelve credits or fewer and Academic Subject Certificates (ASC) are assessed via course assessment only. Courses are assessed on a six-year cycle: program assessment is ongoing. Both course and program assessments require reporting of what will be done to improve the achievement of the student learning outcomes. The Assessment Team reviews results and feedback is given to the faculty and the Division Chairs.

The College's Strategic Plan 2002-2010 is revisited annually. Contained within the document are the College’s objectives, prioritized action plans and their impact on the campus budget. Action plans implemented each year up until 2006 were assessed, and the findings were reported to the campus at the end of each academic year. The College did not revisit the Strategic Plan during the Spring 2006, as all Units of the entire campus worked on completing their respective Annual Reviews.
The *Annual Review* process, developed in 2005, requires all Divisions and Support Units to evaluate their effectiveness. Data from this review process became available in Spring 2006, as Divisions and Support Units finished their first *Annual Review*. Along with data from *Program Reviews*, the *Annual Review* data will be incorporated into the new cycle of strategic planning.

**Self Evaluation**
The College’s plans and objectives meet this standard. The College provides assigned time to the faculty who coordinate assessment work. Assigned time has enabled Assessment Coordinators and the AA program SLO assessment chairs for written and oral communication to make significant progress. The College has also requested funding for the new office of the Director of Policy, Planning, and Assessment and plans to fill the position when funding comes through. The College needs to develop a description of the functions and responsibilities of this position.

**Planning Agenda**
- The Executive Planning Committee and the Assessment Team will review results to insure that quality data has emerged from assessment processes, that changes were instituted, and that budget items were put forwarded as a result. All information and any modifications will be provided to the campus in a timely manner.
- The College will clarify the role of the Director of Planning, Policy, and Assessment, including his role in collecting data on course and program assessments and improvements made. This assessment information will be made available to all faculty, staff, and administrators, with summaries/interpretations provided, and will be used in subsequent *Program* and *Annual Reviews* and revisits of the *Strategic Plan*.

II.A.2.g. If an institution uses departmental course and/or program examinations, it validates their effectiveness in measuring student learning and minimizes test biases.

**Descriptive Summary**
Some College programs of study have program examinations for students at the completion of the course of study. These examinations are based on national and professional standards

- **Food Service**
  Three certification exams are created, disseminated, and graded by the National Restaurant Association. The Food Services faculty is responsible for proctoring these exams. Validation is done by the National Restaurant Association. These exams are given at the end of FSER 21 – Food Service Sanitation, FSER 41 – Dining Room & Beverage Operations, and FSER 74 – Food Service Supervision. See their web site at [http://www.nraef.org/faq/faq_exams.asp?flag=lcd&level1_id=6&level2_id=4](http://www.nraef.org/faq/faq_exams.asp?flag=lcd&level1_id=6&level2_id=4)
• Automotive Technology
The Automotive Technology Program bases its student learning competencies on the tasks prescribed by the National Automotive Technician Education Foundation (NATEF) and the National Institute for Automotive Service Excellence (ASE). The website, http://www.natef.org/about/achieving_ase_cert.cfm, gives more information about the standards for certification of the Automotive Technology Program. Students who exit the program and who have the relevant work experience can take the ASE certification exams. The website http://www.ase.com/ gives more information about the ASE exams and ASE certification. Our Automotive Technology Program helps students prepare for these national exams. The College does not administer these exams.

• Digital Media
The Digital Media Program at Leeward prepares students for two certifications: Web Technician and Web Master. The National Association of Communication Systems Engineers (NACSE) offers these certifications. See http://www.nacse.com/Certifications/Default.aspx for more information. The Digital Media Program helps students prepare for these national exams, but does not administer them.

• Information and Computer Science
Common anonymous tests are offered in ICS 100, ICS 101, and ICS 184 to test the student learning outcomes. The faculty will be engaging in further discussions on departmental course exams as they assess student learning outcomes.

The program prepares those in networking to take the following certification examinations:

1). NANS (NACSE Associate Network Specialist) and
2). NSNS (NACSE Senior Network Specialist).

NACSE is the acronym for the National Association of Communication Systems Engineers. The exams are taken voluntarily. Currently all military students and one-third of non-military students take these exams, which are developed by a national board and are not vendor specific.

Self Evaluation
According to Division Chairpersons and Program Coordinators, no departmental course examinations are used for multiple sections taught by different faculty. In the past, math courses were given a departmental final exam, but this is no longer the case.

Planning Agenda
• No changes are needed to address this standard.
II.A.2.h The institution awards credit based on student achievement of the course’s stated learning outcomes. Units of credit awarded are consistent with institutional policies that reflect generally accepted norms or equivalencies in higher education.

**Descriptive Summary**
CCC#6100 outlines the criteria for creation and modification of courses. All new courses and all course modifications must answer the questions found in the memorandum dated 8/28/91. The Curriculum Central database adheres to the guidelines of this memorandum. Curriculum Committee decisions to approve course modifications or new course proposals are also based on these criteria. This requirements of this memo and the review of courses by the Discipline, Division, Curriculum Committee, Faculty Senate and the Deans of Arts and Sciences and Career and Technical Education insure that course credit is awarded according to generally accepted norms or equivalencies in higher education. The CCCM memo does not address awarding of credits based on achievement of SLOs.

Each instructor must create his/her course syllabus from the core course outline in Curriculum Central. This is to ensure the student learning outcomes are the same for each section of that course. Each Division is responsible for oversight of this consistency. Through the Policy on Curriculum Revision and Review, direct assessment of all student learning outcomes within each course has been scheduled.

**Self Evaluation**
Policies are in place and several levels of review are used to insure that units of credit awarded are consistent with generally accepted norms or equivalencies in higher education.

Course outlines contain student learning outcomes designed by the faculty who teach the courses. Evaluation methods, including exams, papers, group work, and others used by instructors, measure students’ success in meeting these outcomes. Although it is logical to assume that a student earns credits for the course because he/she has accomplished the course SLOs, the College is only beginning to collect direct evidence of this.

**Planning Agenda**
- The College will use data from SLO assessment to consider how student achievement of course SLOs relates to the awarding of credit.
II.A.2.i. The institution awards degrees and certificates based on student achievement of a program's stated learning outcomes.

**Descriptive Summary**
Currently, the College awards degrees and certificates to students who earn credits by passing courses at a satisfactory level. Degree and certificate programs have identified student learning outcomes; however, these program SLOs are not yet assessed, and course credit is not specifically tied to the achievement of student learning outcomes.

With the introduction of Program Review, the College is actively engaged in the assessment of student learning outcomes at the course and program levels. Course assessment, as stipulated in the Policy on Curriculum Revision and Review, calls for all courses to show evidence of assessment of student learning outcomes within a six-year period. As of Spring 2006, 91 courses had begun the process of SLO assessment (Course Assessment Progress Report 5/17/2006). The AA degree General Education core SLOs are also being assessed, changes implemented as a result of assessment, and re-assessed.

Non-credit courses and various programs offered by OCEWD also have SLOs stated. Most of these SLOs can be accessed through the OCEWD website at http://www.lcc.hawaii.edu/ocewd/. Those courses that are created because of specific training needs have well defined SLOs that are accomplished by all students who complete the course. SLO assessments are done by the individual instructors, but are not collected by OCEWD. Because many of the courses are offered only intermittently, making changes based on SLO assessment is not tracked.

**Self Evaluation**
While each degree and certificate program has identified its student learning outcomes, SLO assessment is in its early stages. Much discussion is taking place to ensure that plans and schedules are well thought out before being fully implemented. Faculty have begun assessments at two levels, course and program. Electronic databases are being created to collect course and program assessment results. For the AA degree, a Curriculum Grid was created in Spring 2006 that shows which courses are addressing which General Education SLOs, and at what level. However, only the twenty-one courses identified as those most commonly taken by students to meet the General Education core requirements have been included in the Grid.

**Planning Agenda**
- The College will develop a plan to assess the extent to which graduates achieve program SLOs.
- The Curriculum Grid will be extended to include all courses that satisfy the AA General Education core.
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.

II.A.3.a. General education has comprehensive learning outcomes for the students who complete it, including the following: An understanding of the basic content and methodology of the major areas of knowledge: areas include the humanities and fine arts, the natural sciences, and the social sciences.

Descriptive Summary
The General Education philosophy is found on page 60 of the Leeward CC 2005-2006 Catalog. The General Education Core Requirements for the Associate in Arts (AA) degree are also listed in the college catalog and are grouped into six areas of General Education outcomes: critical thinking, information retrieval and technology, oral communications, quantitative reasoning, written communication, and abstract thinking (see pp. 60-61). Each of these areas specify 6-10 student learning outcomes. The Curriculum Committee insures that each course in the General Education curriculum addresses at least one of these academic skill areas and that student learning outcomes are included in course outlines.

The catalog also lists the Associate in Arts Degree Competencies that are grouped into seven areas: arts and humanities, languages, mathematics and logical reasoning, natural sciences, social sciences, world civilizations, and written and oral Communication. Each of these areas specify 4-12 specific student learning outcomes. Courses fulfilling the General Education requirements must have student learning outcomes that meet some or all of the competencies in their specific areas (social science, natural science, etc.) The AA degree competencies can be found on pages 64-65 of the 2005-2006 Catalog.

The Career and Technical degree programs, including the Associate in Science (AS) and Associate in Applied Science (AAS), require General Education or liberal arts courses, as required by the College or program. General Education course listings for the AS and AAS can be found in the catalog on page 68.

Self Evaluation
A student must have the minimum General Education course requirements to be awarded an AA, AS, or AAS degree. AA degree graduates must have ten credits in natural sciences, nine credits in arts and humanities, and nine credits in social sciences. The College is in the process of developing a Curriculum Grid to insure that all courses in the General Education core have SLOs related to the General Education SLOs in written and oral Communication, information retrieval, critical and abstract thinking, and quantitative reasoning. It does not have a companion grid that would relate courses to the competencies in social science, natural science, and arts and humanities.
Planning Agenda
• The College will design a grid similar to the Curriculum Grid for the AA competencies in each Division, particularly those in natural sciences, arts and humanities, and social sciences. This will provide some evidence that the AA graduates who have taken, for example, three social science classes, have been taught all the social science competencies.

II.A.3.b. 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.

Descriptive Summary
Leeward Community College is committed, through its programs and the General Education curriculum, to enable students to become productive individuals and life long learners. As stated above, the General Education outcomes include those for Critical Thinking, Information Retrieval and Technology, Quantitative Reasoning, Written Communication, Oral Communication, and Abstract Thinking.

The College enforces its Policy on Program Reviews to ensure a high quality of education is being provided to students and that the students are learning. The degree/certificate programs, areas of instruction, and all Support Areas are included in this policy with the purposes of evaluating performance, determining accountability, and improving quality. Through course and program assessment, the College is measuring student learning outcomes achievement in the areas listed above.

Self Evaluation
An example of the progress made in assessment of program SLOs is that of Written Communication, which has also demonstrated collaboration and contributions from both academic and Support Areas. In 2005-2006, six Writing Intensive courses across the curriculum were assessed by eighteen faculty and staff readers, representing eight disciplines and four divisions. Results of the assessment show that in their second year of college, Leeward students do very well with grammar and technical aspects of writing, but that about half the number of students have problems developing a unified, organized essay focusing on a thesis. This finding, which corroborates evidence from previous writing assessment efforts, has caused the change in practice in several “experimental” sections, in which students used graphic organizers to illustrate connections between their thesis statements and supportive evidence. Findings on this change in process will be studied in future assessment efforts and shared with the campus community.

As mentioned earlier, the College is in the process of developing a Curriculum Grid, which will demonstrate which courses meet specific General Education SLOs in written and oral Communication, abstract and critical thinking, information retrieval and technology, and quantitative reasoning. The initial Curriculum Grid (Spring 2006) involved twenty-one courses most frequently taken by our AA graduates. This Grid will be expanded to include all courses that fulfill AA General Education core requirements, listed on pages 66-67 of the Leeward CC 2005-2006 Catalog.
All AA program General Education SLOs are in the process of assessment. There is some specific concern that in the area of information retrieval and technology, as no specific courses are required in this area, AA graduates may lack necessary skills. An assessment of two SLOs with information and retrieval was undertaken in Summer 2006; as data becomes available, it should be possible to determine to what extent computer literacy is achieved by our AA graduates.

The College has appropriate policies in place for Program Review, and its Annual Review process shows promise of bringing together the results of assessment with planning and budgeting. However, the quality of the program and course assessments, as well as the level of faculty participation, vary considerably across the campus.

**Planning Agenda**

- As part of the Program Review process, the College will clarify how students will acquire computer literacy in every degree program and how it will be assessed.

- The College will continue to follow its process and schedule for its program and course SLOs assessments. These ongoing evaluations are to ensure the high quality of education and to enable students to be productive individuals and lifelong learners.

### II.A.3.c. A recognition of what it means to be an ethical human being and effective citizen:

Qualities include an appreciation of ethical principles; civility and interpersonal skills; respect for cultural diversity; historical and aesthetic sensitivity; and the willingness to assume civic, political, and social responsibilities locally, nationally and globally.

**Descriptive Summary**

The General Education Core Requirements provide students with “the opportunity to develop understandings, abilities, values, and attributes that enable them to apply their knowledge, skills, and talents to make judicious decisions and to analyze and solve human problems within a multi-cultural community” (Leeward CC 2005–2006 Catalog p. 64). Examples of General Education courses that can be used to satisfy this standard are as follows:

- Ethical Principles: Philosophy, Political Science and Education.
- Civility and Interpersonal Skills: Psychology and Sociology.
- Cultural Diversity: Anthropology, Asian Studies, Drama, East Asian Language and Literature, Hawaiian Studies, and Humanities.
- Historical and Aesthetic Sensitivity: Arts, Music, Dance, Drama, English Literature and History.
- Civic, Political and Social Responsibilities: American Studies, Political Science, Interdisciplinary Sciences, and Women Studies.

See SLO Appendix A (page 260) for a description of some of the courses offered in each of these 5 sub-categories. The College is committed to providing the students with opportunities through these General Education courses to recognize what it means to be an effective human being and effective citizen.
**Self Evaluation**

Leeward Community College believes in the dignity and potential of each individual and their ability to learn. Through efforts in General Education curriculum development and productive relationships with national and international counterparts, the College provides students with learning experiences that support a recognition of what it means to be an ethical human being and effective citizen. The College meets this standard.

**Planning Agenda**

- No changes are needed to address this standard.

---

II.A.4. All degree programs include focused study in at least one area of inquiry or in an established interdisciplinary core.

**Descriptive Summary**

CCCM #6004, dated November 4, 1996, and pertaining to “Academic Credentials: Degrees and Certificates,” is the document used in defining the College’s degrees and certificates. Leeward CC requires of all its degrees and programs (AA, AS, and AAS) a component of General Education that is interdisciplinary by nature and published in the 2005-2006 Leeward CC Catalog on pages 66-67.

For the AA Degree, forty-three credits of General Education core requirements consist of the following:

- 9 credits in Arts and Humanities (3 in each of three groups)
- 10 credits in Natural Sciences
- 3 credits in Mathematical or Logical Reasoning
- 9 credits in Social Sciences
- 6 credits in World Civilization
- 3 credits in Written Communication
- 3 credits in Oral Communication

In Fall 2005 the Faculty Senate voted to accept the recommendations of the Senate’s AA degree ad hoc committee to change the AA degree, in part to bring the AA requirements into more consistent alignment with that of UH Mānoa Arts and Sciences requirements. The major change in the degree requirements will substitute 6 credits of Global and Multicultural Perspectives for World Civilization. Several courses, including the 6 credits of world civilization, will fulfill this requirement. The AA will continue to have an interdisciplinary core.

For the AS, AAS and AAT Degrees, minimum program requirements consist of the following:

- Courses required by major program
- General Education or Liberal Arts courses required by the college or program
- Electives as needed to meet the total credit hours requirement
- Proficiency in written and/or oral communication and/or mathematics usually met by successful completion of a course or courses identified by the program.
**Self Evaluation**
All degree programs include focused study in at least one area of inquiry or in an established interdisciplinary core.

**Planning Agenda**
- No changes are needed to address this standard.

II.A.5. Students completing vocation and occupational certificates and degrees demonstrate technical and professional competencies that meet employment and other applicable standards and are prepared for external licensure and certification.

**Descriptive Summary**
All vocational programs are required to meet regularly with their advisory boards to assure relevancy of the curriculum SLOs in meeting employment and other applicable standards. A Program Review process is also in place to assure that program efficacy is evaluated and appropriate modifications initiated incrementally over a 4-year time frame. Students who complete a vocational certificate and/or degree program demonstrate technical and professional competencies that meet employment standards. In the Culinary Arts, Automotive Technology, Information and Computer Science, Digital Media Production, and Substance Abuse Counseling Programs, students are prepared for external certification.

**Self Evaluation**
Career and Technical programs and courses keep abreast of industry requirements through their advisory boards, which meet at least once per year. The College’s Program Review process includes course and program assessments, which leads to needed modifications in the curriculum to meet requirements and standards. However, the College does not have sufficient information about the number of students receiving external licensure and/or certification.

**Planning Agenda**
- The College will develop a mechanism to track external licensure, certification, and/or employment after graduation.
Standard II.B. Student Support Services

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.

Descriptive Summary
Student Services (SS) Units include Admissions and Records, Counseling and Advising, Financial Aid, Career Development/Job Prep Services, Campus Health Center, and Student Activities. Services are provided at the Leeward CC-Wa‘ianae satellite campus. One counselor, who is also responsible for servicing the community and Wa‘ianae, Nānākuli, and Campbell High Schools, services the students at the Leeward CC Wa‘ianae campus.

In Fall 2003, the various Units of Student Services developed student learning outcomes and plans for assessing these outcomes. The September 9, 2004 Progress Report to ACCJC includes templates from Admissions and Records, Counseling and Advising, and Student Activities that address the following:

- Unit’s mission
- goal/objective
- outcome measure
- data sample
- method of collection
- expected and actual level of performance
- plans of actions

As part of the campus-wide Program Review process, other areas of Student Services, including Financial Aid and Job Prep Services, have reported on their assessments of student learning outcomes. See http://documents.leeward.hawaii.edu:8080/docushare/dsweb/View/Collection-63/

Self Evaluation
The program assessment process has spurred discussions to facilitate the achievement of student learning outcomes. The Dean of Student Services (DOSS) and Student Services Unit Heads have created appropriate outcome measures and tools to assess the effectiveness of the Division and its parts. The following is a summary of their findings:

Admission & Records
The Admissions & Records Office created assessment tools to gauge the effectiveness and quality of its services. In Spring 2004, 96% of the applicants who applied to Leeward received a decision letter and 100% of all regular requests for transcripts were processed within specified guidelines. Student surveys are now used to measure student satisfaction of services, with results analyzed at staff & Unit Head meetings.

Counseling and Advising
Surveys were designed to measure student satisfaction with counseling services, which were followed by weekly meeting among counselors to assess the initial results.
In answer to the question: Did you receive the information you wanted? The following table shows the students’ responses:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Yes/I think so</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Percent of total (Yes/I think so)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Apply to Leeward CC</td>
<td>163</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>94% (2004)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>462</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>94% (2005)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apply for Financial Aid</td>
<td>123</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>81% (2004)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>398</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>77% (2005)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic Advising</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>99% (2004)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>905</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>98% (2005)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Career Counseling</td>
<td>312</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>97% (2004)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>650</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>97% (2005)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transfer Advising/Grad</td>
<td>326</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>95% (2004)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>618</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>93% (2005)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The three questions relating to retention yielded the following results:

1) Did this counseling session make you feel more confident about going to college?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Yes/I think so</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>NA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>481 (99%) 2004</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>953 (98%) 2005</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2) Was this counseling session helpful in your remaining at this college?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Yes/I think so</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>NA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>437 (85%) 2004</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>849 (97%) 2005</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>147</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3) Did this counseling session help you feel more connected to Leeward Community College?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Yes/I think so</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>NA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>451 (99%) 2004</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>898 (97%) 2005</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>101</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4) Counselor Satisfaction: Would you return to see this counselor?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Yes/I think so</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>NA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1044 (99.4%) 2005</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6% 2005</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

According to survey results, the Counseling and Advising Unit assessed that, in general, students who came in for individual counseling appointments or walk-in services received the information that they were seeking and were satisfied with the counseling they received.
Similar to their pilot project, the category that reflected a need for improvement was financial aid. To support the Counseling and Advising Unit’s professional development opportunities in this area, financial aid workshops were provided, including “Debt Management,” a Life Skills Workshop by USA funds; “The Fish Workshop,” conducted by EdFund; and “Financial Aid 101,” a brief overview of the most important facets of the financial aid process. The “Solving the Retention Puzzle” workshops, initiated by Student Services, extended over the 2005 academic year following the pilot assessment period and established a working group of faculty to discuss strategies to increase student retention, including learning communities, first year experience, and partnerships for student success.

Financial Aid
In 2004-2005, the Financial Aid Office studied the number of students who applied for aid (including Pell Grants), the number who received it, and the amount awarded. The data was accessed through the financial aid database in Banner, and included all students who applied for funds and listed Leeward CC on the Free Application for Federal Student Aid (FAFSA). Data was collected from January 1 through June of each year. The data shows an increase in the number of students needing financial aid in order to attend and remain at Leeward. Results are based on data collected from January 2004 to June 2005 compared to academic years 2002-2003 and 2003-2004.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number of applicants</td>
<td>3645</td>
<td>3567</td>
<td>3472</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number awarded</td>
<td>905</td>
<td>990</td>
<td>1078</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amount awarded</td>
<td>$2,572,153</td>
<td>$2,935,981</td>
<td>$2,946,090</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number Pell Grant Recipients</td>
<td>787</td>
<td>836</td>
<td>847</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Based on reviewing the number of applications for Leeward CC and the number of students awarded, the Financial Aid Office will continue to streamline procedures to make awarding aid more efficient and will also determine the reasons some applicants did not receive aid.

The Unit plans to improve student learning by

- Providing more financial aid workshops by working with the academic divisions on-campus and the community off-campus.
- Having more loan workshops so students are more informed of borrowing as an option to finance their education.
- Referring earlier students on financial aid probation to academic counselors to prevent financial aid suspension.
- Working with students earlier about their choice of programs and eligibility for aid.

The increased complexity of the financial aid process and the limited staffing have made it difficult for this Unit to measure and maintain the quality of its services.
**Job Prep Service (JPS)**
Students seeking job-related assistance come to JPS, and records show the following results for the period of August 2004 to May 2005:

- Number of students using JPS services: 554
- Number of students creating resume for job search: 372
- Number of students placed in jobs: 64
- Number of employers using services: 283

Satisfaction surveys are given to three different group -- students, faculty, and employers -- at the end of each school year. Results of these surveys can be found at [http://documents.leeward.hawaii.edu:8080/docushare/dsweb/View/Collection-63](http://documents.leeward.hawaii.edu:8080/docushare/dsweb/View/Collection-63)

During the summer, Job Prep Services' staff discusses the results of these surveys and comes up with ideas to improve the services. Job Prep Services also complete an annual report on the year's activities, which is discussed with the Assistant Dean of Instruction and used in the planning.

**Campus Health Center**
To assure the quality of its services, statistics are regularly maintained and reports created and filed with the Department of Health. Through its student services/outreach initiatives, the Health Center meets and discusses community health issues with local organizations. The Health Center Coordinator meets weekly with the DOSS.

**Student Activities**
In response to the Program Review process, the Campus Center Facilities Use Plan report was written, during Summer 2004. This report highlights the resource needs of the Office of Student Activities in order to create a constructive learning environment that supports co-curricular learning.

Results of Program Review assessments, along with student achievement data and internal analyses of the Division's strengths, weaknesses, opportunities, and threats, have formed the basis for the Student Services Division's contribution to the Annual Review process. Planning and budgeting are based on analysis of data such as these, rather than on past practices.

**Planning Agenda**
- The College will assess its Program and Annual Review processes to determine their effectiveness in supporting student learning needs through Student Services.
II.B.2.a  The institution provides a catalog for its constituencies with precise, accurate, and current information concerning the following: General Information

**Descriptive Summary**
All programs of study and degree options are carefully described in the *Leeward CC 2005–2006 Catalog*. The Associate in Arts degree and General Education requirements are explained in detail on pages 60-69. General Education student learning outcomes and expectations of competencies in identified areas of study are introduced. Required General Education core courses available are clearly listed.

An overview of each Career and Technical Education (CTE) degree program is followed by a written description of the degree, required courses, elective choices, and identification of the program coordinator. Additionally, prerequisites and specific requirements are provided. Additional information is made available, such as alternative course numbering, career opportunities, preferred course sequencing, and references to academic advising. This information is well organized and described in detail on pages 17-58.

The Student Services Division verifies that information in the catalog is precise, accurate, and current. The Dean of Student Services delegates sections to the various departments (Student Activities, Campus Health Center, Admissions and Records, etc.) to verify that their information is accurate, precise, and current. After each unit's review, the draft is then sent back to the Dean. The catalog lists degree student learning outcomes and is published yearly, both in print and electronic form at ([http://www.lcc.hawaii.edu/Catalog/](http://www.lcc.hawaii.edu/Catalog/)).

**Self Evaluation**
Although the College provides a catalog for its constituencies with current information, there is some concern that the catalog is not published early enough for students to make informed decisions before they register for classes.

**Planning Agenda**
- The College, through its Creative Services Office, will ensure that the catalog is produced and made available in a timely manner.
II.B.2.b. The institution provides a catalog for its constituencies with precise, accurate, and current information concerning the following: Requirements

**Descriptive Summary**
The *Leeward CC 2005–2006 Catalog* provides information on Admissions (page 70-76), Student Fees and Other Financial Obligations (pages 77-79), and Transfer (pages 84-87).

A complete outline of degree and certificate programs is referenced on pages 59-69. Stated learning outcomes, course requirements, and particular degree requirements for all educational programs at the College are displayed.

**Self Evaluation**
The College provides appropriate information for students in its catalog.

**Planning Agenda**
- No changes are needed to address this standard.

II.B.2.c. The institution provides a catalog for its constituencies with precise, accurate, and current information concerning the following: Major Policies Affecting Students

**Descriptive Summary**
Policies listed in the *2005-2006 Catalog* include the following:

- Student Regulations: Student Conduct Code, Academic Dishonesty, Financial Obligations to the University, Lethal Weapons, Smoking, Illicit Drug and Alcohol (pages 165-166)
- Student Academic Grievance Procedures (page 166)
- Academic Probation and Suspension Policy (pages 167-168)
- Educational Rights and Privacy of Students (pages 168-169)
- Academic Rights and Freedoms of Students and Nondiscrimination and Affirmative Action Policies (page 169)
- Policy on Sexual Harassment and Sexual Assault Policy (pages 170–171)
- General Policy involving Non-Students (page 171)
- Refund Policy (page 79)
- Acceptance of Transfer Credits Information (pages 95-97)

The *Schedule of Courses* also includes the Policy on non-Discrimination and Affirmative Action, with contact information.
The College has designated contact people for each of the following areas:

- EEO/AA and Title IX
- Acceptance of Transfer Credits
- Grievance and Complaint Procedures
- Sexual Harassment
- Section 504, Disabilities

Every semester all students are mailed a Campus Safety & Security policies and procedures brochure.

**Self Evaluation**
Leeward CC’s major policies are available to students via hard copy (catalog and brochures) and online (Leeward CC homepage). The general public has access to these major policies.

**Planning Agenda**
- No changes are needed to address this standard.

---

**II.B.2.d. The institution provides a catalog for its constituencies with precise, accurate, and current information concerning the following: Locations or publications where other policies may be found.**

**Descriptive Summary**
Policies (other than those listed in II.B.2.c) such as Academic Probation and Suspension Policy, Academic Rights and Freedoms of Students, Children in the Classroom, Affirmative Action and Non Discrimination, and the Computer Lab/Library Policies that affect students can be found on Leeward CC’s homepage [http://www.lcc.hawaii.edu](http://www.lcc.hawaii.edu), campus bulletins, and on brochures. Policies can also be found at the Counseling Office, Admissions and Records Office, Financial Aid Office, Library, Learning Resource Center, and Math Lab. Information on Prior Learning Credits and AP credits can be found in the Counseling office. The College Credit Equivalency Program information can be found in the Policy and Procedures manual located at the Division offices and the Dean's Offices.

All publications are to be sent to the Marketing Director/Publications Specialist for recommendations/approval prior to duplicating and distribution.

**Self Evaluation**
Because all of Leeward CC’s policies are not centrally located, they are sometimes difficult to find. Most policies are available at Leeward CC’s website and are regularly updated.

**Planning Agenda**
- To ensure ease of access of students and the public, the College will commit appropriate resources and personnel to redesign the College's website.
II.B.3. The College researches and identifies the learning support needs of its student population and provides appropriate services and programs to address those needs.

**Descriptive Summary**

All incoming students are invited to attend Counseling and Advising’s Orientation, Advising, and Registration (OAR) session prior to the beginning of a new semester. At the end of each session, students complete evaluation forms that are used to make changes to better meet students’ needs. Some changes based on past evaluations include adjusted hours of OAR and a revised presentation on how to register with the MyUH Portal system.

At OAR, students are able to voluntarily disclose any information on their physical or invisible disabilities. Students who disclose this information receive appropriate support and accommodations based on their documented disability. Instructors are also highly encouraged to put a disability disclosure statement in their course outline/syllabus.

Support needs are also assessed when students go to Counseling and Advising. Upon their arrival, students are asked to fill out an intake/inquiry form, indicating their concerns and purposes of their appointment, to align the student’s needs with the information and resources provided by the counselor. After their appointment, students anonymously complete evaluation forms that are analyzed by the Counseling and Advising faculty, and improvements made.

Prior to the start of each semester, the College offers an Opening Day Experience to welcome new students. Students are able to meet faculty, staff, administrators, and other students and can sign up for campus clubs or student government. Campus tours and activities are planned throughout the day.

Recognizing that financial aid can be a complicated process, the Financial Aid Office (FAO) offers valuable workshops on campus, at the LCCW campus, and off-campus. Financial aid staff help students to identify appropriate resources and apply for awards.

Job Prep Services provides assistance with job applications, resume writing, interview preparation, and other job readiness skills. The Service sends out a student satisfaction survey every spring semester and uses the results/comments to make changes to better serve students.

Prior to the Fall 2005 semester, Leeward CC’s Institutional Researcher administered a survey on student needs to 2,189 students prior to their placement exams. “The Needs of Incoming Students,” a research report, presents the following findings:
Scholastic Goal

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scholastic Goal</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2-Year Associates Degree</td>
<td>56%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upgrade Skills</td>
<td>22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transfer to Another College</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Certificate Program</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Major

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Major</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Liberal Arts</td>
<td>54%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nursing (not offered at Leeward CC)</td>
<td>21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>12.5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Student Services Support Needed

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Student Services Support Needed</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Academic Advising</td>
<td>75%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tutoring</td>
<td>66%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Career Planning</td>
<td>59%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job Placement</td>
<td>53%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Choice of Leeward: Influences

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Choice of Leeward: Influences</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Family and Friends</td>
<td>33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Location</td>
<td>24%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special Classes</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Self Evaluation

In an effort to meet the College’s mission to provide a variety of curriculum to meet the needs of its community, a Student Needs Survey was designed, specifically targeting incoming students. The data collected has been used in the College’s decision-making process and has been shared with the Student Services and Academic Support Areas.

The College adequately addresses learning support needs of students through its Orientation, Advising, and Registration sessions and subsequent placement in appropriate programs and services. Students receive support and accommodations for disabilities through the Kākoʻo ‘Ike (KI) office; scholarship, grant, and loan assistance through the Financial Aids Office; health assistance through the Leeward CC Health Center; and assistance with applications, resumes, and job finding from Job Prep Services.

(See Standard II.B.1 above for program assessments results for some of the services listed above.)

Planning Agenda

• No changes are needed to address this 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.

**Descriptive Summary**

Student Services’ Admissions and Records, Counseling and Advising, and Financial Aid Offices, in addition to face-to-face contact, offer email addresses for students to pose their questions. Students from all over the world email the Student Services Offices regarding questions and concerns. The emails are picked up daily by “virtual” faculty and staff. Students who have any physical disability also use email for counseling and advising. Applications, transcript requests, change of residency, change of home institution, and responses to frequently asked questions are provided on the Leeward Community College website. The following hours are observed by these offices:

- Admissions and Records: Monday–Friday, 8 am to 4:30 pm
- Counseling and Advising: Monday–Thursday, 8 am to 3 pm; Friday, 8 am to 1 pm for walk-in appointments; evening services by appointment
- Financial Aid Office: Monday–Friday, 8 am to 4:00 pm

The Campus Health Center offers low cost services, including emergency and non-emergency care, acute illness diagnosis, immunizations, and other services. Their hours are Mondays from 8 am to 6 pm, Tuesday, Thursday, and Friday from 8 am to 4 pm, and Wednesday from 8 am to 2 pm.

Job Prep Services assists Career and Technical Education students prepare for job hunting. Information is also posed online at www.lcc.hawaii.edu/jobs/ and walk-in service is available from Monday through Friday from 8 am to 4:30 pm.

Students can go to the Kāko'o 'Ike office (http://emedia.leeward.hawaii.edu/kiprogram/) for appropriate support with documented disabilities. A student can meet with a KI office staff member from 8:30 am to 4:30 pm, Monday through Friday, to determine what services are available to them.

Office of Continuing Education and Workforce Development (OCEWD) provides a variety of continuing education non-credit programs, public service, and cultural programs.

**Self Evaluation**

Leeward does a satisfactory job of informing the campus and general public of the types of services offered to support student learning needs. These services are assessed through survey, one-on-one counseling sessions, and statistical evidence. (See Standard II.B.1 above for assessment results from student support Units.)

**Planning Agenda**

- No changes are needed to address this standard.
II.B.3.b. The institution provides an environment that encourages personal and civic responsibility, as well as intellectual, aesthetic, and personal development for all of its students.

**Descriptive Summary**

Leeward Community College provides numerous avenues for students to develop and demonstrate personal and civic responsibility. The Student Activities Office facilitates co-curricular learning experiences via student participation in clubs, campus events, and student governing boards. Seventeen chartered campus clubs, an Associated Student Government, and two student publications enrich students’ personal and professional development, civic responsibility, teamwork skills, and leadership development.

Among the chartered campus clubs are the following:

- **Bahai Club** - To inform the community about the Bahai Faith and offer assistance to Bahai students attending Leeward CC
- **Gay-Straight Alliance** - To ally students, faculty, and staff who identify as gay, lesbian, bisexual, and transgender with straight communities
- **Information Technology Club** - To provide support to club members in obtaining their goals by sharing common experiences through projects, activities, and work exposure
- **International Club** - To integrate multi-ethnic and multi-cultural students into a united camaraderie that harmonizes and positively impacts the community
- **Kahiau** - To promote the integration of Hawaiian culture values such as Aloha and Malama through various activities, events, and meetings that foster involvement and promote awareness through Ke Kulanui Kaiaulu o Ewa (Leeward CC) and the community
- **KASAMA** - To promote the learning and appreciation of Philippines and Filipino culture, arts, history, and language
- **LCC Auto Tech Car Club** - To educate members about automobile service and performance, and to provide learning experiences in leadership and social interactions in a work-related area
- **LCC Children’s Center Families & Friends Club** - To promote quality child care and early education on campus, provide responsive, high quality program at Center, plan events for families of young children enrolled at Center, seek financial assistance for early education and care services
- **Phi Beta Lambda** - To bring business and education together in a positive working relationship, promote business relationships, establish career goals, and facilitate the transition from school to work
- **Phi Theta Kappa** - To develop leadership and service, scholarship programs, and cultivate fellowship among qualified students
The College supports a **Service Learning** program that encourages and coordinates activities that foster personal and civic responsibility. Some examples include the following:

- A large corporate donor funded $20,000 to each of 20 university/college campuses, of which the University of Hawai‘i was one. Leeward CC used its share of these proceeds in the recruitment and one-semester training of Waipahu Middle and High School students in web page design. During the subsequent semester, the students developed websites for various organizations within the community, such as the YMCA and the Waipahu Community Association. Students gained a sense of civic responsibility in a collegial environment.

- Biology students gathered water samples from various locales for the purpose of testing and gathering vital statistics. These were then forwarded to the State Department of Land and Resources, who appreciated the service that would not have been possible otherwise.

- During the “tax season,” students in accounting have offered regularly scheduled tax preparation services to the campus community and the public.

- Students enrolled in a writing course worked with non-profit agencies on projects such as writing manuals and brochures, website design, and grant writing.

- Students in math courses provided parents with support for involvement in their children’s math education. Projects included designing and hosting a Family Mathematics Night, producing a variety of age-appropriate mathematics activities for families, and developing integrated mathematics and literacy activities for families.

Each semester, the Learning Resource Center (LRC), a unit under Academic Support, offers a series of Success Connection Workshops presented by faculty volunteers for students. The workshops promote development of successful study, computer literacy, and life skills.

The Office of Continuing Education and Workforce Development provides an array of courses and workshops to provide life-long personal development opportunities for students and community members. The Leeward Theatre is well known in the State for bringing world-class performers to its stage for the personal enrichment of our student body and the surrounding community.

**Self Evaluation**

The College provides many avenues for the personal growth and development of its students. Student Services’ Student Activities Office supports co-curricular learning experiences through clubs, events, and governing boards. Service Learning integrates community service into coursework, while the LRC’s Success Connection Workshops promote the development of study, computer, and life skills. OCEWD and the Theater provide students and the community with lifelong skills and personal enrichment.
The Student Activities Office, Service Learning Program, and the LRC are actively engaged in the Program Review process and conduct on-going assessment activities of their stated learning outcomes. Results of these program assessments are fed into the College’s Annual Review process.

**Planning Agenda**
- No changes are needed to address this standard.

**II.B.3.c.** The institution designs, maintains, and evaluates counseling and/or academic advising programs to support student development and success and prepares faculty and other personnel responsible for the advising function.

**Descriptive Summary**
The Counseling and Advising Unit, beginning in 2003, developed their mission as follows: “to assist students to define and clarify personal, academic, and career goals, and to explain and help students understand the processes involved to achievement these goals.” Dialogue among the Unit’s counselors resulted in design of the following SLOs:

1. After contacting a counselor, potential students will understand the process involved in becoming a student at Leeward Community College.

2. After attending an individual or group academic advising session, the student will understand how to explore financial aid opportunities, formulate an educational plan, choose a major and degree program, choose a career and develop a career plan, apply for graduation, and complete the process involved in transferring to another college or university.

3. After completing orientation, students will have a greater understanding of college policies and procedures, campus support services, co-curricular opportunities, academic and financial deadlines, different methodologies of course delivery, and satellite course offering, and how to use the Schedule of Courses and the General Catalog as a resource to select appropriate courses.

4. After completing the placement testing (COMPASS or MICHIGAN), the student will have a clear understanding of his/her level of proficiency in Reading, Writing, and Mathematics.

5. After completing the registration process, the student will know how to navigate the MyUH portal to register for classes.

6. After a meeting with a counselor or job developer, students will know how to write a resume, interview effectively, and follow through with potential job offers.
Assessment of the Student Services Support Area continues as part of an on-going campus-wide effort to review all programs on a six-year cycle. The pilot study in Counseling and Advising, focusing on SLO 1 and 2, was initiated in Spring 2004 and carried through in Fall 2004 and Spring 2005. Over a five-month period, counselors developed a two-page survey to measure their effect on student learning as a result of counseling sessions. Students completed the first page of the survey, indicating why they were coming in for counseling/advising. At the end of the session, students completed the second page of the assessment, indicating whether they had received the information they were seeking and their level of satisfaction with the counseling.

Survey results in 2004 and 2005 indicate that students are receiving the information they are seeking when they come in for counseling and are satisfied with the counseling received. However, in the Annual Review process, some concerns have been expressed by Academic Divisions regarding the academic advising services received by students.

An area in need of improvement regarding financial aid information was identified, and the resulting action was the provision of professional development in support of financial aid services in subsequent semesters. A request for APT positions to support the Financial Aids Office has also been forwarded as a result of these assessment, which were part of the College’s Program and Annual Review processes.

Self Evaluation
Through the College’s Program and Annual Review processes, Student Services’ Counseling and Advising Unit has engaged in appropriate assessments of student learning outcomes. Evidence of the Unit’s enhancement of student development and success are evident in their research results. (See Standard II.B.1 above for additional assessment results from Counseling and Advising). The unit will continue their assessment of student learning outcomes.

Planning Agenda
- Academic Divisions and Student Service Division will collaborate to address concerns raised in the Annual Review process regarding counseling and advising.

II.B.3.d. The institution designs and maintains appropriate programs, practices, and services that support and enhance student understanding and appreciation of diversity.

Descriptive Summary
The Student Activities unit of Student Services has, as one of its student learning outcomes, “Students will increase their appreciation of diverse backgrounds, values, and perspectives.” Focus groups, classes, and workshops are conducted and written evaluations are collected to assess this student learning outcome.

Understanding and appreciation of diversity is also promoted and supported through various course offerings, programs, clubs, and events.
Courses
Leeward offers more than 80 courses that invite students to delve into a diversity of cultural heritages and languages across the spectrum from Asia, the Pacific Islands, and Europe. Academic subject certificates are offered in Hawaiian and Philippine Studies.

Programs
Leeward’s Hālau ʻIke O Pu’uloa is a unique Federal Department of Education Title III grant program dedicated to the preservation and continuance of native Hawaiian cultural values. The program offers an array of cultural courses as well as a variety of services and activities to promote understanding and appreciation of the Hawaiian culture.

Leeward has a robust study abroad program, promoting travel and study in various countries and cultures of the world including destinations in Europe, Southeast Asia, Mexico and South America. The study abroad program sends over one hundred students each year to destinations abroad in order to study and experience other cultures first hand. (see http://emedia.leeward.hawaii.edu/studyabroad).

The English Language Institute (ELI) provides a pre-academic English program to international students wishing to study in Leeward’s credit programs. The program attracts students from around the world and provides opportunities for interaction with students from various cultures and countries. Bringing cultural diversity to our campus helps students participate in the global community and workforce. For more information see http://home.lcc.hawaii.edu/eli.

Kākoʻo ʻIke (KI) provides services and support for students with disabilities through the Learning Resource Center. (see http://emedia.leeward.hawaii.edu/kiprogram). Safe Zone provides support for lesbian, gay, bisexual, and transgendered individuals through faculty and staff who can direct these students to trained counselors when they need help.

Clubs
Several student clubs promote understanding of cultural diversity. The Bantaba Dance and Drum Club’s mission is to educate and inform the public about African culture through drum and dance. The International Club promotes awareness of other cultures and intercultural friendships, while the Japanese Circle Club promotes awareness of Japanese culture and language.

Events
Each spring the College presents the Leeward CC International Festival, a three-day event exploring facets of other cultures and regions. The festival focuses on one international region each year. In 2005 the festival focus was Latin America, and in 2006 the focus was the Philippines, to coincide with the celebration of 100 years of Philippine presence in Hawai’i. A series of lectures, panels and presentations are offered on the first two days, followed by a celebratory day of cultural entertainment and food held in the main campus courtyard.

Workshops are offered to students, faculty, and staff about diversity issues. An example is Leeward’s History Professor Karim Khan’s workshops focusing on gender equality and women’s socio-economic and political roles in Islamic countries. Dr. Khan has also hosted fundraising efforts for Pakistan earthquake victims.

Campus workshops and presentations educate faculty, staff and administrators on a broad range of diversity-related topics such as disabilities, sexual harassment, and workplace violence.
These sessions include dialogue in the form of Q&A sessions and often lead to subsequent informal discussions among faculty and staff.

**Self Evaluation**
The College effectively designs and maintains programs, practices, and services that support and enhance student understanding and appreciation of diversity. The Student Activities Office and the College’s courses and programs promote diversity through their stated student learning outcomes. As part of the Program and Annual Review processes, data is collected, analyzed, and improvements made to address the outcomes that focus on diversity.

**Planning Agenda**
The Annual Review process will be revised to incorporate an assessment of course’s and program’s effectiveness in enhancing student understanding of diversity.

---

**II.B.3.e. The institution regularly evaluates admissions and placement instruments and practices to validate their effectiveness while minimizing biases.**

**Descriptive Summary**
Leeward Community College admits any applicant who is a high school graduate or is at least 18 years old. Given this “open door” policy, the College has made a considerable effort to ensure that students have the prerequisite skills to meet the student learning outcomes listed for each course offering. This has resulted in the practice of testing all new students to assess their reading, writing, and math levels; the development of an appropriate sequence of remedial and developmental courses; and the institution of course prerequisites. The impact of this process extends far beyond mathematics and English, as many other disciplines within the College use the test scores or courses in math, reading, and writing as prerequisites.

Since 1998 the College has relied on the COMPASS (Computerized-Adaptive Placement Assessment and Support System) test as directed by the Community College Chancellor’s Office in 1998. This was done to ensure that all campuses within the System would use a standardized placement instrument and common cutoff scores for those math, reading, and writing courses that were articulated on system-wide basis. (Articulated courses include Eng 21, 22, 100 and 102; Math 24, 25, 100, 103, 135, 140.) COMPASS is a nationally normed test that meets the qualifications for federal financial aid. Additionally, ACT (formerly American College Testing), the organization that produces the test, has taken appropriate measures to minimize cultural and linguistic biases, including the following:

- An internal review of all test questions by ACT’s staff for fair portrayal and balanced representation of societal groups and for use of nonsexist language.

- An external review of the test items by consultants and representatives from five different focus groups—African Americans, Asian Americans, Hispanic Americans, Native Americans, and Women. Input from these groups was used to examine the fairness and sensitivity of COMPASS test questions.

For the relatively small population of non-native speakers of English, Leeward CC uses a placement instrument developed and field-tested by the English Language Institute (ELI)
of the University of Michigan. This test is used for placement only into reading and writing courses. Students are also given the option of submitting writing samples for a more accurate placement. Faculty from Leeward’s English Language Institute and English as a Second Language Discipline meet periodically to evaluate the effectiveness of this instrument although no formal studies have been done concerning cultural and language bias of the test items.

The institution of COMPASS testing in Fall 1998 resulted in an increase in the number of students being placed into remedial and developmental courses and a decrease in students placing into college-level courses, especially in writing. This downward shift in student placement caused considerable concern and discussions about the validity of the test’s interpretations and cut-off scores at the campus. As Leeward has a more extensive prerequisite system compared to the other community college campuses, students with low English and math placement scores were severely limited in the selection of courses they could take. This, in turn, adversely impacted their financial aid and full-time status and extended the time spent in achieving their educational goals.

Leeward CC’s concerns, along with those of its sister campuses, were raised with the Community College System Office that coordinated a long-term system-wide effort to evaluate the effectiveness of COMPASS. As this study required several years’ worth data to be valid, the College implemented the following strategies to support student learning while information from ACT regarding validity and cut-off scores became available.

- Upon completion of the COMPASS test, every student received one-on-one interviews by a testing or counseling staff member to help them understand their test scores and to address any concerns about the testing experience. Those who indicated they had anxiety or difficulties with the test were given the opportunity to retake the test.

- Both English and math disciplines developed waiver systems to accommodate students who felt that the COMPASS test did not place them accurately. In English, students were allowed to write an essay and/or to retake the reading test. In math, students could request an interview with department members and to have their high school transcripts reviewed, or, they could be retested using the Leeward CC Math Test. In addition, for the math portion of the COMPASS test, the order of questions was changed, to place the most appropriate questions first, building student test-taking confidence over the course of the test and minimizing the negative effects of test anxiety. Both English and mathematics developed new courses (Math 22, English 18/19) to provide a bridge between remedial and developmental courses.

- The College also made a number of changes to its marketing and outreach efforts to inform prospective students about assessment testing.

Beginning in Spring 2003, the University of Hawai‘i Community College System staff and representatives from English and mathematics from each campus met periodically to review ACT’s analysis of course placement test accuracy and made recommendations for adjustments.

In English, dialogue about ACT’s analysis of the data was disputed, as members of the discipline felt that its data analysis was too narrow and did not take into account the student
learning outcomes of each course. Despite this fact, a recommendation to lower the ENG 102 cut-off score was made by the Community College System Office. This recommendation was opposed by most English faculty, and the Chancellors of each campus agreed to keep the Eng 21 and 102 cut-off scores as is until further study. Much discussion and review resulted in the following agreements:

- The reading component of the test will no longer be used to place students in writing classes. However, Leeward CC was allowed to use ENG 21 as a pre- or co-requisite for ENG 22 and as a prerequisite for ENG 100.

- English faculties would review ACT’s analysis of data from 1998-2002 and 2002-2005 to validate COMPASS reading placement test score cutoffs between Eng 21 and Eng 102, and make recommendations to the CAOs. Any changes in test cutoff scores would be implemented in Fall 2006.

- The UHCC System Office also agreed to work with faculty in designing and conducting a pilot study to validate prerequisite requirements. The study will attempt to determine whether enrollment and successful completion in developmental courses significantly improves student learning in subsequent and College transfer level courses in English. A report of the findings of this analysis will be presented to the Council of Chancellors in Fall 2006 with implementation of any resulting changes for students registering occurring in Fall 2007.

In math, the evaluation of the COMPASS math test data resulted in the replacement of a number of cutoff scores used by the UH System Office by those unanimously recommended by mathematics faculty, except for the Trigonometry (MATH 135) in Fall 2004. Disagreements among the campus representatives concerning student learning outcomes and course content in pre-algebra and algebra courses (MATH 24, 25) led to current system-wide discussions over MATH 24/25/103 and Leeward CC’s introduction of Math 73/83 to better align the College with its sister campuses. A system-wide meeting concerning the alignment of MATH 24/25 could not fully resolve the issues concerning course content and student learning outcomes. A subsequent meeting is scheduled for the Fall, 2006, with the goal of producing a uniform curriculum within the system by Fall 2007 to allow for a revamping of the sequence of concepts in existing courses and creating new courses if needed.

**Self Evaluation**

In an effort to allow students easy transfer from one campus to another, a common placement instrument was instituted. However, the system-wide placement instrument has been problematic at Leeward and its sister campuses. The study effort, which was initiated as soon as COMPASS was implemented and is ongoing, is appropriately focused on the systematic evaluation of the accuracy and validity of COMPASS for each campus, which serve distinctly different populations. The English faculties reviewed ACT’s analysis of the data but rejected the Community College System Office’s recommendation to lower the ENG 102 cut-off score, as it would severely impact the number of students in ENG 21 who could be better prepared for ENG 100 or 102. This action prompted the System to prolong its validation study and delay its recommendation until Fall 2006. However, some concerns have been raised as the study does not take into consideration a comparison of the test items with the student learning outcomes of courses that is crucial in any validation of a test.
Disagreement that involves two different but equally valid pedagogical approaches used to achieve student learning outcomes in the way the developmental courses, MATH 24/25, are taught is the major stumbling block toward a common developmental math sequence on a system-wide basis. It is anticipated that the next system-wide meeting of math faculty will resolve this issue in Fall 2006. In the meantime the College will continue to employ the temporary measures implemented in 2004 and take steps to ensure that students are properly placed in appropriate entry level courses and to ensure that they are able to achieve their educational goals in a timely and efficient manner as possible.

Planning Agenda
• The College will continue to work with its sister campuses in evaluating COMPASS and make changes for improvement.

II.B.3.f. The institution maintains student records permanently, securely, and confidentially, with provision for secure backup of all files, regardless of the form in which those files are maintained. The institution publishes and follows established policies for release of student records.

Descriptive Summary
All student records from the Aldrich system were migrated to the new SCT Banner Student Information System. With the adoption of Banner, student records are kept on the Banner computer located at UH Mānoa, whose Information Technology Services are responsible for routine backups of the system. The Banner back up tapes are stored off-site by a professional records Management Company, Crown Pacific, that is contracted by UH Mānoa. The company has a secure, climate-controlled facility with surveillance equipment and guards located in Mililani.

Release of student records is regulated by the Family Educational Rights and Privacy Act (FERPA) guidelines. Full documentation can be found in Admissions and Records Office and the Dean of Student Services Office.

The Office of Continuing Education and Workforce Development maintains records that are archived at the end of each term. Data is backed up and stored; hard copy documents are maintained for a period of up to 5 to 7 years, depending on the type of program; and other paper documents, including the course evaluation form and sign in sheets, are filed. The OCEWD Motorcycle Safety Education Program, by federal and state law, keeps permanent records of all student registration information. OCEWD adheres to FERPA regulations and guidelines. Full documentation can be found in the Dean of Student Services Office.

Self-Evaluation
The College meets the standard of maintaining student records permanently, securely, and confidentially through its Banner Student Information System. Release of student records is appropriately regulated.

Planning Agenda
• No changes are needed to address this 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.

Descriptive Summary
As stated above, in Fall 2003, the Acting Dean of Student Services charged each Unit Head to develop a mission statement that reflects the services offered by their respective units and ties in with the Division's and College's Mission Statements. The process involved meetings between the Acting Dean and the Unit Heads as a group, as well as individual Unit meetings, to guide the process of developing goal statements and student learning outcomes, deciding which goals should be measured, and finally, developing an instrument to measure “expected” levels of performance against “actual” level of performance.

Each Unit Head was given reference material from the *Book of Professional Standards in Higher Education*, published by the Council for the Advancement of Standards in Higher Education to develop their assessment activities. The Institutional Researcher (IR) addressed a meeting of the Unit Heads to describe the assessment process. Unit Heads then met individually with the IR for feedback with their mission statements, goals and objectives, and outcome measures. These efforts resulted in completion of the Student Services Support Unit/Area Reviews.

Self Evaluation
Section II.B.1 above presents results of assessments from the following units: Admissions and Records, Financial Aid, Counseling and Advising, Student Activities, and the Health Center.

Student Services engages in the Program and Annual Review processes in its cycle of evaluation, planning, and improvement. The results of each Unit's assessments of student learning are used to develop prioritized lists to improve services for students.

Planning Agenda
- The Program and Annual Review processes will be evaluated for their effectiveness in contributing to the achievement of student learning outcomes in Student Services.
II.C. Library and Learning Support Services

II.C.1. The institution supports the quality of its instructional programs by providing librarians and other learning support service professionals, the institution selects and maintains educational equipment and materials to support student learning and enhance the achievement of the mission of the institution.

Leeward Community College supports student learning through the following Academic Support Units: the Library, the Learning Resource Center (LRC), the Educational Media Center (EMC), the Information Technology Group (ITG), and the Innovation Center for Teaching and Learning. Student learning is also supported through the Math Learning Resource Center (Math Lab), which is a part of the Math and Sciences Division.

The Innovation Center for Teaching and Learning’s mission is to improve teaching and learning by encouraging collaboration, inspiring innovation, and recognizing excellence. This faculty and staff support service is discussed in Standard III.A.5.a and III.A.5.b.

II.C.1.a. Relying on appropriate expertise of faculty, including librarians and other learning support services professionals, the institution selects and maintains educational equipment and materials to support student learning and enhance the achievement of the mission of the institution.

Descriptive Summary

The Library supports the vision and curriculum of Leeward Community College by providing an innovative environment for learning and research. The Library focuses on providing access to, and instruction in, the use of information tools and resources, collaborating with faculty, staff, students, and the community to enhance instruction, learning, and research, and serving as a gathering place, (both physically and virtually), for cultural exchange and diversity in learning. The Unit accomplishes these goals through development of collections, application of technology to enhance access, and provision of information skills instruction.

The Leeward CC Library Advisory Council, composed of members from each academic division, meets to discuss library goals and objectives and library collections (print and electronic) in relationship to student learning needs, as determined by instructional faculty. Library budgetary needs, such as support for electronic resource, and their rationales, are put forward at each Academic Support Division meeting. The Head Librarian is a member of the University of Hawai’i (UH) Library Council, which meets once a month to assess system-wide needs and implement consortia purchases of Library material (electronic or print) to affect cost savings.
Student Learning Outcomes

General Library Equipment

Public Computers
25 Windows-based PCs with Internet Explorer Browser and Adobe Acrobat, two also equipped with Microsoft Word. Available to all users on a first-come, first-served basis, with priority given to Leeward students for academic purposes.

Public Laptops: 16 Windows-based wireless laptops with Internet Explorer Browser and Adobe Acrobat. Available to Leeward students for use within the library for three-hour loan period.

ADA Workstation: one Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA)-compliant computer workstation. Students must go to the Kako‘o ‘Ike Program office for further assistance with ADA equipment.

Networked Printers: one black and white laser printer and one color laser printer for library computer users through debit-card networked printing system.

Audiovisual: Monitor in front entrance of library lists library hours and services. Large-screen television provides continuous directional information and notice of library activities. Twelve VHS players available, four with DVD capability.

Photocopiers: two black and white photocopiers available.

Microform Reader/Printers: two microfilm/microfiche reader/printers available.

Study Rooms: Three study rooms with conference table seating for groups up to eight. Priority given to Leeward students but available for Leeward faculty/staff. Rooms equipped with AV equipment; wireless laptops available for checkout.

Seating: Seating for 342 provided by carrels, tables, couches, casual chairs and group study rooms. Replacement of basic library furniture needed: unfunded for the past three decades.

Library Materials

Library materials include books, periodicals, reference materials, online resources, videotapes DVD’s and general and special collections. As of 2005, the Library had 70,084 print volumes, 112 print serial subscriptions, 1,268 audiovisual items, and 8,544 microforms. Over 20,000 journal titles are available online through the library’s subscribed databases.

The Library’s holdings currently exceed the National Peer Median as reported by the Association of College and Research Libraries. However, the numerical data is not an accurate reflection of the state and quality of the Leeward CC Library print collection. The print collection, although heavily used (2005 total circulation 17,557) because it is readily available, is in fact quite dated and therefore inadequate for disciplines that require currency. Due to a flat materials budget,

- More than half of the collection is pre-1980
- Number of titles 2004-05 (mid-way through the 2000 decade) is about 1/3 of the total for 1990-1999.
- Number of titles 1990-1999 is almost 4,000 less than the decade before.
Printed materials

General Collection comprises the main part of the Library’s circulating materials; housed on the upper floor. Cover all subject areas supporting the College curriculum and classified according to the Library of Congress Classification System. Oversized books shelved separately for efficient use of shelf space.

Reference Collection: Include encyclopedias, dictionaries, handbooks, directories, almanacs, atlases, statistical sources, multi-volume sets, indexes, and other materials. Housed on the main floor behind the Reference Desk; do not circulate. Other appropriate online references sources in “Topic Resources” of the library web page.

ESL/ELI Collection: Special literacy collection including books and audiotapes of fiction by classic writers. Support ESL/ELI instruction programs. Located on the main floor behind the reference desk.

Hawaiian Collection: Include all of the Library’s printed materials relating to Hawai’i and Pacific; shelved on the upper floor.

Culinary Arts Collection: funded by large grant to support material for Leeward CC Culinary Arts program; integrated into General Collection.

Reserves Collection: To ensure student access to required, supplemental, or recommended books, articles, or videos faculty place items on reserve. Located at the circulation desk on the first floor; can be borrowed by students for whatever loan period the instructor has specified.

In conjunction with other Reference Librarians, the Collection Development Librarian is responsible for selecting library print and non-print materials to support the College academic programs. These materials are evaluated using standard review resources, professional journals, publisher’s catalogs, and numerous online sources. The Collection Development Librarian also uses course syllabi, reference and IntraSystem Loan queries, and re-occurring term paper topics as additional tools for developing the collection.

Dialogue with faculty about the nature of the collection occurs on an informal basis and through the Library Advisory Council, composed of faculty from each division. Faculty recommendations and participation are highly encouraged, especially for newly approved programs. Faculty is notified when requested material is available for use. Recent acquisitions are placed on the New Books Shelf.

Electronic Services

Online Collection: Electronic resources paid for by library subscriptions include EBSCOHost; LexisNexis Academic; CQResearcher, Science Direct. College Source and Chronicle of Higher Education.

Web-Based Resources: access to special non-subscription databases reviewed by library staff for relevance and reliability. The Library webpage includes the following:
Links to local national and international news sources.
Information on information literacy and plagiarism.
Research process, citation formats
Tutorials on database use
Topic specific web based resources, reviewed and chosen by the librarians.

As part of the U.H. System Libraries, Leeward CC facilitates access to the University of Hawai'i System Collection as follows:

Direct Access: UH students, faculty, and staff have access via the Hawai'i Voyager online catalog to materials held in any library in the UH System, comprising over 4.3 million physical items and over 37,000 virtual items. With UH ID card, users may borrow circulating books and audiovisual materials in person at any library, and return the items to any library in the UH System.

IntraSystem Loan: Users may request available items held at a different campus library be sent to home library through the IntraSystem Loan service.

Learning Resource Center
The Learning Resource Center’s (LRC) services for students include individual and group tutoring in writing skills and a wide range of academic subjects; group tutorial support for selected courses with an emphasis on learning strategies; makeup tests and Distance Education (DE) testing for courses offered by any UH-system campus; and workshops in academic, life and technology skills. In addition, the LRC provides students with a computer lab that includes desktop computers, laptops, printers, and other peripherals. The LRC provides handouts, reading skills materials, CD-ROMS, and other instructional materials provided by instructors. For more information, refer to http://emedia.leeward.hawaii.edu/lrc/

LRC physical facility
- a 22-station lab of PC computers
- a 13-seat testing room for makeup tests and distance education paper tests
- a 50-seat open area for tutoring and study
- a 14-seat enclosed area for group tutoring, study, training sessions and meetings
- one audio-visual carrel (equipment circa 1975?)
- a variety of supplementary learning materials including self-paced reading kits, handouts, and study skills workshops on DVDs
- foreign language CD-ROMs for student use

LRC tutoring covers a wide and growing range of subjects, with at least 25% more subjects available in Spring 2006 than in Spring 2005. In both Fall 2005 and Spring 2006, the number of students using tutoring services and the number of services delivered increased from the year before. Tutorial support for writing has expanded greatly, with an outreach program that brought tutors to numerous writing classrooms in Spring 2006; this service was well received by faculty. In the content area, tutor-led review sessions were scheduled before exams in a number of challenging courses.
In addition to the services already discussed, the LRC is preparing to hire a Learning Specialist under Perkins funding to begin Fall 2006. This person will work with vocational faculty in designing a pilot program to integrate support services with instruction, with an emphasis on various forms of peer assisted, group or collaborative methods of learning support. The plan is to gradually expand this program to support students in instructional programs across the campus. This program will greatly expand the variety of services offered by the LRC.

As a service of the LRC, the Kāko'o 'Ike (KI) office provides a range of support services for students with disabilities. Services include individual consultation on learning styles, adjusting to College, and learning strategies; accommodations such as note takers, books on tapes, and sign language interpreters; training in and access to assistive technology, including text to speech scanning software, voice recognition software, and text magnification; and outreach to local high schools to assist with college readiness and transition. (For more information, refer to [http://emedia.leeward.hawaii.edu/kiprogram/](http://emedia.leeward.hawaii.edu/kiprogram/).) KI's support services and programs enable students with disabilities to maximize their independence.

**Educational Media Center**
The Educational Media Center (EMC) provides support in instructional technology and related fields for students, faculty, and staff. The unit is made up of Distance Education, Educational Technology, Intec, Video Production, and the Copy Center. The Distance Education Program serves the needs of individual students who, due to distance, time, or other constraints, cannot or choose not to participate in traditional classroom-based instruction. The DE Program plans, develops, and administers the College's credit instruction. (For more information, refer to [http://emedia.leeward.hawaii.edu/de/](http://emedia.leeward.hawaii.edu/de/).) Distance Education students are provided a WebCT orientation, which teaches needed technology skills required for successful online performance. The Distance Education Coordinator provides year-round online, walk-in, and phone support for technical issues and questions specific to DE courses and programs.

**Information Technology Group**
The Information Technology Group (ITG) operates and maintains the College Computing Labs (CCL) and the Help Desk. The College Computing Labs in BS 109 and BE 226 have Macintosh and Windows computers available for classroom usage (by reservation) and for open lab use (with a valid student ID).

Help Desk supports students, faculty, and staff experiencing computer or network-related problems. (See SLO Appendix B, page 265 for a listing of Computer Classrooms and Open Labs managed by ITG.)
Math Lab
The Math Lab’s services include walk-in tutoring, make-up examinations, software and computer-based tutorial programs, and worksheets to supplement instruction.

The Math Lab provides the following:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Quantity</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tutors</td>
<td>7 to 10</td>
<td>Provide tutoring to students on a walk-in basis from 8:30 am to 7:30 pm, Monday – Thursday and from 8:30 am to 3 pm, Friday, during Fall &amp; Spring semesters. Summer Session hours are from 8:30 am to 5:30 pm. Usually, 2 to 3 tutors on duty at one time.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scientific Calculators</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>Students and faculty can borrow during the day</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graphing Calculators</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>Students and faculty can borrow during the day</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PC Computers</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>Internet access, Microsoft Office, tutorial software for Math 1B – Math 206</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Imac Computers</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>Microsoft Office, tutorial software for Math 1B – Math 206</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Texts &amp; Solution Manuals</td>
<td>50+</td>
<td>Texts and solution manuals for all math courses, available for students to borrow</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Software</td>
<td></td>
<td>Microsoft Office, tutorial software from text publishers, digital video tutor – CD rom based video lessons. Also, internet based content available from the text publisher</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Worksheets</td>
<td></td>
<td>Paper based worksheets from Math 1B through Math 103 available to students to use and take with them</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Videos</td>
<td></td>
<td>VCR tapes of all math courses offered. Some provided by publishers others are tapes of Leeward CC math courses (100, 115, 50C)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exam taking</td>
<td></td>
<td>Students can make-up exams in the Math Lab</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instructor Evaluations</td>
<td></td>
<td>Math Lab Staff is responsible for transcription of student comments from semester evaluation forms</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Self Evaluation**

Relying on faculty input, the Library, LRC, EMC, and Math Lab provide sufficient services that support student learning, taking into consideration location and delivery format. Both the Library and LRC have space and computer needs that are reflected in the *Annual Review* process, and the Library has also indicated print resource needs.

**Planning Agenda**

- Upon completion of each year’s *Program Review* and *Annual Review* processes, the College will assess the extent to which these processes are successful in implementing changes in Academic Support Units to improve student learning.

---

**II.C.I.b. The institution provides ongoing instruction for users of library and other learning support services so that students are able to develop skills in information competency.**

**Descriptive Summary**

Leeward Community College’s Library, Learning Resource Center, and Educational Media Center provide ongoing instruction so that students are able to develop information competency skills.

The Library uses nationally recognized standards of information literacy established by the Association of College and Research Libraries (ACRL). These standards have been discussed with the Leeward CC Library Advisory Council and made available on the Leeward CC Library web site. (Refer to http://www.lcc.hawaii.edu/lib/faculty/il10.htm. Library faculty provide general orientation, subject-specific, and research-based sessions that support student learning outcomes and competency skills. As a member of the University of Hawai’i Library Council, the Head Librarian meets monthly to discuss system-wide needs and implement consortia purchases of library material.

The Instruction Librarian works closely with the Language Arts Division to administer and support the Library Skills Exam that has been used as an indicator of student competence in the use of information resources. Students are given two chances to pass this self-paced online course. In the event that they do not pass within two attempts, they receive individual tutoring before taking the exam again.

The Head Librarian is a team leader for the AA General Education Information Retrieval SLO assessment. This assignment will be handed over to the Instruction Librarian as part of a plan to establish a campus-wide program for information literacy.

The Library is an active participant in the development of the Learning Information and Literacy Online (LILO) project initiated by the University of Hawai’i Library Council. In Fall 2005, the UH Information Literacy Committee made its LILO website, which teaches students how to select and research a topic using the principles of Information Literacy, available to all UH faculty and students. Leeward CC’s Instructional Librarian has given a number of presentations on campus about the use and value of this program. To date over 95 faculty and students are using LILO to teach or develop information literacy skills; ultimately it is hoped that faculty in all disciplines will make use of the program. A self-testing component is also being developed for LILO.
While the Library handles the majority of information competency instruction, the Learning Resource Center also provides relevant services. LRC Writing Consultants (peer tutors) assist students with research processes and writing. These consultants and the LRC Writing Specialist (a faculty member) visit classes on instructors’ requests to provide in-class assistance with research projects. The LRC’s Success Connection includes a four-workshop series on research that incorporates information competency as an integral component of the research process.

The Educational Media Center’s Instructional Development Team, including the Distance Education Coordinator, has developed strategies to assist students taking Internet TeleWeb (cable and Internet), and Technology Enhanced Courses that utilize WebCT, an online e-learning system. Included are the following:

- Documentation and interactive tutorials available through the web (http://emedia.leeward.hawaii.edu/de/).
- On-campus orientations for DE students introducing WebCT. Serving approximately 137 students for the period of Fall 2004-Spring 2006
- On-campus orientations for specific Internet courses given by the course instructor. Serving approximately 410 students for the period of Fall 2004-Spring 2006
- Starting Spring 2006, orientations for Technology Enhanced courses, serving approximately 312 students.
- Streamed video orientations (http://emedia.leeward.hawaii.edu/de/streaming/StreamingVideos.htm). Note that the posted video(s) is/are for the current semester.
- Technology support for students experiencing problems with WebCT.

Self Evaluation
The Library, LRC, and EMC provide students with ongoing instruction on information competency skills. Library staff members have participated on assessment of the General Education student learning outcomes relating to information literacy. The Head Librarian has related certain weaknesses in these outcomes to the institution, resulting in productive dialogue among constituents of the College. For the LRC, evaluation forms are distributed at each Success Connection workshop to measure student satisfaction of learning.

Planning Agenda
- The Library will hold discussions with the institution’s administration on developing a College information literacy vision statement. Informal discussions have occurred with the Chancellor on this issue.
II.C.1.c. The institution provides students and personnel responsible for student learning programs and services adequate access to the library and other learning support services, regardless of their location or means of delivery.

Descriptive Summary
Leeward CC’s Library, Learning Resource Center, and Math Lab provide students and relevant personnel with adequate access to learning support services. These services are provided at multiple locations and through multiple means of delivery.

The Library is open Monday through Thursday, 8 am to 8 pm; Friday, 8 am to 3 pm; Saturday 9 am to 1 pm. During the Summer Session, the library is open Monday through Thursday from 9:00 a.m. to 5:30 p.m. and Fridays from 9:00 a.m. to 3:00 p.m. Students can remotely access the library’s collection through the Hawai’i Voyager online catalogue, a variety of electronic periodical databases and selected relevant websites. The Library’s E-mail Reference Service is available to all students, faculty, and staff. The Library Skills Exam modules are available in electronic format to eliminate time and distance restrictions for students. The Library’s web site is available at http://www.lcc.hawaii.edu/lib/.

The LRC, which is housed on the Pearl City campus, is open five days a week, including two evenings until 7:00 p.m. and one evening until 5:30 p.m. to accommodate students enrolled in evening classes or returning to campus after work. Students can obtain tutoring at the LRC or through the Online Writing Assistance Program (OWAP), which enables students to submit papers online for any course to a writing consultant, and feedback/response is sent by return e-mail within forty-eight hours. (For more information, refer to http://emedia.leeward.hawaii.edu/lrc/online.htm).

LRC-provided tutoring services are also available on the Wai’anae campus. As a service of the LRC, Kāko‘o ‘Ike (KI) serves students with documented disabilities. One of the major goals of the KI program is to improve access for students with disabilities. KI consulting services are available on the Pearl City and Wai’anae campuses on a regular basis. Students can obtain resources from the KI’s web site at http://emedia.leeward.hawaii.edu/kiprogram.

The Math Lab is open during the Fall and Spring semesters from Monday through Thursday from 8:30 am to 7:30 pm, and on Friday from 8:30 am to 3 pm. Summer hours are Monday, Tuesday, Thursday from 8:30 am to 5:30 pm and Wednesday and Friday from 8:30 to 3.

Services include walk-in tutoring, make-up examinations, software and computer-based tutorial programs, and worksheets to supplement instruction.

Self Evaluation
The Library, LRC, and Math Lab provide students with adequate access to learning support services at the Pearl City and Wai’anae campuses, as well as online and via phone.

Planning Agenda
• No changes are needed to address this standard.
II.C.2. The institution evaluates library and other learning 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.

**Descriptive Summary**

As part of the College’s Program Review process, Academic Support units engage in continuous assessments of student learning outcomes, as designed by each unit. The support area’s primary function is to provide a broad range of services to the academic programs of the College. The Library and other learning support services’ assessment results are reviewed as part of the overall campus’ Annual Review.

Results of the 2003-2004 assessments by Academic Support are documented in the September 9, 2004 Progress Report to ACCJC. Additional results of assessments for 2004-2005 are posted on DocuShare at the following address: http://documents.leeward.hawaii.edu:8080/docushare/dsweb/View/Collection-14 (“Support Area/Unit,” and the specific unit of interest.) Assessment results are summarized below:

**Library**

Results of the 2004 “Library User Satisfaction Survey” on customer service and support needs – average 3.9 on a scale of 5.

- Ratio of borrowing, excluding reserve, by undergraduates to undergraduate student FTE:
  - FY 2003 3.4 15,741/3,621
  - FY 2004 3.5 12,743/3,653

- Usage of core collection of electronic databases as a measure of usefulness and accessibility.
  - FY 2003 33,640
  - FY 2004 45,118

- Individual Instructional sessions (number of students in parentheses) taught:
  - Fall 04 23 (403)
  - Spring 05 39 (848)

- Number of reference questions answered:
  - FY 03 3642
  - FY 04 5247
Faculty post-semester evaluation of library instruction classes. Five questions scored from 1-5 with 5 being most strongly agree.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Faculty Library Instruction Survey N=8</th>
<th>Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Q1. Students have an understanding of appropriate information resources to use for their projects.</td>
<td>4.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q2. Students used appropriate resources as reflected in their bibliographies.</td>
<td>4.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q3. Students were able to access and retrieve information through the library’s electronic databases and web resources.</td>
<td>4.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q4. Students have an understanding of the process of evaluating the accuracy and authenticity of electronic information sources.</td>
<td>3.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q5. Lower incidence of plagiarism or improper citations.</td>
<td>3.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q6. At some time would you be willing to allow us to review the bibliographies of your student papers or projects from Fall ’04 and Spring ’05?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Fall 2006 Library Student Survey produced the following results:

- Of 328 students, 197 (60%) indicated that library computers or printers were insufficient in quantity or currency.
- Of 144 respondents, 91 (63%) indicated that Library workstations and laptop computers were reliable.

**Overall Findings:**

- a. Usage of electronic resources continues to grow, resulting in a need for a replacement plan for computer hardware and software.
- b. Print resources continue to be an important to information needs of the curriculum; however, flat budgets have resulted in dated materials.
- c. Electronic resources play important role in on-campus and distance education curriculum.

**Learning Resource Center (LRC)**

Tutoring student satisfaction survey (2-week period during Spring 04); average 4.48 on scale of 5

- Students receiving LRC tutoring services in Spring 2005:
  - Satisfied with tutoring received: 90% Strongly Agree or Agree;
  - Would recommend LRC tutoring to others: 92% Strongly Agree or Agree;
  - Improved understanding of subject: 88% Strongly Agree or Agree

In the Spring 2005 faculty survey, results included:

- 82% agree or strongly agree with the statement “Peer tutoring increases student success and retention.”
• 92% recommend LRC services to their students

• 100% responded agree/strongly agree with the statement “Overall, I’m satisfied with LRC services and facilities”

Additional Data:

• Number of tutoring services recorded for Fall 2004 and Spring 2005: 1364 tutoring services, 446 students served

• Development of Technology Skills Via CLUE workshops student satisfaction survey – 4.11 to 4.34 on a scale of

• Success Quotient (SQ) Workshops student satisfaction survey – average 4.6 of

• Students with Disabilities – number of student requests for notetaking filled: 87.5% fill rate

• Supplemental Instruction (SI) – comparison of students participating in SI to non-participants: average GPA for SI .8 higher than for non participants; failure rate 22% (versus 43% for non-SI); re-enrollment rate 25% higher for SI participants from Spring 2002-Spring 2003

• Success and retention of students who are frequent users of tutoring services as measured by (a) grade in course they received tutoring and (b) reenrollment following semester: Overall, 80.5% regular tutoring clients received grades of A, B, or C in the subject they were tutored. (Fall 04 students = 73%; Spring 05 students = 84%); Overall, 82% regular tutoring clients reenrolled at Leeward CC or another UH-system campus following semester. (Fall 04 students = 92%; Spring 05 students = 76%)

• Number of services other than tutoring delivered in the LRC: including computer lab services, testing, media use and duplication, materials use, study space, etc.: Total for year (Fall + Spring): 27,027 non-tutoring services, approx. *3350 students served-- 20,352 (75%) were computer uses; 2316 students used LRC computers.

Findings:
LRC Services are highly valued by students and faculty, as evidenced by annual survey results. The computer lab is the most heavily used LRC service; however, it is not included on the campus lab replacement cycle, as reflected in the Unit’s Annual Review.

Kāko‘o ‘Ike (KI)
Spring 2005, Leeward faculty an online survey to indicate familiarity with disability issues and services (66 responded):

• 38 indicated “more than an average” knowledge,
• 22 indicated “less than average,” and
• 4 respondents indicated “very knowledgeable” about disability issues and services.
Educational Media Center (EMC)
Campus-wide survey in Fall 2003 on EMC efforts to assist Leeward campus to effectively use information technology – 4.33 on a scale of 5

- Technology Partners survey/self assessment on increased ability to instruct using technology in the classroom – Spring 2003: 100%; Fall 2003: 93%; Spring 2004: 75%
- Technology Partners survey/self assessment on increased student learning due to use of technology in the classroom – Spring 2003: 100%; Fall 2003: 73%; Spring 2004: 62.5%
- Distance Education (DE) student satisfaction survey regarding academic support, student services, and quality of instructional modalities: 96% rated 4-5 on 5 point scale.
- Cable Televised Courses student satisfaction survey on Video Production Unit – 4.0 on scale of 5
- Copy Center student, faculty, and staff satisfaction survey – average 4.7 on scale of 5

Information Technology Group
Campus Computing Labs (CCL) student satisfaction survey on customer service: average 4.2 to 4.6 on scale of 5.

- Campus Computing Labs (CCL) student satisfaction survey on assistance received – average 3.9 to 4.5 on scale of 5
- ITG-IS staff tracking of request for data extraction: 29 data samples
  53 of Level 1 - about 5 hours of programmer time
  6 of Level 2 - about 16 hours of programmer time
  10 of Level 3 - about 40 hours of programmer time.
- Number of server problems recorded 112 -- servers not available to the Leeward Campus for 567.95 hours per year or about 6.48%
- Total number of hours for all 8 trouble calls: 758.33 hours for the year. Average time spent on a trouble call: 94 hours

Math Lab
During the Fall 2005 semester, the Math Lab logged in 4000 student contacts through attendance slips, tutoring sessions, or sign out sheets. In the time period from August 22 to December 16, 2005, 642.5 total hours of tutoring was provided by the Math Lab. Tutoring was the reason most often listed for attending the Lab, with 1,813 entries; computer usage was second with 630 entries.
On a scale of 1 to 5, student surveys reflected the following levels of satisfaction with the Math Lab tutoring they received:

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Availability</td>
<td>4.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knowledge</td>
<td>4.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Patience</td>
<td>4.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Courteousness</td>
<td>4.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall Experience</td>
<td>4.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A Math and Science Faculty survey administered in Spring 2005 produced the following results:

|                                                                                |        |
|                                                                                |        |
| Tutoring makes a critical difference for some of my students                  | 5/5 respondents: 100% |
| Tutoring is valuable for some of my students                                  | 5/5 respondents: 100% |
| Tutoring is valuable because I don’t have enough time to work with all my students individually. | 2/5 respondents: 40%  |
| Math Lab website                                                             | I excellent, I good, 3 haven’t seen it |

As a result of the surveys, small changes were made in the computer section of the Math Lab. Staff monitor students more carefully and let the manager know if students are using the Internet inappropriately. The Advisory Committee also suggested enhancing the website, which will occur during Summer 2006.

**Self Evaluation**

The Library, Learning Resource Center, Educational Media Center, Information Technology Group, and Math Lab identify the extent of their efforts in meeting student needs and in supporting the achievement of student learning outcomes. Student satisfaction surveys, statistical evidence, faculty and staff surveys, and other input by members of the College are used as the basis for evaluating these services. The results of these assessments are used to develop prioritized lists in the annual revisit of the College’s Strategic Plan. These lists are submitted to the Dean of Academic Support as part of the Annual Review process.

**Planning Agenda**

- The College’s Program and Annual Review processes will be assessed for their effectiveness in determining improvements needed in learning support services.
Standard III: Resources

Standard III.A: Human Resources

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.

As part of the College’s Program and Annual Reviews, faculty members are engaged in the process of developing, assessing, and implementing changes to improve student learning outcomes. Within Disciplines, faculty engage in thinking and discussions about these processes. Course and program assessments at the College vary in form and method, ranging from assessments of lab reports and other forms of writing to traditional tests.

Two examples of course assessments that have led to changes are Business 127, MS Word for Business, and Speech 251, Principles of Effective Public Speaking. The faculty members in Business Technology focused on the following SLO: “Key information accurately and efficiently for employment in a business setting at 30 gross words a minute (GWAM) on a five-minute timing with no more than five errors…” In Phase 1 of the assessment, all majors successfully passed the test according to published criteria. Business Technology faculty discussed the findings at the UH System-wide Business Technology articulation meeting, and by consensus, the Leeward faculty agreed to increase the minimum passing score to 40 net words a minute. Their Phase 2 assessment, which was done before the change was implemented, again showed 100% of the students passed with the minimum 30 GWAM. In the next assessment, the new criteria will be used.

In Speech 251, the SLO of focus was “The student will be able to conduct an audience analysis.” In Phase 1, assessment of speech outlines showed that 36% of the students identified the audience of the intended communication. Discussions among the speech faculty resulted in unanimous agreement that instructors require the identification of the intended audience in student outlines. As a result of this change, Phase 2 results showed competency levels at 65%.

Additional examples of efforts intended to measure how well students are learning, as well as the roles of faculty in these efforts, are described in the response to Standard II.A.2.a. of this theme and on the DocuShare website at http://documents.leeward.hawaii.edu:8080/docushare/dsweb/View/Collection-14

As faculty engage in evaluation processes, including lecturer review, they may address their participation in course and program assessments, as well as any other assessments of student learning outcomes they have designed for their own classes. The 2005-2006 UH Community College Contract Renewal Suggested Guidelines contain the recommendation that faculty provide “a self-assessment of your teaching ability with respect to courses you have taught, including a discussion of your effectiveness, learning outcomes, student responses to your approach, etc.” However, Guidelines For Tenure and Promotion, University of Hawai‘i Community Colleges, 2005-2006 do not address student learning outcomes achievement, except for the recommendation that faculty discuss “the possible impact and contributions you have made toward achieving your professional objectives and meeting your students’ needs.” Lecturer
evaluation guidelines that have been developed by each Division, some requiring a self-assessment of the lecturer's ability to demonstrate effectiveness in producing student learning outcomes for their course, but others making no mention of student learning outcomes.

Self Evaluation
The College has begun the practice of using course and program SLO assessment results to make improvements in student learning, but the policies governing this practice are still evolving. This has resulted in some controversy at the College. The Faculty Senate (FS) took the stance that the purpose of SLO is to assess programs and courses and not to evaluate faculty, and that it was not appropriate to combine the two. This was followed by charging its Faculty Committee with conducting an exploratory study of "the principles and practices of the legitimate use of SLO for faculty assessment and evaluation." Based on the committee's findings, the Senate passed a motion recommending 1) more time for widespread conversations among faculty, 2) the Accreditation Self Study Committee review its documents and either eliminate or correct any content that may contradict the distinction between SLO assessment and faculty evaluation, and 3) the Senate submit written feedback on Standard III.A.l.c. The College's Accreditation Liaison Officer appeared before the Faculty Senate on May 10, 2006 to explain the standard and the approach that would be taken in the self-study write up. During a closed executive session, Faculty Senators unanimously accepted the draft of the entire self study, with specific recommendations regarding the standard's write up, “including a sixth recommendation that the spirit of these recommendations be reflected in other theme sections” (Motion 06-57).

Planning Agenda
• The College will continue the dialogue resulting in the development of a common understanding of the definition, development, and assessment of student learning outcomes and their place in faculty evaluation.

• The College will work with the system-wide Human Resources Office to recommend revision of the guidelines for contract renewal and tenure and promotion to reflect an emphasis on producing student learning outcomes.

• The College will revise and standardize lecturer evaluation guidelines and include references to effectiveness in producing student learning outcomes.

III.A.5.a. The institution plans professional development activities to meet the needs of its personnel.

Descriptive Summary
Leeward Community College offers numerous professional development activities to meet the needs of its personnel. A full-time Staff Development Coordinator monitors the needs of the faculty and staff, plans appropriate activities, and assesses the effectiveness of the activities. See SLO Appendix C, page 266, for data on the College Colloquia workshops. At all workshops, attendees are asked to rate the effectiveness of the workshop and to communicate their needs for other professional development activities.
In addition to these workshops, other programs and activities occur throughout the year. The Clerical Staff Council (CSC) sponsors various workshops for its members via its Professional Development Committee. The CSC is devoted to providing continued development in a professional environment for all Clerical Staff of the College. The UH Mānoa Clerical Association also sponsors a yearly workshop for all Clerical Staff. A Staff Day, Wo Learning Workshop, and Excellence in Education Day is set aside for Clerical, APT, and O/M staff to engage in professional development.

For faculty, the College provides travel grants, Conference Dollars, and sabbatical leaves. The Community College System sponsors workshops such as Writing Across the Curriculum, Program Assessment by Ruth Steihl, and Return to Industry. Wo Champion Workshops, the Hawai‘i National Great Teachers Seminar, Teaching Squares, and Teaching Guidelines and Issues for Faculty (TGIF) are offered to all faculty.

An annual Leadership Retreat for administrators and campus leaders is held prior to the start of each academic year. Non-credit classes are also made available through OCEWD, and the Innovation Center for Teaching and Learning provides financial assistance for faculty and staff for conference or class fees. The State of Hawai‘i, University of Hawai‘i Human Resources Office, and employee unions provide information and training.

Course assessment workshops were held throughout Fall 2005 and Spring 2006 to assist faculty with understanding student learning outcomes and to write effective learning outcomes.

The schedule of these sessions were as follows:

- Wednesday, Nov. 9 from 1:00-2:00 pm
- Wednesday, Nov. 16 from 9:00-10:00 am
- Thursday, Nov. 17 from 2:30 to 3:30 pm
- Monday, Nov. 21 from 1:00-2:00 pm
- Monday, Nov. 28 from 12:00-1:00 pm

Workshops continue in spring 2006 as follows:

- Wednesdays 1:00-2:00 April 6, 13, 20
- Thursdays 1:30-2:30 April 7, 14, 21

**Self Evaluation**

The College actively seeks ways to support professional development of all its personnel and evaluates the results of most of those activities via evaluation forms and surveys. Additional funds to support assessment were included in the College’s supplemental budget request, and part of these funds could be used to support professional development directed toward assessment.

**Planning Agenda**

- The College will evaluate the activities and the role of the Innovation Center for Teaching and Learning as part of its evaluation of its Program and Annual Review processes and make changes as needed.
Appendix A

Examples of Courses that satisfy General Education requirements

Many of the courses listed below could be used in other sub-categories. Below are examples of courses can be used to satisfy each sub-category.

1). Ethical Principles
   a). PHIL 100 Introduction to Philosophy: Survey of Problems (A historical and/or positional approach to some of the major problems of philosophy such as, Existence of God, Good & Evil, Nature of Man, Nature of Human Knowledge, Truth, Freedom, Morality, and Law.)
   
   b). PHIL 101 Introduction to Philosophy: Morals and Society (An introductory study of moral values, nature of end or goals, the voluntary, virtues and vices, natural law, happiness, nature of morality.)
   
   c). PHIL 102 Introduction to Philosophy: Asian Traditions (Methods and fields in philosophy from the historical and/or positional perspective of basic Hindu, Buddhist, Taoist, Confucian and Zen Buddhist philosophers.)
   
   d). POLS 110 Introduction to Political Science (An introduction to the study of the theory, structure, functions and techniques of modern government, with special attention given to contemporary problems and controversies. The course is designed to provide knowledge of government and to encourage creative and critical thinking about political concepts, institutions and practices.)
   
   e). ED 286 Special Populations I (This course addresses the issues confronted by people who currently work, or plan to work, with special needs populations in primary and secondary education. It will cover characteristics of selected disabilities and the particular needs experienced by students with mild to moderate disabilities. Identification of the challenges that confront the disabled student, the educational assistant (EA), and the teacher within the classroom setting will be described. An examination of strategies used to work with each area of disability will be explored. There will also be an emphasis on information needed to help prepare students with disabilities to transition into adulthood.)
   
   f). ED 287 Special Populations II (This course addresses the issues confronted by people who currently work, or plan to work, with special needs populations in primary and secondary education. It will cover characteristics of moderate to severe disabilities and the particular needs experienced by students with these disabilities. Information other populations needing support (Multicultural and ESL learners) will also be covered. Identification of the challenges that confront the disabled student, educational assistant (EA), and teacher within the classroom setting will be described. An examination of strategies used to work with each area of disability will be explored. There will also be an emphasis on the use of Assistive Technology as part of related and supplementary services to help...
students succeed. As well, the course will address the most effective inclusion and transition practices for the moderate to severe special needs population. Identifying community resources and increase parent involvement will also be a focus of this course.)

2). Civility and Interpersonal Skills
   a). PSY 202 Psychology of Women (Survey of topics relevant to the psychological development of women: personality, domestic violence, mental health, gender differences, achievement motivation, and theory.)

   b). SOC 250 Community Forces in Hawai‘i (This course is designed to acquaint the student with sociological principles and the application of these principles to aid in the awareness, understanding, and appreciation of the unique social environment of the State of Hawai‘i. Fundamental concepts of sociology in the area of race relations are presented with emphasis on Hawai‘i’s unique potential “melting pot” social environment and the development of an “unorthodox race doctrine” for Hawai‘i. Sociological aspects of the various cultural contributions by the ethnic groups to Hawai‘i including values, concepts, practices, history, and language are also investigated)

3). Cultural Diversity
   a). ANTH 150 Human Adaptations (A survey course of physical and cultural anthropology. Major topics include human evolution, prehistoric development of culture, recent and contemporary human cultures, common features and principal variations in cultural behavior.)

   b). ANTH 151 Emerging Humanity (Introduction to the paleontology of human biological evolution and the archaeology of culture in the world prior to AD 1500.)

   c). ANTH 200 Cultural Anthropology (A survey course of cultural anthropology designed to provide the student with an understanding of the concept of culture, the principles of field methodology, cultural diversity, some of the factors underlying this diversity and the universal aspects of culture. Aims at assisting the student to view objectively his/her own as well as other cultures. Additional topics include: history and theory of cultural anthropology, culture and personality, processes of cultural change, applied anthropology.)

   d). ANTH 210 Archaeology (An introduction to prehistoric archaeology, methods and techniques of excavation and laboratory analysis, as well as a survey of human cultural growth and prehistoric times.)

   e). ANTH 215 Physical Anthropology (An introduction to the methodology and principles of physical anthropology. Topics covered include: heredity, evolution, human variation, primatology, fossil (humans), and eugenics.)

   f). ASAN 203 Philippine Culture: A Survey of Philippine Culture (A study of the history, politics, society, culture and art forms of the Philippines from pre-history to the present. Selected topics are approached through the integrated use of the art forms, e.g., music, literature, theater arts, etc., as ways of experiencing and understanding cultural and political issues.)
g). ASAN 204 Filipinos in the United States: The History and Culture of Filipinos in the U.S. (A study of the history of the Filipino as traveler and immigrant; historical and contemporary experiences in the U.S.; ethnic identity as expressed and represented in their cultural practices and art forms.)

h). DRAM 262 Hawaiian-Style Theatre (A practical performance-oriented theatre course which presents the local experience in a theatrical production. The actual production activities the student undertakes will vary with the production requirements of the play being produced.)

i). EALL 271 Japanese Literature in Translation: Traditional (Readings in English translations of the earliest works of Japanese literature to 1868, with the focus on how the text reflect the Japanese cultural character and worldview as well as universal truths of the human condition. Selections from Japanese film classics are also featured.)

j). EALL 272 Japanese Literature in Translation: Modern (Readings in English translations of modern works of Japanese literature from 1868 to the present, with the focus on how the text reflect 19th and 20th century Japanese life as well as general truths of the human condition. Selections from modern Japanese film classics are also featured.)

k). HWST 107 Hawai‘i: Center of the Pacific (An introduction to the unique aspects of the native point of view in Hawai‘i and the larger Pacific with regards to origins, language, religion, land, art, history and modern issues.)

l). HWST 110 Outdoor Recreation: Hawaiian (The course emphasis is on traditional cultural activities of the Hawaiians. Instruction is given in traditional crafts such as making corsages, leis, sandals, skirts, and nets. A general overview of Hawai‘i’s progression from earliest history to the period of discovery” is included. Field experiences includes visits to historic sites.)

m). HUM 220 Introduction to Japanese Culture (This course is a survey of Japanese culture, including interpersonal relationships, daily life, theatre, art, architecture, tea and Zen. Basic values and aesthetic tastes of the Japanese that have had a long existence will be explored. Therefore, although the focus is on contemporary society, the traditional aspects of it will be emphasized.)

n). HUM 225 Japanese Culture: Man and Nature (A thematic, team-taught Japanese culture course offered in alternate Leeward CC summer sessions, i.e., 1987, 1989, 1991, etc. Principal lectures will be offered by a visiting scholar from the Beppu University faculty of Kyushu, Japan. Through one humanities discipline, such as history, literature, religion, philosophy, or art, the lectures will thematically explore the Japanese view of Man and Nature.)

o). HUM 261 Hawaiian Literature (Hawaiian literature in English translation is studied in the context of the Hawaiian culture. Its characteristics, forms, relation to other Hawaiian arts, history and society are)
4). Historical and Aesthetic Sensitivity
   a). Variety of Art theory and practice courses such as ART 101 Introduction to Visual Arts and ART 104 Introduction to Printmaking
   b). Variety of Music theory and practice courses such as MUS 106 Introduction to Music Literature and MUS 121 Beginning Instrumental Class
   c). Variety of Dance theory and practice courses such as DNCE 150 Introduction of Dance and DNCE 131 Modern Dance I
   d). Variety of Drama theory and practice courses such as DRAM 101 Introduction to Drama and Theatre and DRAM 221 Beginning Acting I
   e). Variety of English Literature courses such as ENG 251 British Literature (Middle Ages to 1800)

5). Civic, Political and Social Responsibilities
   a). AMST 201 The American Experience (Interdisciplinary course that examines diversity and changes in American values and institutions -- political, economic, legal, and social.)
   b) AMST 202 Diversity in American Life (Interdisciplinary exploration of such current American domestic issues topics as politics, economics, civil rights, family life, the justice system, and the environment.)
   c). AMST 211 Contemporary American Issues: Domestic (Interdisciplinary exploration of such current American domestic issues topics as politics, economics, civil rights, family life, the justice
   d). AMST 212 Contemporary American Issues: World (Interdisciplinary exploration of such current global issues as international diplomacy, economic development, national security, demographic change, and the environmental protection.)
   e). POLS 120 Introduction to World Politics (A study of the mechanics of international organization through a systematic exposure and analysis of the relations among nations; history and origin of the state systems and causes behind state policies.)
   f). POLS 130 Introduction to American Politics (A contemporary look at the ideology behind the problems, the structure and policy formation process of the American political system. Comparisons will be made from analysis of the problems with actual government policies intended to deal with them. This course will attempt to present an even-handed treatment unveiling the problems as well as the strengths of the American political system.)
g). **POLS 180 Introduction to Hawaiian Politics** (An examination of contemporary Hawai’i political institutions, processes, issues, and personalities at the State and County levels, Hawai’i’s place in the national and international political arenas, and the future of politics in Hawai’i. Emphasis is placed on citizen roles and responsibilities in local politics.)

h). **IS 221 Problems of War and Peace** (This course explores questions of whether war is an inevitable part of the international system, whether it is a desirable part of the system, or whether it can or should be abolished. Is war a moral question, an economic question, or a question of psychology or politics? What alternatives are there to nuclear deterrence and war? What are the conditions of a peaceful world?)

i). **WS 151 Introduction to Women Studies** (An interdisciplinary introductory course which looks at the gender roles and relationships between women and men and among women, historically and in contemporary societies. Examines the social, cultural, historical and political influences on the status of women. Present women’s experiences from diverse backgrounds, social structures, and cultures.)
## Appendix B

### Computer Classrooms/Open Labs managed by Information Technology Group

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Biological Sciences (BS) Bldg &amp; Rm #</th>
<th>Number of computers</th>
<th>Processor</th>
<th>Processor Speed</th>
<th>RAM</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BS 103 classroom</td>
<td>21 Macs</td>
<td>G4</td>
<td>Dual 1.25 GHz</td>
<td>2 GB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BS 104 classroom</td>
<td>21 Macs</td>
<td>G4</td>
<td>Dual 1 GHz</td>
<td>1 GB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BS 105 classroom</td>
<td>21 PCs</td>
<td>Pentium 4</td>
<td>2.8 GHz</td>
<td>512 MB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BS 106b classroom</td>
<td>21 PCs</td>
<td>Pentium 4</td>
<td>3.0 GHz</td>
<td>512 MB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BS 107 classroom</td>
<td>21 PCs</td>
<td>Pentium 4</td>
<td>2.0 GHz</td>
<td>512 MB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BS 109 open lab</td>
<td>22 PCs</td>
<td>Pentium 4</td>
<td>2.0 GHz</td>
<td>512 MB</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Business Education (BE) Bldg &amp; Rm #</th>
<th>Number of computers</th>
<th>Processor</th>
<th>Processor Speed</th>
<th>RAM</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BE 225 classroom</td>
<td>21 PCs</td>
<td>Pentium 4</td>
<td>3.0 GHz</td>
<td>512 MB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BE 226 open lab</td>
<td>21 PCs</td>
<td>Pentium 4</td>
<td>1.8 GHz</td>
<td>256 MB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BE 227 Test Center</td>
<td>17 PCs</td>
<td>Pentium 4</td>
<td>1.8 GHz</td>
<td>256 MB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BE 228 classroom</td>
<td>21 PCs</td>
<td>Pentium 4</td>
<td>2.8 GHz</td>
<td>512 MB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BE 229 classroom</td>
<td>21 PCs</td>
<td>Pentium 4</td>
<td>2.8 GHz</td>
<td>512 MB</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Other computer labs supported by ITG. ITG is responsible for the maintenance of the computers in these labs.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Number of computers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Educational Media Center (L112)</td>
<td>24 PC laptops</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hoolu (DA 110)</td>
<td>16 PC laptops</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Library (public access)</td>
<td>26 PCs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Library (public access)</td>
<td>17 PC laptops</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Learning Resource Center (L101)</td>
<td>22 PCs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Math Lab (MS 204)</td>
<td>10 PCs and 10 Macs</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Appendix C

#### Staff Development Workshops for Spring, 2005

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Session Title</th>
<th>Day</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Attend.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dialogue on Reorganization Proposal Progress (Session #1)</td>
<td>Tu</td>
<td>1/4/2005</td>
<td>1-1:50 p.m.</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dialogue on Rvsn to LCC's AA Degree Core Curriculum (Session #1)</td>
<td>Tu</td>
<td>1/4/2005</td>
<td>1-1:50 p.m.</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dialogue on Reorganization Proposal Progress (Session #2)</td>
<td>Tu</td>
<td>1/4/2005</td>
<td>2-2:50 p.m.</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dialogue on Rvsn to LCC's AA Degree Core Curriculum (Session #2)</td>
<td>Tu</td>
<td>1/4/2005</td>
<td>2-2:50 p.m.</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preventing Harassment &amp; Violence in the Workplace</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>1/5/2005</td>
<td>8-10 a.m.</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preventing Harassment &amp; Violence in the Workplace</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>1/5/2005</td>
<td>12-2 p.m.</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Write-right Workshop</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>1/5/2005</td>
<td>10-11 a.m.</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preventing Harassment &amp; Violence in the Workplace</td>
<td>Th</td>
<td>1/6/2005</td>
<td>9-11 a.m.</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preventing Harassment &amp; Violence in the Workplace</td>
<td>Th</td>
<td>1/6/2005</td>
<td>1-3 p.m.</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Title III Dialogue Session</td>
<td>Th</td>
<td>1/20/2005</td>
<td>1:30-3:00p</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Title III Dialogue Session</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>1/26/2005</td>
<td>1:30-3:00p</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Campus Forum: LCC's Proposed AA Core Curriculum</td>
<td>Tu</td>
<td>2/8/2005</td>
<td>1:30-2:30p</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resolving Conflict with Tongue Fu</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>2/11/2005</td>
<td>1:30-3:30p</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chatting with the Chancellor</td>
<td>Tu</td>
<td>2/15/2005</td>
<td>1:00-2:00p</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TGIF - Who, Where, How? Getting to Know the LCC Campus and the UHCC System</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>2/18/2005</td>
<td>2-4p</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marketing &amp; PR Discussion Series: PR Brainstorming</td>
<td>Th</td>
<td>2/24/2005</td>
<td>1:30-2:30p</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TGIF - Getting to Computer &amp; Technology Resources</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>2/25/2005</td>
<td>2-4p</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Writers @ LCC Presents: Dynamic Slam Poet Steve “Kealoha” Wong</td>
<td>Th</td>
<td>3/10/2005</td>
<td>From 1:30p</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TGIF - Classroom Teaching Techniques</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>3/11/2005</td>
<td>2-4p</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baby Talk</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>3/16/2005</td>
<td>12-1p</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TGIF - Classroom Teaching Challenges</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>3/18/2005</td>
<td>2-4p</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sneak Peak at Our New Website</td>
<td>Tu</td>
<td>3/29/2005</td>
<td>1:30-2:30p</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TGIF - Campus Groups and Working Relationships</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>4/1/2005</td>
<td>2-4p</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Course Assessment Workshop</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>4/6/2005</td>
<td>1-2p</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Course Assessment Workshop</td>
<td>Th</td>
<td>4/7/2005</td>
<td>1:30-2:30p</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TGIF - Choosing Your Committee, College, &amp; Community Service</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>4/8/2005</td>
<td>2-4p</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Course Assessment Workshop</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>4/13/2005</td>
<td>1-2p</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Course Assessment Workshop</td>
<td>Th</td>
<td>4/14/2005</td>
<td>1:30-2:30p</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The New York Times Faculty Workshop</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>4/15/2005</td>
<td>1-2:30p</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TGIF - Preparing for Progress Reports, Contract Renewals, and Tenure/ Promotion</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>4/15/2005</td>
<td>2:30-4:30p</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Introduction to On-Line Investing</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>4/20/2005</td>
<td>1-2p</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Course Assessment Workshop</td>
<td>Th</td>
<td>4/21/2005</td>
<td>1:30-2:30p</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Turnitin Training Session - Free &amp; Quick</td>
<td>Th</td>
<td>4/21/2005</td>
<td>1:30-2:30p</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TGIF - Developing Course Assessment Techniques for Next Semester</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>4/22/2005</td>
<td>2-4p</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Turnitin Training Session - Free &amp; Quick</td>
<td>Tu</td>
<td>4/26/2005</td>
<td>1:30-2:30p</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Solving the Retention Puzzle</td>
<td>Th</td>
<td>5/5/2005</td>
<td>9a-3:30p</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total Attendance</th>
<th>Average Attendance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>584</td>
<td>13.27</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

number of workshops 44
## Student Learning Outcomes Documents and Websites

### Standard I

**2007–09 College Plan**
- **web**  [http://emedia.leeward.hawaii.edu/cs/planning/budget/](http://emedia.leeward.hawaii.edu/cs/planning/budget/)
- **print** following Evidence List, page 462 and Evidence Room

**Annual Review** process (2006)
- **web**  [http://emedia.leeward.hawaii.edu/cs/planning/](http://emedia.leeward.hawaii.edu/cs/planning/)
- **print**  Evidence Room

**Policy on Program Reviews**
- **web**  [http://home.lcc.hawaii.edu/docs/policies](http://home.lcc.hawaii.edu/docs/policies)
- **print**  Evidence Room

### Standard II

**Annual Review** process (2006)
- **web**  [http://emedia.leeward.hawaii.edu/cs/planning/](http://emedia.leeward.hawaii.edu/cs/planning/)
- **print**  Evidence Room

Association of College and Research Libraries (ACRL) standards of information literacy
- **web**  [http://www.lcc.hawaii.edu/lib/faculty/il10.htm](http://www.lcc.hawaii.edu/lib/faculty/il10.htm)

Automotive Service Excellence (ASE)
- **web**  [http://www.ase.com/](http://www.ase.com/)

Campus Safety & Security policies and procedures brochure
- **print**  Evidence Room

CCCM #6004, (November 4, 1996) pertaining to “Academic Credentials: Degrees and Certificates”
- **print**  Evidence Room

CCCM #6100 criteria for creation and modification of courses
- **print**  Evidence Room

Courses offered entirely through the Internet (WebCT) and Teleweb
- **web**  [http://emedia.leeward.hawaii.edu/de/](http://emedia.leeward.hawaii.edu/de/)

Curriculum Central
- **web**  [http://emedia.leeward.hawaii.edu/central](http://emedia.leeward.hawaii.edu/central)

Distance Education website
- **web**  [http://emedia.leeward.hawaii.edu/de/](http://emedia.leeward.hawaii.edu/de/)
Educational Media Center Streamed video orientations
  web http://emedia.leeward.hawaii.edu/de/streaming/Streaming_Videos.htm

English Language Institute (ELI)
  web http://home.lcc.hawaii.edu/eli

JPS surveys results
  web http://documents.leeward.hawaii.edu:8080/docushare/dsweb/View/Collection-63/

Kākoʻo 'Ike Office
  web http://emedia.leeward.hawaii.edu/kiprogram/

*Leeward CC 2005-2006 Catalog*
  web http://www.lcc.hawaii.edu/catalog
  print Evidence Room

*Leeward CC Strategic Plan, 2002-2010*
  web http://emedia.leeward.hawaii.edu/sp
  print Evidence Room

Learning Resource Center website
  web http://emedia.leeward.hawaii.edu/lrc

Library website and Library Skills Exam modules
  web http://www.lcc.hawaii.edu/lib/

NATEF and the National Institute for Automotive Service Excellence (ASE)
  web http://www.natef.org/about/achieving_ase_cert.cfm

National Association of Communication Systems Engineers (NACSE)

National Restaurant Association
  web http://www.nraef.org/faq/faq_exams.asp?flag=lcd&level1_id=6&level2_id=4

Office of Continuing Education and Workforce Development website
  web http://www.lcc.hawaii.edu/ocewd/

Online Writing Assistance Program (OWAP)
  web http://emedia.leeward.hawaii.edu/lrc/online.html

*Policy on Curriculum Revision and Review*
  web http://home.lcc.hawaii.edu/docs/policies
  print Evidence Room
Policy on Program Reviews, (rev. 2005)
web  http://home.lcc.hawaii.edu/docs/policies
print  Evidence Room

DocuShare site
web  http://documents.leeward.hawaii.edu:8080/docushare/dsweb/HomePage

Program and Support Area Assessment 2004 results
web  http://documents.leeward.hawaii.edu:8080/docushare/dsweb/View/Collection-14

Program and Support Area Assessment 2005 results
web  http://documents.leeward.hawaii.edu:8080/docushare/dsweb/View/Collection-14

Progress Report to ACCJC, September 9, 2004
web  http://emedia.leeward.hawaii.edu/cs/planning/reports/
print  Evidence Room

Results of Academic Support Program assessments for 2004-2005
web  http://documents.leeward.hawaii.edu:8080/docushare/dsweb/View/Collection-14
Select “Support Area/Unit” and the specific unit of interest.

Student Services, including Financial Aid and Job Prep Services, reports on SLO assessments
web  http://documents.leeward.hawaii.edu:8080/docushare/dsweb/View/Collection-63/

Study Abroad Program
web  http://emedia.leeward.hawaii.edu/studyabroad/

WebCT
web  http://webct.hawaii.edu/webct/public/show_courses.pl

General Education Project, UH Systemwide General Education Academic Skill Standards
web  http://www.hawaii.edu/ovppp/gened/gedwww.htm
print  Evidence Room

**Standard III**
2005-2006 UH Community College Contract Renewal Suggested Guidelines
web  http://home.lcc.hawaii.edu/docs/faculty

DocuShare website
web  http://documents.leeward.hawaii.edu:8080/docushare/dsweb/HomePage

*Guidelines for Tenure and Promotion University of Hawai‘i Community Colleges 2005-06*
web  http://home.lcc.hawaii.edu/docs/faculty
inclusive, informed, and intentional efforts
programs to support learning
evaluation of program effectiveness
communication and decision making structures
organized to produce and support learning
Organization

The Standards require colleges to have inclusive, informed and intentional efforts to define student learning, provide programs to support that learning, and to evaluate how well learning is occurring. This requirement means that the institution must have in place the organizational means to identify and make public the learning outcomes, to evaluate the effectiveness of programs in producing those outcomes, and to make improvements. This requirement for adequate staff, resources and organizational structure (communication and decision making structures) is not new to accreditation standards, but the new expectation is that these be oriented to produce and support student learning. Consequently, they will be evaluated in part by how well they support learning.

Organization
Standard I           pages 273–276
Standard II          pages 277–287
Standard III         pages 288–320
Standard IV          pages 321–347

List of Evidence
Documents and Websites pages 348–352
**Standard I: Institutional Mission and Effectiveness**

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

**Descriptive Summary**

The organizational structures at Leeward Community College (Leeward CC) that support dialogue about student learning and institutional processes include the Faculty Senate, the Campus Council, the College’s Administration, Academic Divisions, Clerical Staff Council (CSC), Administrative Professional and Technical (APT) Group, and Operations and Maintenance (O&M) Group. The College’s Program and Annual Review processes insure faculty, staff, and administrator participation in these processes.

The **Faculty Senate** is an elected body, recognized by the University of Hawai‘i Board Of Regents, and charged with the task of giving the College faculty input regarding curriculum, academic assessment, tenure and promotion, and other issues dealing with the College’s academic structure. The Senate has three standing committees that contribute to the maintenance of the College’s ongoing dialog concerning student learning and institutional processes. The Curriculum Committee is charged with oversight of all matters concerning course offerings, prerequisites, and academic programs and their structure. The Program Review Committee is charged with measuring the demand for, and efficiency and effectiveness of the College’s academic programs. The Senate’s Student Committee is charged with reviewing all student complaints about academic evaluation, grading and other issues related to the effect of the College’s academic programs on students.

Although the **Campus Council** does not involve itself with curricular development or academic policy, its role in making recommendations about budget planning and resource allocation makes it an important organization for the College. The Council is representative of all organized constituencies on campus, thus facilitating dialogue throughout the campus.

In 2004, the College’s **Administration** formed an Assessment Committee charged with overseeing the Program Review process for the College, including assisting Program Coordinators and Support Area Supervisors with the development of student learning outcomes and identification of appropriate data collection methods, monitoring the timeliness of review completions, and assisting with the analysis of data and the identification of actions for improvement. Serving on this committee are the Vice Chancellor, along with the College’s Assessment Coordinator, Strategic Planner, Accreditation Liaison Officer, Institutional Researcher, and the chair of the Senate’s Program Review Committee.

The College’s **Academic Divisions** are in continual dialogue about the improvement of student learning. Based on a schedule established in the Policy on Program Reviews (revised 5/05), student learning outcomes of programs and courses are assessed, changes implemented, and outcomes reassessed again. Much dialogue occurs in the development of the student learning outcomes (SLO), as well as in methods for assessment. Once results are available, discussions about changes for improvement occur at the division level.

The **CSC, APT, and O&M** groups are comprised of non-faculty staff members whose technical jobs lead them to be interested in the processes by which the College’s non-instructional tasks are completed and through which they interface with the College’s students and faculty.
Leeward Community College’s *Program Review* process is the means by which the campus engages in the assessment of institutional effectiveness. Through systematic collection and review of student learning outcomes in all courses, programs, and Support Areas, faculty, staff, and administrators identify and address concerns and make improvements to ensure that programs meet their goals and address the College’s mission.

In Fall 2005, the *Annual Review* process was developed, and after extensive dialogue, implemented on a college-wide basis in the Spring 2006. In this process, all Academic Divisions and Support Areas are required to complete an *Annual Review Template* (see schematic illustrating the template and process on next page) that prompts planning discussions based on SLO assessment, student achievement data, and an analysis of each Division/Areas’ strengths, weaknesses, opportunities, and threats (SWOT). Faculty and staff are guided by questions derived from ACCJC Standards. The result of these planning discussions is a Division/Area plan and prioritized budget lists. Each Area’s priorities are then consolidated by discussions among representatives of the four major Units of the College (Instruction, Student Services, Academic Support, Institutional Support), resulting in a prioritized, campus planning list that is the basis of the College’s budget proposal. The completion of the first cycle of the *Annual Review* has resulted the *College Plan*, the basis for FY 2007-2009 Budget Proposal. (See *College Plan* on page 462, following Evidence List)
## Student Learning and Achievement

Describe major actions taken as a result of assessments. (IIA.2.e, f) What has been learned from assessments? What plans are there for changes in the future?

What evidence do you have that students actually are achieving your stated learning outcomes?

Discuss the success of your students when they transfer and the degree to which your division is meeting the learning and employment needs of students (IIA.1a, b).

Discuss how the division approaches class scheduling to meet student needs and the level of student demand for course offerings. (IIA.1a, b)

### ANNUAL REVIEW

Institutional Research Data and Assessment Data provided

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strengths</th>
<th>Weaknesses</th>
<th>Opportunities</th>
<th>Threats</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strengths</td>
<td>Weaknesses</td>
<td>Opportunities</td>
<td>Threats</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

**PLANNING LISTS**

- Academic Plan
- Student Services Plan
- Academic Support Plan
- Institutional Support Plan
- College Plan
The second phase of the *Annual Review* process focuses on the continued assessment and refinement of planning and budgeting activities. To involve more of a cross section of the campus, the second phase calls for the creation of Phase II committees that focus on such areas as: Space Allocation and Use, Staffing, Information Technology, External Issues and Equipment.

These committees will consider the planning lists resulting from *Program Reviews* and will recommend priorities, based on their area of expertise. The prioritized lists will be submitted to the Executive Planning Committee, composed of the Faculty Senate and Campus Council Executive Committees, the Deans of Arts and Sciences, Career and Technical Education, and Academic Support, and the Director of Administrative Services and Vice Chancellor. This group will recommend the budget priorities of the College.

**Self Evaluation**

The College has appropriate organizational structures in place to support dialogue about improving student learning and institutional effectiveness. With the *Program* and *Annual Review* processes in place, more dialogue has occurred than in the past. However, discussions must continue, especially among faculty and staff across the curriculum to determine changes needed to improve program SLOs.

**Planning Agenda**

- The College’s *Program* and *Annual Review* processes will be assessed to determine their effectiveness in improving student learning and institutional processes.
II.A. Instructional Programs

II.A.2.d. The institution uses delivery modes and teaching methodologies that reflect the diverse needs and learning styles of its students

Descriptive Summary
Faculty and staff at Leeward Community College utilize a variety of delivery modes and teaching strategies in an attempt to meet the diverse learning styles of its students. In addition to courses taught in a traditional lecture format, a growing percentage provide students with a variety of options including hands-on, online, televised, and a number of hybrids composed of a mixture of delivery modes. These formats have been documented in Curriculum Central, the College’s repository for course proposals, modifications, and assessments. Curriculum Central’s databank holds course descriptions, student learning outcomes, and course assessment results. As such, it serves as an important component of the College’s Program Review that provides evidence of depth, breadth, and rigor in all courses.

Organizationally, the College’s learning support services provide additional means that are appropriate to meeting the needs of its disabled student population and students in need of supplemental instruction. The College also has organizational structures that facilitate the development of delivery modes to meet the diverse needs of students. The Educational Media Center (EMC), Information Technology Group (ITG), the Innovation Center for Teaching and Learning, and the Learning Resource Center (LRC) provide a number of workshops and training sessions to help faculty and staff implement various delivery modes of instruction. In addition, regularly scheduled mentoring sessions, including TGIF for new Faculty and the Great Teachers’ Seminars, provide faculty with the opportunity to engage in dialogue about different teaching strategies and learning styles. This often results in informal mentoring of junior faculty members within the various disciplines throughout the College.

Self Evaluation
Although assessment of student learning styles does not occur formally, in their day-to-day teaching, faculty and staff use a variety of delivery modes and teaching strategies to meet the needs of individual students. Program Review, which includes student learning outcomes assessment at the course and program levels, may offer a measure of how well these modes and strategies support student learning. Learning support services provide supplemental instruction for students and workshops and mentoring sessions for faculty.

Planning Agenda
- The College will make available to all students a quick survey assessment of learning style, either as part of new student orientation/counseling, or as a voluntary service for students. In addition, an annual workshop on learning styles will be offered, perhaps as part of new faculty orientation.
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.

II.A.3.a. General education has comprehensive learning outcomes for the students who complete it, including the following: An understanding of the basic content and methodology of the major areas of knowledge: areas include the humanities and fine arts, the natural sciences, and the social sciences

Descriptive Summary
Leeward Community College's General Education philosophy is clearly stated in the 2005-2006 Catalog (page 60):

General education provides students the opportunity to develop understandings, abilities, values, and attributes which enable them to apply their knowledge skills, and talents to make judicious decisions and to analyze and solve human problems within a multi-cultural community. General education is that part of education which encompasses the common knowledge, skills, and attitudes needed by each individuals to be effective as a person, a family member, a worker, and a citizen.

Both Academic and Career and Technical degree programs require a component of General Education based on this philosophy. All AS and AAS degree programs require that students take at least one course in each of the following areas: humanities/fine arts, the natural sciences, and the social sciences. Requirements for AS and AAS programs can be found on pages 29-59 of the 2005-2006 Catalog. AA general education requirements (43 credits total) can be found on pp. 66-67 of the Catalog. While the College's AA degree requirements will change beginning Fall 2006, the General Education requirements will still include 9 credits in Arts and Humanities, 9 credits in Social Sciences, and 10 credits in Natural Sciences.

The AA degree has established competencies for the following major areas of knowledge: arts and humanities, mathematics and logical reasoning, natural sciences, social sciences, world civilizations, and written and oral communication. These competencies can be found on pages 64-65 of the 2005-2006 Catalog. To fulfill a General Education core requirement, each course must, through its student learning objectives, demonstrate that it meets competencies for one of the major areas of knowledge listed above. The course must successfully proceed through the following approval process: Division review, Curriculum Committee review, Faculty Senate review, and Administrative review. Student learning outcomes of all courses are found in their core outlines housed in Curriculum Central.

Self Evaluation
The College has processes in place that to help ensure that General Education courses include content and methodology in the areas listed above. For the AA degree, it is unclear which courses meet the specific content competencies listed (pages 64-65 of the 2005-2006 Catalog) for social sciences, natural science, and arts and humanities. While the College is in the process
of establishing a Curriculum Grid relating AA General Education core courses to the six skill-based AA Student Learning Outcomes, it has not done a similar grid for the knowledge-based competencies.

The General Education philosophy and requirements are clearly listed in the 2005-2006 Catalog, which is also available on the College’s website at http://www.lcc.hawaii.edu/catalog/

Planning Agenda

• The College will design a grid similar to the Curriculum Grid for the AA competencies in each Division, particularly those in natural sciences, arts and humanities, and social sciences. This will provide some evidence that the AA graduates who have taken, for example, three social science classes, have been taught all the social science competencies.

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.

Descriptive Summary

Students are required to take courses to develop competence in oral and written communication, information competency, scientific and quantitative reasoning, and critical analysis/logical thinking through the AA program. Student Learning Outcomes for each area are clearly identified in academic advising sheets and in the Programs of Study section of the Leeward CC 2005–2006 Catalog (pp. 60-61). The AA degree is assessed by focusing on six General Education areas: Critical Thinking, Information Retrieval and Technology, Oral Communication, Quantitative Reasoning, Written Communication, and Abstract Reasoning. Program assessment results are shown on pp. 24 – 44 of the Report on Program Reviews and Support Area Reviews. These assessments may be viewed online at http://documents.leeward.hawaii.edu:8080/docushare/dsweb/View/Collection-14. Templates included in this publication delineate outcome measures, definition of data sample, method of data collection, expected and actual results, and action plans.

The campus has also established a process for course review, including a six-year timetable during which all courses must be reviewed. Related questions about the course’s breadth, depth, sequencing, and currency are addressed in the campus Curriculum Central database. Division chairs are responsible for ensuring that all the SLOs on course outlines match the core outline in Curriculum Central.

Self Evaluation

Based on the current degree requirements, it is unclear whether students acquire computer literacy in every degree program (i.e. Associate in Arts). As computer literacy is a component of information retrieval, more data will become available when computer literacy is assessed.

Planning Agenda

• As part of the Program Review process, the College will clarify how students will acquire computer literacy in every degree program and how it will be assessed.
II.A.5. Students completing vocational and occupational certificates and degrees demonstrate technical and professional competencies that meet employment and other applicable standards and are prepared for external licensure and certification.

Descriptive Summary
All Career and Technical Education (CTE) programs are required to meet with their advisory boards to assure relevancy of the curriculum SLOs in meeting employment and other applicable standards. A Program Review process is also in place to assure that program efficacy is evaluated and appropriate modifications initiated incrementally over a 5-year time frame. Students who complete CTE certificate and/or degree programs acquire technical and professional competencies that are intended to meet employment standards. The certificate/ degree programs also prepare students and for external licensure and certification when that is desirable or required for employment in the field.

The Certificate of Completion in Substance Abuse Counseling gives students the knowledge and skills required to pursue work as an alcohol or drug abuse counselor. The program also prepares students to take the state exam to become a Certified Substance Abuse Counselor (CSAC). The certificate program fulfills the substance abuse specific education requirement and a portion of the hours of experiential learning required for certification by the Hawai‘i Department of Health.

The AAS degree in Culinary Arts enables students to develop the skills, knowledge, and confidence essential to prepare for a wide range of employment opportunities in the culinary world. Students complete a combination of hands-on experience and theoretical instruction that gives them a solid foundation of the fundamentals of the food service industry. In addition, the American Culinary Federation, Inc accredits the Culinary Arts program. This stamp of approval ensures the quality of the program and enhances the credibility of graduates when they are seeking employment. Students who successfully complete the AAS degree are awarded certified cook status by the ACF, provided that they join the local chapter of the ACF as a junior member.

The AAS degree in Automotive Technology is designed to prepare students with the skills and competencies necessary for a successful career as an automotive technician. Emphasis is placed upon the importance of work habits and attitudes required to succeed in a highly competitive work environment. The curriculum is constantly changing to keep abreast of the latest technological changes in the automotive field. Students understand that they will be required to pursue continuing education in order to remain effective in their chosen profession. Students who are chosen to participate in the Automotive Student Service Educational Training (ASSET) program, sponsored by Ford Motor Company and Hawai‘i Ford and Lincoln/ Mercury Dealers, are held to higher standards than other AMT students. They are required to successfully complete all dealer-based courses and achieve Automotive Service Excellence (ASE) certification. All ASSET students earn the AAS degree; in contrast, students in the generic AMT program have more flexibility. They can choose to earn a certificate only, or complete an individual course that focuses on one aspect of automotive repair, if that is their goal.
The AMT program is accredited by the National Automotive Technician Education Foundation (NATEF). This certification process requires program self evaluation, NATEF review of the self study materials, and an on-site evaluation led by an Evaluation Team Leader (ETL) assigned to the campus by NATEF. During this two-day visit, the visiting team determines if the program meets the established industry requirements. These requirements include assessment of ten automotive standards statements, eight technical areas of expertise and tasks related to these areas, applied academics and workplace skills, and tools and equipment. When industry requirements are met, the program is certified for five years.

The ICS AS degree program is approved by the National Association of Communications Systems Engineers (NACSE). The program was also designed under the guidance of 3COM Corporation to meet employment standards. All students who earn an AS degree in ICS are eligible to take national certification tests.

The AS degree in Digital Media Production (beginning Fall 2006) is designed to provide students with the art and design training necessary for successful careers in the digital communications industry. Upon completion, students will be prepared to pass two National Association of Communication Systems Engineers (NACSE) certifications: NACSE Web Technician (NWT) and NACSE Certified WebMaster (NCW).

**Self Evaluation**

Through their advisory boards and the College's Program Review process, Career and Technical programs and courses of study keep in close contact with industry requirements and national standards, adjusting their curriculum to meet those requirements and standards. However, the College does not have sufficient information about the number of students receiving certification.

**Planning Agenda**

- As part of the Program Review of Career and Technical Education, the College will develop a mechanism to track certification and/or employment after graduation.
II.C. Library and Learning Support Services

II.C.I.a. Relying on appropriate expertise of faculty, including librarians and other learning support services professionals, the institution selects and maintains educational equipment and materials to support student learning and enhance the achievement of the mission of the institution.

Descriptive Summary

The College is organized to support student learning through the following Academic Support Units: the Library, the Learning Resource Center (LRC), and the Educational Media Center (EMC), and Information Technology Group (ITG). The Math and Science Division’s Math Learning Resource Center (Math Lab) also provides tutoring for students enrolled in mathematics or courses using math, at no charge. The Academic Support Units and Math Lab have several organizational structures in place to aid in the selection of equipment and materials to support student learning.

Leeward’s Library Advisory Council is composed of members from each Academic Division that meet to discuss library goals and collections to support student learning needs. Library Skills sessions, including the range from general orientations to subject-specific, research-based instruction, assure that student learning outcomes and competency skills are addressed. As a member of the University of Hawai‘i Library Council, the Head Librarian meets monthly to discuss system-wide needs and to implement consortia purchases of library material.

Leeward’s LRC facilitates educational offerings through individual and group tutoring in academic subjects; make-up and Distance Education testing for courses offered by any UH-system campus; and workshops in academic, life, and technology skills. The LRC also provides students with a computer lab, handouts on learning skills, reading development materials, CD-ROMS, and other instructional materials selected or provided by instructors. (For more information, refer to http://emedia.leeward.hawaii.edu/lrc/ ) Selection of educational materials is based on discussions with faculty who serve on the LRC Advisory Committee.

The EMC provides support for student learning through the use of technology. As part of the EMC, the Distance Education (DE) Program provides students with a WebCT orientation, which teaches technology skills required for successful online performance and year-round online, walk-in and phone support for technical issues and questions specific to DE courses and programs. ITG’s HelpDesk services are provided to assist students with WebCT as well as computer hardware and software issues. Selection of equipment and materials is based on faculty and staff input.

The Math Lab’s equipment and materials are selected by the Math Lab Advisory Committee and Math and Sciences faculty. Analysis of data collected about tutoring by subject, professor, and tutor; amount of resource usage including calculators, texts, and solution manuals, and computer usage by time and type of activity are used in this selection.

Self Evaluation

Leeward’s Academic Support Units discussed above support student learning through the selection of appropriate equipment and materials based on collaboration with faculty and staff. Support Units like the Innovation Center for Teaching and Learning provide assistance to faculty and are discussed in Standard III.A.5.
Since the implementation of Program Review in 2004, the College’s Academic Support Units have continuously revised their processes in response to input from their assessments of student learning. Through the Annual Review process, which integrates the results of these assessments with student achievement data and internal analyses of Academic Support’s strengths, weaknesses, opportunities, and threats, the College develops plans and budget requests.

**Planning Agenda**
- No changes are needed to address this standard.

II.C.1.c. The institution provides students and personnel responsible for student learning programs and services adequate access to the library and other learning support services, regardless of their location or means of delivery.

**Descriptive Summary**
The College is organized to provide access to students by providing support services as follows:

The **Library** is open Monday through Thursday, 8 am to 8 pm; Friday, 8 am to 3 pm; Saturday 9 am to 1 pm. Students can also access the library’s collection through the Hawai‘i Voyager online catalogue, a collection of electronic periodical databases. The Library’s E-mail Reference Service is available to all students, faculty, and staff. The College’s Library Skills modules are available in electronic format to eliminate time and distance restrictions for students. The Library’s web site is available at [http://www.lcc.hawaii.edu/lib/](http://www.lcc.hawaii.edu/lib/+).

The **LRC** is open five days a week, including two evenings until 7:00 p.m. and one evening until 5:30 p.m. to accommodate students enrolled in evening classes or returning to campus after work. Students can obtain tutoring at the LRC, through the Online Writing Assistance Program, or on the Wai‘anae campus. Kāko‘o ‘Ike (KI) services for students with documented disabilities are available on the Pearl City and Wai‘anae campuses on a regular basis.

The **EMC** is open five days a week from 8 am to 4:30 pm. Intec, which facilitates the use of instructional technology equipment for faculty, staff, and students, is open from 7:45 am to 5 pm Mondays through Fridays. The Copy Center provides low-cost, high-quality duplicating services to all offices, departments, faculty, and staff from Monday through Thursday at 8 am - 7:00 pm and on Friday 8:00 am - 4:30 pm.

**ITG** operates and maintains the College Computing Labs (CCL) and the Help Desk. Hours of availability are shown below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Hours</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BS 109 (Open Lab)</td>
<td>8 am to 8 pm M-Th</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>8 am to 4 pm Friday</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>9 am to 1 pm Saturday</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BE 227 (Testing Center)</td>
<td>8 am to 4 pm M-F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Online testing is also available from 4 to 8 pm daily in BS 109)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BE 226 (Open Lab)</td>
<td>8 am to 4 pm M-F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Help Desk</td>
<td>8 am to 7 pm M,T</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>8 am to 5 pm W,Th</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>8 am to 4 pm Friday; 9 am to 12 noon Saturday</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
During the Fall and Spring semesters, the Math Lab is open on Monday through Thursday from 8:30 am to 7:30 pm, and on Friday from 8:30 am to 3 pm. Summer hours are Monday, Tuesday, Thursday from 8:30 am to 5:30 pm and Wednesday and Friday from 8:30 to 3. Services include walk-in tutoring, make-up examinations, software and computer-based tutorial programs, and worksheets to supplement instruction.

**Self Evaluation**
The Library, LRC, EMC, ITG, and Math Lab provide faculty, staff, and students with adequate access to learning support services on campus, as well as online and via phone. The LRC has sometimes limited its hours, in part due to lack of funding for student assistants. In addition, on occasion, this Unit and the Library have had to close early because professional staff were not available to supervise operations. The LRC has revamped some of its tutoring activities in order to cover as many subjects as needed with fewer student tutors.

As part of the College’s Program Review process, Academic Support Units have assessed student learning outcomes specific to their Units and implemented changes based on these assessments. Combined with student achievement data, assessment of student learning is the basis of the Support Areas’ contribution to the College’s Annual Review process for planning and budgeting. Staffing needs, like those addressed above, are reflected in Support Units’ Annual Review templates.

**Planning Agenda**
• Academic Support Units, as part of their Annual Review, will continue to assess staffing needs to support student learning.
II.C.1.d. The institution provides effective maintenance and security for its library and other learning support services.

**Descriptive Summary**
Academic Support units are organized to ensure the integrity of facilities and collections. During regular business hours, users enter and exit the Library through a single door. As they exit, they pass through the gates of an electronic book detection system, which alerts the circulation staff if it detects a library item, such as a laptop computer that has not been properly checked out.

The Library also has a video camera security system which monitors the elevator entrance used by disabled students and secluded areas of the Library. On the upper floor of the Library is a telephone that connects directly with the reference in case students need assistance. In the evening, the desk is manned by a student assistant equipped with a radio that allows constant communication with the Circulation staff.

The greatest security concern in the LRC is for the well-being of the student staff. In both the LRC and KI, a professional is generally present in the center or office, or else reachable via cell phone and able to return promptly if elsewhere on campus. Because of the nature of some of the KI students served and the space plan of the KI office (only one entrance/exit), that office also has a camera security system and a “panic button” in the coordinator’s office that connects to an alarm in Security. No specific measures are in place to protect LRC or KI equipment.

The EMC has a video camera security system that can monitor and record the two main entrances.

The Math Lab, like the remainder of the campus, is provided service by Security Officers who are on duty 24-hours a day, 7 days a week, 365 days a year. The unit is staffed by a Security Supervisor and five Security Officers.

**Self-Evaluation**
Maintenance and security measures function adequately. The Library, LRC and KI, EMC, and Math Lab have had no problems with equipment theft.

**Planning Agenda**
- As part of their Annual Review, Academic Support Units will assess staffing needs to support student learning.
II.C.I.e. When the institution relies on or collaborates with other institutions or other sources for library and other learning support services for its instructional programs, it documents that formal agreements exist and that such resources and services are adequate for the institution's intended purposes, are easily accessible, and utilized. The performance of these services is evaluated on a regular basis. The institution takes responsibility for and assures the reliability of all services provided either directly or through contractual arrangement.

Descriptive Summary
Leeward CC has appropriate organizational structures in place when collaborating with other institutions for support services.

The Leeward CC Library has physically housed the University of Hawai‘i at West O‘ahu (UHWO) Library within its own facility for years. This unique arrangement has both college libraries working together to achieve ease of use, accessibility, and sharing of materials for both student populations. For example, periodicals in print and in microfilm formats are inter-shelved or filed together. Duplication of periodical subscription titles is kept to a minimum. Guidelines for borrowing materials are documented in the Chancellor For Community Colleges Memo (CCCM #11100, February 1, 1994), Subject: Community College Library Circulation Policy and the Interlibrary Loan Guidelines (CCLC Sept 19, 1997).

The Library is a member of the University of Hawai‘i Library Council (UHLC), which is composed of the Library Directors of all UH System campuses. The purpose of the UHLC is to establish policies that improve and expand services and resources offered by individual members, specifically in the following ways:

- Improve services and access to resources through cooperation
- Benefit economically by bargaining/purchasing/applying for grants collectively
- Serve as a means of communication among UH library directors
- Make decisions and/or recommendations and represent the point of view of UH library directors to any agency affecting their library services.


- Through UHLC the Leeward CC Library serves as member of the Hawai‘i Library Consortium (HLC). The HLC is composed of library representatives from the UHLC, DOE, Hawai‘i State Public Library System and a number of private academic K-12, colleges, and universities in Hawai‘i. The purpose of the consortium is to increase, enhance, and facilitate cooperation among libraries in the State of Hawai‘i through consortia purchasing of resources, expanding access to resources, and encouraging partnerships between and among member libraries. The HLC bylaws can be found at [http://www.hlc.hawaii.edu/documents/HLC--bylaws.pdf](http://www.hlc.hawaii.edu/documents/HLC--bylaws.pdf). Through the HLC, Leeward Community College’s Library receives access to a package of full-text databases from EBSCOHost, covering
a broad range of subjects. EBSCOHost databases are the most heavily used
electronic resources in the library (38,863 full-text articles retrieved in FY 2005).
The Hawai‘i Library Consortium completed an evaluation of EBSCOHost in
November 2004, and decided to renew the statewide contract through 2010.

Currently, the **LRC** has one external contract, with Red Rock Software. This annually renewed
contract provides technical support for the TutorTrac software, which is used to log services for
LRC and KI clients and also to record LRC tutoring appointments. KI has an annual contract
with Reading for the Blind and Dyslexic (RFB&D) to provide textbooks on tape for students
who require this accommodation.

The **EMC** has no external contracts.

**Self Evaluation**
The Library’s cooperation with UHWO, UHLC, and HLC is effective and no changes are
needed or planned at this time.

The LRC has found the Red Rock Software to be useful in tracking and analyzing usage of
services; the technical support has been responsive and helpful. RFB&D provides a needed
service, but it has its limitations. Considerable lead time is needed to obtain the taped
textbooks, so students are told to request this service in advance, but some do not; those who
make late requests may not receive their taped text materials for several weeks of the semester
(or more). Alternative means of converting texts to audio format in-house are being piloted
this semester by using a scanner and software that digitize the text. This new option may enable
KI to achieve several objectives: (1) provide audio texts to students in a more timely manner
than by using RFB&D; (2) use the same converted text for more than one student, thus
maximizing resources; (3) reduce costs for RFB&D by enabling KI to subscribe to the service
at a lower level (fewer books/year).

**Planning Agenda**
- No changes are needed by the Library to address this standard.
- The KI program will
  1. Evaluate the new scanning/digitizing process to determine how
effective it is and how extensively it can be used;
  2. Establish procedures for requesting and providing this new service;
  3. Consider whether, in the light of the new service, the RFB&D
     subscription can be reduced for 2006-07.
Standard III: Resources

The institution effectively uses its human, physical, technology, and financial resources to achieve its broad educational purposes, including stated student learning outcomes, and to improve institutional effectiveness.

III.A. Human Resources

III.A.1.a. Criteria, qualifications, and procedures for selection of personnel are clearly and publicly stated. Job descriptions are directly related to institutional mission and goals and accurately reflect position duties, responsibilities, and authority. Criteria for selection of faculty include knowledge of the subject matter or service to be performed (as determined by individuals with discipline expertise), effective teaching, scholarly activities, and potential to contribute to the mission of the institution. Institutional faculty play a significant role in selection of new faculty. Degrees held by faculty and administrators are from institutions accredited by recognized U.S. accrediting agencies. Degrees from non-U.S. institutions are recognized only if equivalence has been established.

Descriptive Summary

Leeward Community College assures the integrity and quality of its programs and services by employing people who, by education, training, and experience, are qualified to provide or support the programs and services. The College is in full compliance with the University of Hawai‘i System policies and procedures that govern position classification, appointment, and compensation. The directives ensure that created positions meet the institutional mission and priorities, are comparable with other accredited institutions of higher learning, and provide consistent system-wide position classification. For each position, essential knowledge, skills, abilities, experiences, level of education, and contributing activities are articulated through the following:

- Executive/Managerial (E/M) Positions: UH Board of Regents Policy (BORP), Section 9-14, Executive/Managerial (E/M) Personnel Policies, provides Board of Regent (BOR) authority for establishing administrative positions. Although the University President is delegated the authority to establish new E/M positions, the System Office of Human Resources acts as the President’s executive agency in E/M classification, ensuring position duties and responsibilities are in accordance with organization and functional statements.

  The College can pursue changes in the duties or responsibility of an E/M position to reflect changes in campus need or program direction. These variances in position series, class, or description may be submitted to the System Office of Human Resources by the College for appropriate classification and reorganization.

- Faculty Positions: The May 1, 2001 UHCC memorandum entitled "Revised Faculty Minimum Qualifications and Salary Placement Guidelines,” lists the minimum qualifications for Community College faculty positions agreed upon by the Deans of Instruction and Chancellors of the University’s Community
College (UHCC) System. The document established a consistent standard for each Discipline and type of faculty position (credit/non-credit, instructional/non-instructional) in the Community Colleges. The minimum level of education (including degree and field of study), experience, and special consideration (e.g., licensing, rating, or certificate) are listed in the guidelines.

Recruiting statements that articulate position titles, working titles (if any), conditions of employment, duties and responsibilities, and minimum and desirable qualifications are often used in lieu of position descriptions. Division/Unit Chairs, responsible Deans, and the College’s Human Resources Office (HRO) collaborate to ensure that the recruiting narratives will solicit appropriate applicants.

- Administrative, Professional, and Technical (APT) Positions: UH AP 9.210, Classification and Compensation Plan for Administrative, Professional, and Technical (APT) Personnel, sets forth APT classification, position description, and compensation based on the establishment of four bands or levels of work complexity: A (entry/intermediate/independent), B (journeywork/working supervisor), C (system-wide senior expert/technical advisor/subject matter expert), and D (manager/administrator of a highly complex subject area or a program of considerable breath and depth). Within each band, OHR establishes a career group designation (e.g., academic support, instructional and student support, institutional support), position classifications within each career group, and possible duties and responsibilities for each.

College supervisors may initiate an on-line APT position description, articulating the duties and responsibilities, authority, job-related selection criteria (minimum and desirable qualifications), and credentials needed for the position. The description must be reviewed and accepted by the appropriate Dean and the College’s HRO and receive approval by the Chancellor. All electronic APT position descriptions are subject to OHR audit for appropriateness in assignment of band and career designation.

- Civil Service Employees. Position descriptions for Civil Service employees of the University are generally addressed in UH AP A9.300, Position Description for Civil Service Personnel. While the College may recommend changes to reflect unique situations or campus requirements, the responsibility for Civil Service employees rests with the OHR and the State’s Department of Human Resources Development.

The need for positions must be validated and integrated in the College’s mission, Strategic Plan, and organizational structure. The responsible supervisor (Division/Unit Chair, key Staff Officer, or Dean) identifies the organizational need addressed by filling the position and coordinates with the College’s HRO to ensure appropriate classification, position identification, and basis within the organizational structure.

Once validated, positions must be prioritized to maximize use of limited resources (e.g., full-time equivalencies, funds) from the Division/Unit through administrative levels. Where possible, consensus among Deans, Directors, and Vice Chancellors serves as the basis for prioritization. As the hiring authority, the Chancellor approves or modifies priorities.
The College adheres to the guidance set forth in UH AP A9.540, Recruitment and Selection of Faculty and Administrative, Professional and Technical (APT) Personnel, in determining the applicant best qualified to provide or support the programs and services of the College. The recruiting narrative articulates the hiring criteria and terms of employment for the position. The narrative, based on the position description, clearly states the primary duties and responsibilities of the position, the minimum and desirable qualifications (e.g., education, training, and experience), and needed knowledge, skills, abilities, and personal characteristics.

The College's HRO, which is responsible for Equal Employment Opportunity and Affirmative Action (EEO/AA), ensures that recruiting narratives comply with appropriate position classification/descriptions, contain no discriminatory or prohibited language, and promote diversity. The narratives are published on-line at http://workatuh.hawaii.edu, in the Honolulu Star Bulletin, and for E/M positions, in the Chronicle of Higher Education.

Interview committees are designated by Division/Unit Chair and approved by the College's HRO. Whenever possible, the committees are balanced ethnically and by gender, representative of the stakeholders (those impacted by the position to be filled), and contain at least one member with subject matter expertise. For faculty positions, the committee is usually composed of faculty from the Discipline.

Several methods are used to assess an applicant’s qualification, expertise, and suitability for the position under consideration.

- **Application Assessment.** To help gauge and substantiate an applicant’s qualifications and potential, resumes (employment, training, and research history), official transcripts from accredited institutions of higher learning, training certifications, and personal statements are required of applicants for administrative, faculty, and staff positions. The employment qualifications of Civil Service applicants are verified by the State’s Civil Service System and matched to the posted position.

- **Interview.** Interview questions must be job-related and designed to solicit information that will enable further assessment of the applicant’s background and potential to perform the required duties and responsibilities of the position. An applicant may be asked to demonstrate effective teaching skills or knowledge by responding to hypothetical questions or hands-on exercises. Applicants are asked to provide examples of scholarly endeavors and indicators of potential to contribute to the College’s mission. Letters of recommendation and references are reviewed as indicators of applicant’s character, experience, and qualifications.

- **Dean’s Review.** The recommended list of applicants, ordered by preference, is reviewed by the appropriate administrator. The Dean/Director may conduct a personal interview with the finalist(s) to verify qualifications for compensation. Checks with current and former employers may be conducted to confirm periods of employment, official titles, duties and responsibilities, work habits and attitudes, and reasons for termination.

The College’s HRO is responsible for ensuring that hiring procedures are consistently applied, that selection processes are based on objective and job-related consideration, and that EEO/AA
requirements are in place. Procedural safeguards include approval of the following: screening and handling of applications, composition (gender, racial, and representation) of interview committee, interview questions and exercises, analysis of selection/non-selections, and timely investigation of complaints of hiring improprieties or irregularities.

**Self Evaluation**
The College meets this standard by following UH System policies and procedures that govern classification, appointment, and compensation of faculty, staff, and administrators.

**Planning Agenda**
- No changes are needed to address this standard.

---

**III.A.1.b.** The institution assures the effectiveness of its human resources by evaluating all personnel systematically and at stated intervals. The institution establishes written criteria for evaluating all personnel, including performance of assigned duties and participation in institutional responsibilities and other activities appropriate to their expertise. Evaluation processes seek to assess effectiveness of personnel and encourage improvement. Actions taken following evaluations are formal, timely, and documented.

Every College employee is evaluated systematically and periodically to assess effectiveness and areas of possible improvement.

- **E/M Personnel:** In accordance with BORP Section 9-14, Part IV (*Conditions of Service*), the University President establishes the criteria and procedures for evaluating E/Ms. All E/Ms undergo an annual evaluation by their supervisors during the March-June timeframe for performance and accomplishments.

  In addition, the OHR requires of all E/M personnel a “360 Assessment.” In this anonymous survey, an E/M’s peers, subordinates, and constituents (other individuals with whom the E/M works or supports) selected by OHR rate an E/M on leadership, relationships, planning, decision-making, problem solving, and organizational abilities, as well as EEO/AA and safety. The assessment is consolidated and forwarded by OHR to the E/M for review and self-validation.

- **Faculty Members:** The collective bargaining agreement governing faculty members outlines the process, steps, and timelines for the evaluation of faculty for probation, contract renewal, tenure, or promotion. In general, faculty members submit information regarding the nature and extent of their contribution in each duty of their range. The subsequent formal evaluation by the appropriate Division Chair, Division Personnel Committee, or Tenure and Promotion Review Committee, depending on the assessment action being considered, is to assess the faculty member’s strengths, weaknesses, overall performance, and candidacy for favorable professional advancement.
Tenured faculty members who do not apply for promotion are evaluated once every five years through a post-tenure review process. This periodic evaluation monitors each tenured faculty member's efforts toward meeting the criteria of performance for his or her position and rank and provides an opportunity for peer input concerning professional development activities for continued improvement of performance. Source documents for post-tenure review are Board of Regents Policies, Section 9-15 (Evaluation of Board of Regents Appointees), October 16, 1981, and Executive Policy 9.203 (Evaluation of Board of Regents Appointees), October 1981. The implementing document for Community Colleges is Chancellor for Community Colleges Memorandum (CCCM 7200) Faculty Evaluation Procedure), March 19, 1982. The procedure has been adapted (e.g., replacing “Provost” with “Chancellor” etc) but essentially, a faculty member will be evaluated every five years, unless during such 5-year period, s/he has been evaluated for reappointment (or similar review); evaluated for tenure; evaluated for promotion; or received a merit pay increase.

Students may periodically provide individual faculty members with course evaluations regarding instructional style, achievement of stated course objectives, and other considerations. Done anonymously, the surveys are summarized by the College and the provided to the faculty member as classroom feedback.

- **APTs:** Performance expectations based on the APT’s position description and projected activities are established between the APTs and their supervisors in November of each year. The yearly performance standards are then entered on the University’s online APT system and referred to and modified as needed to gauge performance throughout the year. At the end of the rating period (October of the following year), online assessment of competency, quality, and productivity is made by the APT’s supervisor.

- **Civil Service Employees:** Evaluation of civil service employees is similar to that of the APT, under the Civil Service Performance Appraisal System. At the beginning of the performance appraisal period, supervisors meet with employees to discuss job duties, expectations/requirements, and methods of evaluation. The employee is monitored, coaching is provided if improvement is needed, and achievements are noted. At the end of the annual evaluation period, employees are rated in terms of quality, quantity, and timeliness of work; reliability and initiative; relationship with others; and safe use of equipment.

**Self Evaluation**

Organizational processes are in place to ensure appropriate evaluation of administrators, faculty, and staff.

**Planning Agenda**

- No changes are needed to address this standard.
III.A.2. The institution maintains a sufficient number of qualified faculty with full-time responsibility to the institution. The institution has a sufficient number of staff and administrators with appropriate preparation and experience to provide the administrative services necessary to support the institution’s mission and purposes.

Descriptive Summary
Staffing levels at the College are initially determined by a complex process that depends on a review by the following external bodies: the Executive and Legislative branches of the State of Hawai’i, the University of Hawai’i System, and the Community College System. Upon approval of an appropriate staffing level, State General Funds are allocated on a basis of full-time equivalences (FTEs) and divided among the following employee categories: administrative, faculty, staff and civil service, along with the method of funding. Position numbers and descriptions are assigned to ensure compliance with system-wide qualification guidelines.

To keep pace with changing demands and requirements, the College periodically evaluates and updates each position description to ensure currency and to monitor its human resources. Temporary positions may be established to meet unexpected and immediate manpower demands or to staff new academic programs or institutional initiatives in response to student and community needs.

The College has had a history of administrative instability due to high personnel turnover and has made several attempts to address this situation since its accreditation self study in 2000. The most recent attempt resulted in a proposal to increase the number of administrators, elevate a number of Assistant Dean positions to Deans, and more clearly define roles of responsibility, supervision, and communication. A number of these positions have been temporarily filled, pending final approval of the proposal by the Board of Regents.

In the Program and Annual Review processes, personnel needs are reflected in Division and Support Area templates.

Self Evaluation
To attain an appropriate staffing level, the College is required to follow a complex and time-consuming process mandated by State Government that requires approval at many levels. Although the College is allowed to establish temporary positions to meet unexpected and immediate manpower demands, it is currently implementing a data-driven model, the Annual Review process, in an attempt to improve its current practices and performance. The College has also submitted a proposal to reorganize its administrative levels, increasing the number of executive/managerial positions to a level that is needed to support its purposes.

Planning Agenda
• The College will assess the Program and Annual Review processes to ensure that they appropriately address staffing needs.
III.A.5. The institution provides all personnel with appropriate opportunities for continued professional development, consistent with the institutional mission and based on identified teaching and learning needs.

III.A.5.a. The institution plans professional development activities to meet the needs of its personnel.

**Descriptive Summary**
The College has a full-time Staff Development coordinator who runs activities through Leeward’s Innovation Center for Teaching and Learning (ICTL). The ICTL provides in-service training and professional development activities for the College, in addition to coordinating activities organized and initiated by specific campus constituencies. Planning is based on campus-wide input that includes the following:

- The ICTL advisory committee composed of 12 members who represent all segments of the college
- A campus-wide needs assessment conducted every 3 years
- Input from individuals, programs, offices, and personnel groups (Clerical Staff Council, the APT, Operations and Maintenance, and Lecturer groups).

**Self Evaluation**
The College relies on an inclusive process to ensure that appropriate opportunities, consistent with its mission and purposes, are provided for professional development.

**Planning Agenda**
- No changes are needed to address this standard.

III.A.5.b. With the assistance of the participants, the institution systematically evaluates professional development programs and uses the results of these evaluations as the basis for improvement.

**Descriptive Summary**
The College provides professional development opportunities through two avenues:

- The Innovation Center for Teaching and Learning: The Coordinator of the Center is responsible for providing in-service training and professional development opportunities to faculty and staff. The activities are intended to enhance the awareness or capabilities of those who attend, thus enhancing their effectiveness to address their respective goals and objectives as part of the overall organizational mission. In the recent academic year, the Coordinator’s activities included the semester’s opening Convocation activities, a Leadership Retreat, supervisory training, and a variety of presentations and workshops for faculty and staff.

- Subject Matter Experts: Campus subject matter experts, either separately or in conjunction with the Innovation Center’s Coordinator, provide professional development events to promote competence, awareness, or compliance in their
respective areas of responsibility. Examples include the College’s EEO/AA Coordinator arranging workshops on how to prevent discriminatory practices, sexual harassment, and workplace violence; the Auxiliary Services Officer holding training in occupational safety or the handling of hazardous materials; or a faculty consortium promoting the use of “teaching squares” as an interdisciplinary approach to improving instructional skills and abilities.

Professional development programs are evaluated in the following ways:

- An analysis of session attendance and categories of attendees
- Written evaluations on a 1-5 rating scale and open-ended questions regarding specific aspects of the workshop
- Written or verbal comments

Self Evaluation
The Innovation Center for Teaching and Learning and subject matter experts support professional development needs of the College’s personnel. However, the impact on the improvement of teaching and learning needs to be assessed.

Planning Agenda
- The Innovation Center for Teaching and Learning will develop an assessment instrument to provide evidence that the professional development activities that improve participants’ ability to produce and assess student learning outcomes.

III.A.6. Human resource planning is integrated with institutional planning. The institution systematically assesses the effective use of human resources and uses the results of the evaluation as the basis for improvement.

Descriptive Summary
Leeward CC has recently modified its organizational, communication, and decision-making structures in response to the reorganization of the University of Hawai‘i System and to address a revised mission that places an emphasis on student learning outcomes.

In 2004 the College submitted a proposal to reorganize its administrative structure, placing all Instructional Divisions, Academic Support, Student Services, and non-credit programs under the position of Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs (VCAA). This move was intended to address the College’s history of administrative instability as well as to promote the integration of institutional planning among all Divisions and Units that contribute to student learning. A major part of this proposal included the creation of the Office of Planning, Policy, and Assessment directly under the Chancellor to coordinate and sustain a comprehensive and objective program of planning and assessment.

The implementation of the Policy on Program Reviews in 2004 allowed the College to obtain measures of its effectiveness in all of courses, programs, and support areas and to use this information to point out areas in need of improvement. As the College carried through its assessments, the Program Review process was continuously modified. It now provides the mechanism by which course, program, and Support Area assessment data become the basis
for planning and budgeting decisions that are formalized by the *Annual Review* process. This process relies on the analysis of appropriate student achievement data and assessments of student learning outcomes, and integrates assessment, planning, and budgeting that is inclusive of the entire campus community. *Annual Review* requires responses to questions aligned with current accreditation standards from all Units of the College. Responses to these questions became the basis for each Unit’s determination of its strengths, weaknesses, opportunities, and threats (SWOT) in the areas of student achievement, human resources, physical resources, and external issues.

The completion of the first phase of *Annual Review* in Spring 2006 resulted in a prioritized planning list for the College and served as the basis for Leeward CC’s biennial budget proposal.

The College’s initial attempt at implementing the *Annual Review* will be evaluated and refined in the Fall of 2006 by a planned second phase as described in Standard I.B.3. This second phase focuses on the continued assessment and refinement of planning and budgeting activities. To involve more of a cross section of the campus, the second phase calls for the creation of Phase II committees, including a committee devoted to analyzing the effectiveness of the College’s staffing practices and needs. This committee will consider the planning lists resulting from *Program Reviews* and will recommend priorities, based on their area of expertise.

**Self Evaluation**

Human resources are a critical part of the College’s planning, as future programs and services require adequate staffing in the form of FTEs, position numbers, and classifications. Although the administrative reorganization proposal was initially prompted by the need to address the College’s history of administrative turnover, it was also intended to improve the coordination and integration of efforts of all segments of the College that were directly involved with student learning. A part of the proposal requesting an additional executive/managerial position, as well as changes in titles for existing administrative levels, caused a controversy at the College that was eventually resolved by the efforts of a Reorganization Committee made up of members from all major constituencies on campus during the Fall of 2004. This committee worked with the administrators toward a solution and the campus was given ample opportunity to provide input based on two hearings and two votes, first by Campus Council and second, by Faculty Senate. The modified proposal by these campus governance organizations is scheduled to be submitted to the Board of Regents in Fall 2006.

The College has taken a significant step away from past practices and toward a culture of evidence by implementing its *Program* and *Annual Review* processes.

These data-based mechanisms provide a comprehensive evaluation of the College effort and are intended to ensure that human resource needs are integrated with institutional needs and plans for improvement.

**Planning Agenda**

- The College will assess the effectiveness of the *Program* and *Annual Review* processes in identifying staffing needs.
III.B. Physical Resources

III.B.1. The institution provides safe and sufficient physical resources that support and assure the integrity and quality of its programs and services, regardless of location or means of delivery.

Descriptive Summary

Leeward’s Office of Administrative Services is charged with the responsibility of managing, maintaining, and improving the College’s physical facilities to support student learning and to assure the integrity and quality of its programs and services. This Office, headed by the Director of Administrative Services, is composed of three Units: the Business Office, the Human Resources Office, and Operations and Maintenance.

The Operations and Maintenance Unit, headed by an Auxiliary Services Officer, ensures that the physical facilities on campus are safe and properly maintained on a daily basis. Operations and Maintenance is composed of three subunits: Maintenance and Ground Services, Custodial Services, and Security. Staffing includes 5 maintenance workers, 15 custodial staff, 6 security personnel, 1 mailroom worker, and 5 groundskeepers. The College’s staff maintains most of the facilities and equipment, while private contractors provide other specific services.

Maintenance personnel handle minor repairs, clean and replace air conditioning filters, change light fixtures, and paint classrooms. The custodial staff is responsible for cleaning all campus facilities and for providing logistical support services. Security personnel provide 24-hour protective services for the campus. The mailroom worker ensures the timely distribution of incoming and outgoing mail to the campus, and five groundskeepers are responsible for maintenance of campus landscaping, including lawns and plant beds. Repairs that cannot be handled by the in-house technicians are serviced by private companies. These include air conditioning and elevator maintenance, and inspections of fire extinguishers.

State laws require that major projects such as roofing and structural repairs be open to bid by private companies. Funds for major repairs and maintenance are provided by a special appropriation from the Community College’s Facilities and Planning Office that prioritizes and coordinates the repair and maintenance projects for seven campuses in the university System. Recent projects at Leeward include the replacement of railings, re-roofing of campus buildings, and renovations to the Student Center, cafeteria and Food Service operations. The special repair and maintenance allocations have not been sufficient to fund all of the projects submitted annually by Leeward. A “Repair and Maintenance” folder that documents both funded and un-funded projects is kept by the Director of Administrative Services, who periodically updates the campus on the status of repair and maintenance projects as funds become available.

The College also operates a satellite campus in Wai’anae (LCCW), which serves the Leeward Coast service area. Since 1991, the facility has been housed in a commercial building and is maintained by the landlord under the terms of the lease. It currently consists of six classrooms, a reception area, a learning lab, six staff offices and a storage area. The Wai’anae staff handles general maintenance and upkeep of the facility on a daily basis, and once a week, two maintenance workers from the Pearl City campus assist with these efforts.
Currently, LCCW does not have its own specific operating budget, relying on Divisions to cover costs of courses offered in Wai‘aina. The current Biennium Budget proposal includes a substantial request to increase capacity and support for LCCW operations.

In Spring 2005, the College opened another satellite campus in Haleiwa, on O’ahu’s North Shore. The facility was housed in one building with four classrooms on the campus of Haleiwa Elementary School. The facility is maintained by Haleiwa Elementary School and includes air conditioned classrooms, and a computer lab furnished by the Leeward’s Office of Continuing Education and Workforce Development (OCEWD). Operation of this satellite campus was discontinued in Fall 2005, as the projected demand for College’s services was not realized.

**Self Evaluation**

Budget constraints, coupled with the limitations of its aging physical facilities and equipment, have constantly challenged the College to provide a safe and secure environment, as well as to maintain the integrity and quality of its programs and services. These constraints were among many factors considered in the design of the College’s Program Review, as the institution set out to measure the effectiveness of its student learning programs and support services in the Spring of 2004. The initial assessment of instructional programs, individual courses, and support areas resulted in an extensive dialogue that prompted ongoing evaluation and modification of the process. The goal was to develop a more comprehensive mechanism that integrated assessment, planning, and budgeting, and that was also transparent and inclusive of the campus community. This effort led to the development of the assessment-based Annual Review process. Implemented in Spring 2006, the process required responses to questions in an Annual Review template from all Units within the four major operational areas of the College: Instruction, Student Services, Academic Support, and Institutional Support. Personnel within Instructional Divisions and Support Areas discussed a series of questions associated with accreditation and assessment and determined their strengths, weaknesses, opportunities, and threats (SWOT) in the areas of student achievement, faculty and staff, physical resources (including equipment), and external issues. Each area was also required to present a prioritized list of actions for discussions involving all four operational areas that would result in list of planning and budgeting priorities for the entire College. The first cycle of the Annual Review, completed in April 2006, yielded a College Plan that will be submitted to the University System for funding. Ongoing commitment to and continued evaluation and refinement of these new planning and budgeting processes will be needed to sustain the campus’ effort toward continuous improvement.

**Planning Agenda**

- No changes are needed to address this standard.
III.B.1.a. The institution plans, builds, maintains, and upgrades or replaces its physical resources in a manner that assures effective utilization and the continuing quality necessary to support its programs and services.

**Descriptive Summary**

**Physical Resources**

At Leeward Community College, physical resource planning is integrated with institutional planning and is guided by two documents, the *Strategic Plan 2002-2010* and the *Long Range Development Plan (LRDP)* formulated in 1995 by private consultants and adopted in 1996. These plans are aligned with two other documents within the University of Hawai‘i System: the *University of Hawai‘i System Strategic Plan* and the *University of Hawai‘i Community Colleges Strategic Plan*. These documents provide long-range goals and directions for the University of Hawai‘i, UH Community Colleges, and Leeward CC to ensure that all of the campuses operate as a coordinated system in meeting program and service needs.

Leeward’s physical configuration has not changed significantly since the last self-study report in 2000. The College has attempted to accommodate the increase in enrollment and the expansion of programs through major renovations of existing structures funded by a combination of Federal and State general funds. However, classroom, meeting, and conference facilities continue to be short supply, and the lack of sufficient office space continues to be reported by nearly all Divisions. Space is also limited in the LRC, Library, and EMC, especially during peak hours. The College has been working with the Facilities Planning Office since 2000 to justify the expansion of its facilities.

In April 2006, the College was allotted $1.3 million for the planning and design of a Teacher Education Building, its first new facility since the 1970s.

**Equipment**

Funds for the acquisition of equipment are derived primarily from the College’s annual operating budget, and to a lesser extent, from Federal and private agency grants. The College’s operating budget is determined by the “current services base,” a figure representing what it costs the College to provide its basic services needs (payroll, supplies, equipment, facilities maintenance) for one year. In 2001, all colleges within the university system were granted increased autonomy by the State Legislature through the passage of Act 115. (See Session Laws of Hawai‘i 1998, as codified in chapter 304, Hawai‘i Revised Statutes.) Since then, each College has been allowed to keep funds generated from student fees and tuition, but it is also expected to pay for part of the costs of operations with this income. Although the College has greater flexibility in utilizing its allocated funds, the result has been a budget that is significantly dependent on student enrollment and external fundraising.

The College has relied on the following practice to determine the amount of funds that can be used for the acquisition of equipment. In planning each fiscal year, the Director of Administrative Services projects the operating costs for the entire College. The projection is based on staffing plans, the previous year’s allocation and expenditures, projected executive and system requirements, collective bargaining costs, projected tuition revenues, and any carry-over funds. This projection is analyzed and evaluated by the entire Administrative staff. The final amount that is to be allocated for equipment acquisition is discussed with Campus Council.
The responsibility for the acquisition and maintenance of equipment to support programs and services is divided among the five operating College Units: Instruction, Administrative Services, Academic Support, Student Services, and Office of Continuing Education and Workforce Development (OCEWD). Equipment requests that go beyond the program/service's internal budget are initiated by each unit through the Division Chairs and Deans. These requests are then prioritized through joint discussions among Division Chairs and members of the administrative staff.

Policies and procedures of the University and the procurement laws of the State of Hawai‘i govern equipment purchases. Acquisitions are made from a State bid list unless the item is not included on the list or the governing bodies approve an alternative purchase. Certain bid-list items, such as computers, are designated as “optional” and allow for the acquisition of alternate items if they are deemed beneficial to the College. Existing State procurement guidelines assure that equipment is acquired competitively and in accordance with the applicable rules and regulations.

The procedure by which equipment is maintained varies according to the type of equipment and/or operating unit.

1. Mainframe computers are supported by the Campus Computing Center and are maintained via maintenance contracts.

2. Technicians and student helpers are assigned the task of on-campus maintenance of all electronics equipment and desktop computers, including those used to support the College’s Distance Education Programs.

3. Repairs that cannot be handled by the in-house technicians are serviced by private companies.

4. Services that include the acquisition and maintenance of hardware and software used to produce and deliver courses by the College’s Distance Education component are provided in part by personnel from the University of Hawai‘i at Mānoa.

Equipment – Technology

Leeward Community College has designated a specific amount of its annual budget and the coordinated efforts of several Support Units to address its growing technology needs, including equipment needs pertaining to its Distance Education component. In 1999, the College designated a $100,000 line item for campus technology infrastructure and software and in 2001, an additional $100,000 was added to this fund, which is now known as the Technology Fund (Tech Fund). The fund is used for technology that affects the entire campus, such as the networking infrastructure, Operating System and Office software, and server infrastructure. The Tech Fund has never been fully funded at $200,000 due to budgetary constraints.
Leeward’s Educational Media Center (EMC) and the Information Technology Group (ITG) are the major Units that are designated to provide support, including the acquisition of computer hardware, software, and other electronic components that are required in the development and delivery of alternate delivery modes of teaching and learning. The history of the Technology Fund and respective roles of the EMC and ITG are described in detail under Standard III.C.1.b., III.C.1.c., and III.C.1.d. of this theme.

The safe and proper use of all equipment is a primary consideration of the College. All Units operate within Occupational Safety and Health Administration (OSHA) guidelines to provide a safe working environment. In science and vocational-tech labs, instructors and staff members supervise students to assure safe and proper handling of specialized and potentially dangerous equipment. All personnel who are involved with biological or chemical materials are required to attend annual workshops on the proper handling, storage, and disposal of hazardous materials.

Designated personnel within each of the Divisions or services conduct annual equipment inventories that are coordinated by the Auxiliary Services Officer. The inventories identify items that have been relocated, lost, stolen, or need to be disposed. The College Security Office is notified when any equipment is lost or stolen.

Self Evaluation
The above processes and practices, especially with the way equipment is acquired, maintained, and updated, have been the sources of long-standing controversy at the College. The College’s attempts to address this issue are described in more detail in Standard III.C.1.c. The development and implementation of the Annual Review process as described in the section above represents a systematic, data-based approach that is intended to ensure the effective use and continuing quality to support programs and services. The second phase of Annual Review is intended to refine and broaden the scope of the assessment-based process by allowing additional input from Phase II committees that will focus on addressing facility and equipment needs.

Planning Agenda
• The College will assess the effectiveness of the Program and Annual Review processes in providing sufficient physical resources to support student learning programs and services.
III.B.1.b. The institution assures that physical resources at all locations where it offers courses, programs, and services are constructed and maintained to assure access, safety, security, and a healthful learning and working environment.

**Descriptive Summary**

The College has demonstrated through its policies and procedures that a safe and secure environment is critical for students, faculty, and staff. Campus Security, under the Operations and Maintenance Unit, is responsible for keeping the campus safe and secure. Six security personnel patrol the campus and keep students, faculty, and staff safe. The Security Office has requested the hiring of additional personnel to provide added evening coverage for students and faculty, greater visibility on campus, quicker lockup of facilities, and adequate coverage in the case of illness or vacation. Although night students are still concerned about safety due to limited visibility, the College recently improved lighting between buildings and in the parking lots. A proposal has been submitted for a campus-wide security alarm system as a means of increasing the security of its facilities against theft.

Except for the first few weeks of instruction each semester, the College’s no-cost parking facilities continue to sufficiently accommodate all vehicles. During the first few weeks of each semester, overflow parking areas are designated if the available parking space is insufficient to meet demand. Handicapped stalls have been designated in all parking areas to minimize walking distances. At least one security officer is on duty at all times to patrol the entire campus. Faculty are encouraged to announce to students, especially in night classes, that security personnel can be called upon to escort students to their cars.

The College has made modifications to buildings and grounds to conform to State and Federal requirements for handicapped access and security. The College’s Coordinator for Student Affairs has been designated as the disabilities specialist for the campus and is responsible for monitoring Federal requirements regarding access to ensure that the College is in compliance with the Rehabilitation Act of 1973, Section 504, on accessibility for persons with disabilities.

Leeward CC has a Health Center, staffed by a nurse practitioner, located on the first floor of the Administration building. Services are provided to students, faculty and staff during normal working hours.

The College has an *Exposure Control Plan*, which is related to all health issues. Security personnel have in place procedures for health emergencies. All faculty, staff, and students must have a tuberculosis clearance prior to employment or enrollment at the University of Hawai‘i.

The College complies with the State environmental laws that prohibit smoking in any State building and with environmental standards relating to the disposal of hazardous waste materials. In science and vocational-tech laboratories, students and faculty follow specific guidelines regarding the disposal of hazardous materials. The Community College System has an Environmental, Health and Safety Officer who conducts annual workshops on hazardous waste materials for faculty and staff. Environmental guidelines are provided to those engaging in potentially hazardous work. Maintenance, custodial, and grounds staff are provided with ear and eye protectors and support belts for lifting heavy objects.

Disaster planning is covered in the *Emergency Procedures Manual*, and is available in the Director of Administrative Services office. A condensed copy, “Emergency Procedures for
Leeward Community College,” was distributed to all faculty and staff in February 2005 and is posted in most Division offices on campus. It covers appropriate procedures for evacuation in the event of bomb threats, fire, hazardous materials accidents, severe windstorms, earthquakes, explosions or threat of explosion, war, or fallen aircraft. These guidelines include instructions to the person notified of an emergency situation, procedures for evacuating buildings and campus, suggestions for action on locating suspicious objects, and procedures for reoccupying buildings. The instructions specify which personnel to call on campus (Security and Director of Administrative Services) and off campus (Police or Civil Defense). A private contractor inspects fire extinguishers annually and the College maintenance staff tests fire alarms periodically.

Evacuation of the campus is still problematic because there is only one access road. During peak hours of instruction, when classes are in session, it would be very difficult to evacuate the campus in a short period of time. Emergency vehicles also have to share the same access road. The College continues to discuss the need for a second access road with area legislators and the State Department of Transportation.

Self Evaluation
Leeward Community College, through its policies and procedures, assures that physical resources are constructed and maintained to assure safety and security in a healthful learning and working environment. The implementation and ongoing refinement of the Annual Review process is a positive step in addressing current concerns about meeting standards of good practice. Discussions with the State Department of Transportation continue, regarding the need for a second access road.

Planning Agenda
• The College’s Administration will address the need for an additional access road to campus.

III.B.2.a. Long-range capital plans support institutional improvement goals and reflect projections of the total cost of ownership of new facilities and equipment.

Descriptive Summary
Leeward Community College’s Long Range Development Plan (LRDP) is the major document that establishes functional relationships, space requirements, and space allocations in relation to the College’s long-term goals and planned activities. When it was approved in 1996, the College lacked Capital Improvement Project (CIP) Funds with which to construct and/or renovate its facilities. However, the LRDP has provisions by which the College may submit requests for funding of capital improvement projects (CIP) based on health and safety needs, compliance to governmental regulations, and long-range expansion.

As Leeward CC’s physical configuration has not changed significantly since the last self-study report in 2000, the College has been challenged to accommodate a steady increase in enrollment and the expansion of programs. The College has responded in the following ways to meet the increased demands: increasing the efficiency of existing structures through renovations; computerized room scheduling of activities; and the acquisition of equipment via federal grants to upgrade or replace aging equipment. Despite these efforts, classroom,
meeting, and conference facilities continue to be short supply, and the lack of sufficient office space continues to be reported by nearly all Divisions. Space is also limited in the LRC, Library, and EMC, especially during peak hours. Rapid advances in technology and the lack of general funds to maintain a sustainable equipment replacement schedule over the past decade has minimized the impact of federal funds in addressing the College’s equipment needs.

The College has been working with the Facilities Planning Office since 2000 to justify the expansion of its facilities, as well as to address a backlog of renovations and repairs. Since 2004, Leeward has received approximately $10 million in appropriations for the repair and renovation of its aging facilities on the basis of health and safety reasons. In summer 2006 the College received an appropriation of $1.3 million for design of its newest physical facility that was part of the original LRDP in 1996.

In response to the lack of funds required to implement the LRDP up until this year, a prolonged period of budget constraints, including severe restrictions on funds targeted for equipment funds, were major factors that led the College to revisit its Strategic Plan (SP), as described in response to Standard I.A.4. of this theme. These revisits provided the College with the only other formalized process to address its immediate needs, including facilities and equipment needs. The revisit of the SP provided an important pathway for all members of the campus community to propose action plans to support their efforts. The revisiting process was constantly evaluated, revised, and refined. In Spring 2005, the annual revisit stipulated that all action items be based on the assessment of student learning outcomes, as a means of linking the College’s Program Review process with the planning and budgeting process and included a category for CIP requests. All faculty, staff, and administrators were again invited to present their respective action items at an open forum prior to prioritization by campus vote. The prioritized list of actions, in addition to the direct input of Division/Unit Heads, was submitted to the Administrative Team and served as a basis for the College’s budget requests.

Ongoing evaluation of this process prompted the campus to assess and refine its planning and budgeting cycles to clarify the role of assessment and analysis in its Program Review model, resulting in the Annual Review process. This process served as the basis for planning and budgeting decisions in the creation of the College’s 2007-2009 biennial budget proposal. A planned second phase of the Annual Review process will involve input from a number of Phase II committees that focus on specific areas of expertise, including facilities and equipment needs and usage.

**Self Evaluation**

The current budget planning process has significantly changed since the last self-study. Its development and implementation depended on ongoing dialogue, beginning with a small group of individuals and gradually evolving to include the entire campus community. The current Annual Review process invites everyone to submit data-based planning lists and integrates the Program Review and strategic planning processes. It ensures that staff, faculty, and administrators engage in considerable dialogue to determine how the budget may be allocated to best support student learning. The process will continue to undergo revisions as the College attempts to change past practices that have been reactionary rather than data driven.
The next iteration of the *Annual Review* process will have several Phase II committees that will provide additional support and input to this process. One of these committees will focus on the College's use of physical space, another on equipment needs. Although still evolving, input from these committees will provide a more comprehensive planning perspective that incorporates both short- and long-term space, planning, and utilization needs in conjunction with campus-wide program planning and assessment efforts.

**Planning Agenda**

- The College will evaluate the effectiveness of its *Program* and *Annual Review* processes in developing long-range capital plans and make changes for improvement.

---

**Descriptive Summary**

Facilities planning decisions for Leeward Community College are based on the College's *Program Review* and strategic planning processes, which incorporate the assessment of student learning outcomes and institutional effectiveness. The process allows the College to determine its priorities, and based on the priorities list, the College allocates (or reallocates resources to a particular program.)

As part of the University of Hawai‘i System, facilities planning for the Leeward campus occur at many administrative levels.

- The University of Hawai‘i Board of Regents’ Committee on Physical Facilities has the responsibility to review, study, and make recommendations to their membership on matters relating to the physical master plans for each campus in the system. The decisions of the committee are in turn related to the University document, *Focus on Quality: The University of Hawai‘i System Strategic Plan 1997–2007*.

- The University of Hawai‘i Community Colleges *Strategic Plan 1997-2007* includes programmatic, academic, and facilities priorities over a ten-year period. The office of the Vice-President for Community Colleges includes a unit for Physical Facilities, Planning, and Construction and assists individual campuses with capital improvement and major repair and maintenance projects.

The College's *Long Range Development Plan*, completed and approved in 1996, identifies the needs of the various programs and involved the entire campus community. Students, faculty, staff, and administrators worked with a private consulting firm (Group 70) and designed a master plan, which determined how the physical structure of the College could ideally meet instructional goals. This Facilities Master Plan is based on instructional needs, as the *Long Range Development Plan* states that space designated for instructional activities were “based on the guidelines outlined in the Educational Specifications.”
Self Evaluation
Physical resource planning at Leeward CC is integrated with institutional planning. Through its Program and Annual Review processes and the annual revisit of the Leeward CC Strategic Plan, the College systematically assesses the effective use of physical resources and uses the results of the evaluation as the basis for change.

Planning Agenda
• No changes are needed to meet this standard.

III.C. Technology Resources
Technology resources are used to support student learning programs and services and to improve institutional effectiveness. Technology planning is integrated with institutional planning.

III.C.l.a. Technology services, professional support, facilities, hardware, and software are designed to enhance the operation and effectiveness of the institution.

Descriptive Summary
Since 1999, the College has designated a specific portion of its budget to support its growing technology needs. This budget line item, known as the Technology Fund (Tech Fund), is used for technology that affects the entire campus such as networking infrastructure, Operating system and Office software, and server infrastructure and security. Decisions regarding the expenditure of the Tech Fund were primarily based on recommendations from the following Academic Support Units that are designated to provide technology support services for the entire campus: the Educational Media Center (EMC), the Learning Resources Center (LRC), and the Information Technology Group (ITG).

The Educational Media Center is made up of the following sub-units: Distance Education, Educational Technology, Intec Services, Video Production, and the Copy Center. The following is a summary of the functions of those areas that are directly involved in providing technology support.

Distance Education’s primary function is to provide support to faculty, staff, and administrators in planning, developing, and administering Leeward CC’s Distance Education (DE) courses.

Educational Technology provides support to faculty and staff in the effective use of computers, multimedia classrooms, and video. Services include the following:

• assisting faculty and staff with developing instructional materials with an emphasis of Instruction Design concepts
• providing technology training programs, including Technology Mentoring, intended to improve student learning
• overseeing training on the use of all multimedia “smart” classrooms on campus
• providing “on demand” assistance and support for Distance Education courses
• investigating use of new technology in the teaching and learning experience
Intec Services provide training in the use of new technologies through workshops and one-on-one training and assist in the transfer of instructional materials from older to newer technology formats.

Video Production assists students with access to cable and teleweb Distance Education courses and provides faculty and staff with needed support.

The Learning Resources Center provides a range of technology services, primarily for students, in the following areas:

- technology skills workshops for students
- individual computer help with access to computer hardware and software
- supervised test-taking facilities for students enrolled in online classes
- assistive technology for students with disabilities

The Information Technology Group is comprised of the following units: Campus Computing Labs (CCL), Data Extraction, Help Desk, Network Repair, Web Content, and Computer Security.

- ITG supervises two PC and two Macintosh labs equipped with either Windows or Macintosh software systems. The PC labs are available to any registered student daily, throughout the day and evening. The Macintosh labs are available between regularly scheduled classes that require Apple systems.
- The Help Desk provides assistance with any hardware/software or networking problems that are encountered by faculty, staff, or students.
- Data Extraction personnel respond to requests from faculty and staff for student data reports.
- Network and Repair personnel maintain all computer equipment and campus-wide networking services.
- Web Content’s function is to maintain and manage institutional servers.
- Computer Security provides regular updates on security measures and maintenance tips for both Macintosh and PC.

In addition to the organizational structures described above, each of the College’s Academic Divisions and Support Areas is given the responsibility of selecting and acquiring materials and equipment specific to its needs. In general, the staff in each particular Unit, after assessing its needs via observation and discussion, and after receiving feedback and suggestions from faculty and staff, selects equipment and materials to help the Unit fulfill its function. Division Funds, allocated general funds supplemented by summer session earnings, are given to each Academic Division for this purpose. Each Division is given the autonomy to prioritize and use these funds, which may be spent on Division computers that are not paid for by the Technology Fund.
Since late 2005, the College has been engaged in its *Annual Review* process. Each Academic Division responded to the *Annual Review* by completing a Division template based on discussions of a series of questions associated with accreditation and assessment, including the following:

- Personnel
- Equipment and Supplies
- Capital Improvement Projects
- Space Issues
- Repair and Maintenance
- Information Technology
- Training/Travel
- Other

Academic Support Units, including the EMC, LRC, and ITG, have similar templates and developed planning lists. Based on the Academic *Annual Review*, Support Area Review, and other data collected, a *College Plan* was developed. As Information Technology is one component included throughout the entire *Annual Review* process, information technology needs are reflected in the *College Plan*.

**Self Evaluation**

The College has provisions for technology services, professional support, facilities, hardware, and software to enhance its operation and effectiveness. The College’s Technology Fund is the budget line item that supports campus technology needs, including network infrastructure, operating system and software, and server infrastructure and security. The EMC, LRC, and ITG provide support of Distance Education courses through their assistance of faculty, staff, and students involved in these courses. Workshops, mentoring, provision of hardware and software, and assistance are all part of the College’s technology support.

The *Program* and *Annual Review* processes are the College’s attempt to integrate assessment, planning, and budgeting in all areas of decision-making. Academic Divisions respond to the *Annual Review* based on course student learning outcome assessments and analyses of personnel, equipment, etc., as described above, resulting in prioritized planning lists. These lists are submitted to the Dean of Arts and Sciences and are re-prioritized by the Executive Planning Committee.

**Planning Agenda**

- The College will evaluate the effectiveness of the *Program* and *Annual Review* processes in responding to the campus’ information technology needs.
III.C.l.b. The institution provides quality training in the effective application of its information technology to students and personnel.

**Descriptive Summary**

The structures in place to assess the need and to provide support for technology include the following Academic Support Units:

**Library**

The Library supports student use of technology by providing access to information resources via library-subscribed databases; email reference through its own website; CD-ROMs; DVDs; and videotapes on various topics. The Library provides training in the use of technology for access to information sources via a Library Skills Exam (using WebCT), which is mandatory for students who take English 22 and English 100. Training is also provided via library instruction classes in a computer-based environment, with each student provided with a laptop. The Library also provides one-on-one consultations and online tutorials.

**Learning Resource Center (LRC)**

The LRC provides workshops for students including technology skills, learning skills, life skills, and information literacy workshops. Individual computer help is also available to students in the LRC computer lab, and tutoring in selected computer science courses is available on an appointment basis.

**Kāko'o 'Ike (KI)**

KI provides support for students with disabilities through the use of assistive technology such as text-to-speech scanning software, voice recognition software, a screen reading program, and text magnifiers. Individual training is available from program staff.

**Educational Media Center (EMC)**

The EMC provides support for faculty in technology training workshops, small-group training, one-on-one consultations, technology mentoring, WebFun I and II summer institutes, and online tutorials. The EMC also supports students in the use of WebCT through orientation workshops, one-on-one assistance, and online tutorials.

**Information Technology Group (ITG)**

The Leeward CC Helpdesk provides one-on-one support for faculty, staff, and students in technology. The management, maintenance and operation of the technological infrastructure is handled by ITG. ITG is comprised of professional staff with expertise in the areas of Network, Computer Repair, Server system administration, Student Information systems and Microcomputer support and services. The professional staff is supplemented with approximately 10 - 12 student assistants.

**Self Evaluation**

**Library** – The Library assesses the need for information related technology through the use of data gathered from faculty and student satisfaction surveys. Survey results (2005) indicate a satisfaction level of 3.5 or higher on a Likert Scale of 1-5. The Library Review and long term plan may be found at: [http://emedia.leeward.hawaii.edu/clrit/3_year_plan/Library_Plan.pdf](http://emedia.leeward.hawaii.edu/clrit/3_year_plan/Library_Plan.pdf)
The LRC’s CLUE workshop series (CLUE = Computer Literacy: Understanding Essentials) offers training on commonly used computer programs, primarily MS Office programs, to Leeward students, faculty, and staff. Data from eight semesters show that workshops received consistently strong evaluations, with attendees’ responses generally averaging 5.0 or close to it on a 1-5 scale. The greatest challenge with these workshops was low attendance. Over the years, various scheduling strategies were implemented by the LRC Technology Specialist who coordinated the series, including different days, different times of day, repeating introductory workshops at different times of the semester, etc. After the Technology Specialist position was eliminated, technology workshops were incorporated with study and life skills workshops in a new LRC series, Success Connection (SC).

So far, the LRC has not asked students to systematically evaluate assistance they have received in the computer lab. It would be impractical and intrusive to ask student clients to fill out a form every time they ask a quick question while working on an assignment.

Among the subjects tutored in the LRC are technology subjects in the areas of Business, Digital Media, and Information & Computer Science. Tutoring effectiveness in these subjects is incorporated in our overall evaluations of tutoring effectiveness. The LRC Assessment Report and long term plan may be found at: [http://emedia.leeward.hawaii.edu/clrit/3_year_plan/LRC_plan.pdf](http://emedia.leeward.hawaii.edu/clrit/3_year_plan/LRC_plan.pdf)

Kākoʻo ‘Ike (KI) - Student use of this technology is tallied and feedback is also obtained from student surveys.

**Educational Media Center** - Assessment on the effectiveness of technology training is done through a variety of methods, including student, staff, and faculty satisfaction surveys, one-on-one interviews, open-forums, and online feedback. A survey of the EMC mentoring program, Technology Partners, from Spring 2003 to Spring 2004 showed the following results:

- **Spring 2003**: 100% of the Technology Partners agreed that their capability to instruct has increased as a result of the program.
- **Fall 2003**: 93% of the Technology Partners agreed their capability to instruct has increased.
- **Spr 2004**: 75% of the Technology Partners agreed their capability to instruct has increased.

The same survey of the Technology Partners produced the following responses:

- **Spr 2003**: 100% of the Technology Partners agreed student learning has increased because of the program.
- **Fall 2003**: 73% of the Technology Partners agreed student learning has increased.
- **Spr 2004**: 62.5% of the Technology Partners agreed student learning has increased.

EMC’s technology summer institute called WebFun showed the following results:

- **Summer 2003**: 79% of the participants were able to create a WebCT module at the end of WebFun.
- **Summer 2004**: 67% of the participants are using WebCT in their courses one year later.
EMC’s Distance Education survey asked students to evaluate their satisfaction with academic support, student services, and quality of the instructional modalities in which they receive their courses. Overall, 96% of students who responded were satisfied with the quality of their experience and scores averaged between a 4 and 5 on a 5 point scale.

The EMC Assessment Report with self-analysis and planning for the next three years may be found at: http://emedia.leeward.hawaii.edu/clrit/3_year_plan/ITG_Plan.pdf

Information Technology Group (ITG) - Each semester the ITG unit surveys faculty and staff on the services delivered in computer classrooms and from the Help desk. The average response rating from user computer classroom surveys ranged from 3.9 to 4.5 on a scale of 5. Users who requested assistance of the Helpdesk about computer related problems rated service at 4.9.

Planning Agenda:
• The College will evaluate the effectiveness of the Program and Annual Review processes in responding to technology training.

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

Descriptive Summary
The College identified concerns regarding the lack of a systematic plan to address the task of acquiring, maintaining and upgrading its technology infrastructure and equipment to meet its institutional needs during its past self study in 2000.

Prior to 2000, a Leeward Community College Strategic Planning on Information Technology (Leeward SPIT) Committee was created to design a systematic plan for technology. As stated earlier, one result of this committee’s work was a $100,000 line item for campus technology infrastructure and software. In 2001, an additional $100,000 was added to this fund, which is now known as the Technology Fund (Tech Fund). The fund is used for technology that affects the entire campus. It has never been fully funded at $200,000 due to budgetary constraints. The Leeward SPIT dissolved shortly after the recommendations were made in 2000.

Following SPIT, the AIC on the Planning of Technology, Information/Learning Resources was charged on March 4, 2002 to “formalize planning procedures in the areas of technology and information and learning resources.” This committee was plagued by unclear direction and high committee membership turnover. Due in part to the section of the Accreditation Midterm Report this committee submitted, the College was placed on Warning by ACCJC in January 2004.

One of the results of the AIC on Planning of Technology, Information/Learning Resources was that each Academic Support Unit began data collection to assess the services provided. The data was regularly collected and reported to other Academic Support Coordinators and to its Dean.
The findings addressed the following:

- Sufficiency of Information and Learning Resources
- Acquisition and Maintenance of Educational Equipment and Materials
- Accessibility of Information and Learning Resources
- Professionally Qualified Staff, Sufficient and Consistent Financial Support
- Formal Agreements with Other Institutions and Other Sources
- Adequacy and Effectiveness of Learning and Information Resources and Services

Additionally, each Academic Support Unit developed 3-year plans based on the data collected. The data and the 3-year plans were used for annual budget requests for funding beyond the annual base allocation.

Another finding resulting from the AIC on Planning of Technology, Information/Learning Resources focused on the use of Division funds, allocated general funds supplemented by summer session earnings that are given to each instructional Division. Each Division is given the autonomy to prioritize and spend these funds, which may be used for Division computers that are not paid for by the Technology Fund. The recommendation from the AIC was that each Division develop a 3-year plan of their own for acquiring, maintaining, and upgrading their technology. However, an overall campus plan for acquiring, maintaining, and upgrading technology was lacking. This problem was pointed out in the ACCJC Warning letter of January 2004. As a result, the former Provost/Chancellor created the Committee for Learning Resources and Information Technology (CLRIT), with the charge of developing a college-wide, long-range plan for Technology and Information and Learning Resources. (Charge document, minutes, and recommendations from the committee may be found at http://emedia.leeward.hawaii.edu/clrit/)

The large CLRIT committee was made up of constituents from all areas of the campus. The committee was subdivided into groups on the following focus areas:

- Teaching, Learning, and Students
- Administrative and Student Services
- Communications and Network Services
- Space and Facilities
- Faculty and Staff Support
- Information, Technology, and Learning Resources

The committee adopted the University of Hawai‘i Strategic Plan for Information Technology 2002-2010 (http://www.hawaii.edu/spit/spit2000.pdf) with minor changes. Each subcommittee was charged with modifying the UH Strategic Plan Information Technology for their area and drafting an appropriate plan.

Prior to completing the college-wide, long-term plan and presenting it to the campus, the committee was disbanded on October 3, 2005 by the Acting Chancellor. In lieu of the CLRIT’s plan, the Annual Review process was developed to address, in part, college-wide, long-term planning for technology, information/learning resources.
Self Evaluation
A recurring issue that has continued to surface regarding acquiring, maintaining, and upgrading or replacing technology to meet the campus’ needs is how faculty/staff receive technology resources. The process that has been articulated throughout the campus, starting with the AIC on Planning of Technology, Information/Learning Resources from 2002, was that technology resource requests (as with any other resource) are made to the Division Chair. If Division funds are available, the Chair may choose to use those funds to purchase the requested item. If there are not enough funds, the request goes to the Division’s Dean. The Dean brings the request to the Administrative Team, who funds the request if it is within the campus’s budget and in line with the strategic planning goals.

Although this process has been articulated at all levels, it is not being followed and consistently applied. Because exceptions are made for the “squeaky wheels,” the process breaks down, promoting an attitude of “everyone for him/herself.”

Planning Agenda
• The College will ensure that processes for acquiring, maintaining, and upgrading or replacing technology are consistently applied, without exception.

• The Divisions/Units will develop a plan for replacement of faculty/staff computers on a regular basis.

• The College will assess the effectiveness of the Program and Annual Review processes in identifying technology needs.

III.C.l.d. The distribution and utilization of technology resources support the development, maintenance, and enhancement of its programs and services.

Descriptive Summary
The College’s attempts to improve its processes concerning the distribution and utilization of technology resources have been described in the previous sections of this standard. As stated earlier, the campus currently has an annual budget of $160,000 for its Technology Fund. This budget is dedicated to financing information technology that has a campus-wide impact or scope. The infrastructure areas that have been identified that fit these criteria are Campus Computer Labs and classrooms, production campus servers and networking, and computer repair.

Prior to the start of each fiscal year, the ITG coordinator develops a spending plan for the IT infrastructure. The coordinator solicits information from the following sources to help develop this plan:

• Academic Divisions regarding the curriculum changes that would require changes to the campus technology. The needs of Distance Education fall into this category.

• Unit heads of ITG (network administrator, server administrator and helpdesk and CCL manager) regarding equipment replacement, software licenses, and service contracts.

• Data collected over the course of the previous year related to usage trends, service growth/decline, hardware failures and industry information.
IT infrastructure technology or the services delivered from it are delivered campus-wide. The distribution of computer workstations is done as follows: the CCL upgrades approximately 3 labs or classrooms each fiscal year. The replaced equipment is then rotated out to faculty and staff. This rotation is based on input from each of the major campus units (Division Chairs, Directors, or Deans). Each of these Unit heads is provided with an IT inventory report. The distribution plan within each of these Units is communicated to ITG, which carries out the plan. These major Units may also purchase computers for their faculty and staff, allocated from a portion of their annual budget.

The Information Technology Group also maintains the following:

Network infrastructure – Every major building on campus is interconnected via the campus fiber optic backbone. Additional dark fiber (spare fiber optic cable) is in place. Every room (office, classroom and lab) has network connectivity. The vast majority of the campus has a 100 Mbs network with a few areas with Gigabit connectivity. Remote and automated monitoring systems are in place to test the integrity of the network infrastructure.

Server infrastructure – The production servers of the campus are configured with hardware based RAID disk systems for redundancy. They also have redundant power supplies and network interface cards. The College has implemented automated monitoring systems to check for system status every 60 seconds. In the event of a failure, an alert is sent out to the systems administrators. This system is also monitored by the Help Desk staff. Disaster recovery procedures have been developed and tested. A differential backup is performed each week night, as well as a full system backup on the weekend.

Security – The campus has implemented an enterprise level firewall, which is placed between the campus network router and the UH system routers. Therefore, all network traffic is inspected before it is allowed into the campus network. All campus production servers are kept current in terms of service packs and security patches. All workstations have antivirus software installed and are configured to automatically check for antivirus update files at least once daily. Additionally, all current workstations running Microsoft operating systems are configured with a personal firewall.

Other technologies are provided at the System level and do not involve any of the campus IT staff. Example include the Student Information System known as Banner and WebCT.

Self Evaluation
The equipment rotation process does not guarantee an even distribution of the newest technology across the campus because each campus unit may place a different priority on IT needs. However, it has allowed the College to achieve a minimum level of computer technology on desktops and to run the most current version of the operating system and MS* Office suite.
The *Program* and *Annual Review* processes were developed to address, in part, college-wide long-term planning for technology and information/learning resources. These processes are data-based and require inclusive dialogue within and among Divisions/Units of the College. They are intended to provide the campus with a transparent and coordinated plan for the acquisition, distribution, and utilization of technology resources.

**Planning Agenda**

- No changes are needed to address this standard.

### III.D. Financial Resources

#### III.D.a. Financial planning is integrated with and supports all institutional planning.

**Descriptive Summary**

Leeward Community College’s *Long Range Development Plan*, adopted in 1996, and its *Academic Developed Plan (ADP)*, revised and approved in 2002 as the *Leeward CC Strategic Plan 2002-2010*, ensure that financial planning is integrated with institutional planning. These campus-specific documents were developed in alignment with two other documents, the *University of Hawai‘i System Strategic Plan 1997-2007* and the *University of Hawai‘i Community Colleges Strategic Plan 1997-2007*. All of these plans in turn conform to the guidelines specified by the State of Hawai‘i Planning, Programming, and Budgeting System (PPBS). Together, these plans set the long-range goals and provide the direction for the College in a manner that is consistent with those of State of Hawai‘i, the University of Hawai‘i, and the Community Colleges.

**Self Evaluation**

The existence of the above mentioned long-range planning documents adequately assures that financial planning at the College is integrated with institutional planning. The implementation and ongoing refinement of the College’s *Program* and *Annual Review* processes, ensures that planning is more closely aligned with the achievement of student learning outcomes.

**Planning Agenda**

- The College will assess the effectiveness of its *Annual Review* process in integrating financial planning with institutional planning.
III.D.1.b. Institutional planning reflects realistic assessment of financial resource availability, development of financial resources, partnerships, and expenditure requirements.

**Descriptive Summary**

Approximately 70% of the College’s operating budget is derived from the State’s general fund, appropriated by the Legislature, with about 23% provided by the collection of student tuition and fees, and about 5% from special and revolving funds. The availability of general funds is based on biennial legislative appropriations subject to the Governor’s allocation. By law, the Governor is required to allocate funds based on projections by the State’s Council of Revenues. Should revenues not materialize, restrictions may be imposed by the Governor to balance the State’s budget. At the beginning of each academic year, the College is provided with information on its annual budget by the Director of Administrative Services.

Currently the level of funding from general funds and student fees and tuition is adequate to cover basic operating and fixed costs. However, the College has the flexibility to reallocate funds and relocate positions among Disciplines and programs and has done so on a continual basis to meet current needs and long range plans.

The reallocation of funds and positions is guided by the College’s *Strategic Plan*. The goals, objectives, and action plans that comprise the *Strategic Plan* are derived from the College’s mission and serve as both a short- and long-term planning document. The *Strategic Plan* has been revisited each year since 2003, incorporating new action plans that are intended to improve institutional effectiveness. Prioritization of these action plans by the entire campus provides the College with a method to attain its goals.

The institutional and financial planning process continues to evolve. Beginning in Fall 2004, the College implemented the assessment of its programs, Support Areas, and courses as stipulated by its *Policy on Unit/Area Program Review*. In 2005, most of the action items in the revisitation of the *Strategic Plan* were generated through data derived from program, courses, and Support Area assessments and connected to the *Strategic Plan* goals. An evaluation of this process prompted the campus to refine its planning and budgeting cycles to clarify the role of assessment and analysis in its *Program Review* model. To get a full accounting from all Instructional Divisions and other areas subsumed within the overall *Program Review* document, a planning tool, the *Annual Review*, was developed and is now in place in the Academic Units and Support Areas.

The template for the *Annual Review* brings together several activities required by current accreditation standards: assessment of student learning, planning, and budgeting that includes the entire College. All operational units of the college have begun an assessment of their effectiveness; analyzed their strengths, weaknesses, opportunities, and threats; and engaged in dialogue that has resulted in a prioritized planning list that is used to construct the institution’s budget.
PROGRAM REVIEW
AA, AS, AAS Degrees, OCEWD

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program Overview</th>
<th>Student Learning and Achievement</th>
<th>Faculty &amp; Staff</th>
<th>Curriculum</th>
<th>Support</th>
<th>External</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Description Mission</td>
<td>SLO Assessment Program &amp; Course SLOs</td>
<td>Response to Mission Professional Development</td>
<td>Innovations Challenges Problems Issues Trends</td>
<td>Technology Library &amp; Learning Resources Facilities Equipment Marketing Professional Development Other Resources</td>
<td>Advisory Boards Community Input Job Outlooks National Standards Specialized Accreditation</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Input from above Academic Program Review drives Support Area reviews

Support Area Reviews
- Student Services Area Review
- Academic Support Area Review
- Institutional Support Area Review

ANALYSIS

PLANNING LISTS
Prioritization and Budget Implications

STRATEGIC PLAN
Annual Up-dating of Strategic Plan

Program Review Model
Self Evaluation
The State's legislative budget process minimizes opportunities for significant changes to the College's budget, as the College is a small part of the State's annual and long-range financial plan. Despite this restrictive budgetary climate, the College has worked to improve the process that allows it to achieve its goals. The completed first cycle of the Program and Annual Review processes has had flaws primarily related to the lack of access to appropriate student achievement data, as well as with the various assessments tools that were used. However, the campus leaders are committed to the new processes and to a sustained effort in changing past practices.

Planning Agenda
• The College will continue to work with the Community College and UH Systems so that campus needs are met. Collaboration with our sister campuses is essential to make a significant impact on decision-making at the University level.

III.D.l.c. When making short-range financial plans, the institution considers its long-range financial priorities to assure financial stability. The institution clearly identifies and plans for payment of liabilities and future obligations.

Descriptive Summary
The College's financial management must operate within the policies and guidelines of the State of Hawai‘i. Management is based on the University of Hawai‘i: Systemwide Administrative Procedures Manual (http://www.svpa.hawaii.edu/svpa/apm/sysap.html), which gives specific and detailed guidelines, formats, and forms for contracts, bid list purchases, advertising, personnel procedures, and audits. The guidelines in the Administrative Procedures Manual must adhere to State Statutes on what can be purchased and how money can be expended.

University of Hawai‘i and State of Hawai‘i policies and statutes prohibit the College from incurring any long-term obligations. Financial emergencies are generally responded to at the campus level. If the situation is beyond the means of the campus, the problem may be resolved at the UH Community College’s System Office. If the problem cannot be resolved there, then the University of Hawai‘i System may be involved in managing the financial emergency. In situations where there is claim against the State or University, funds to pay these claims are specifically requested through the Legislature.

Self Evaluation
The existing policies and statues are appropriately employed to maintain the financial integrity of the College.

Planning Agenda
• No changes are needed to address this standard.
III.D.1.d. The institution clearly defines and follows its guidelines and processes for financial planning and budget.

Descriptive Summary

Leeward Community College uses the State of Hawai‘i’s Planning, Programming, and Budgeting System (PPBS) that combines planning with allocating and expending funds on specific projects, with an emphasis placed on performance. PPBS has a very complex structure designed to centralize and formalize the budget requests from all units of State of Hawai‘i. Individual Unit budget requests undergo detailed analysis by the Department of Budget and Finance, which is the central agency designated to make recommendations to the Governor.

The budgeting process is spread over a two-year period due to a biennium budget calendar. The budget is implemented on the first of July of odd numbered years, and supplemental appropriations resulting from program changes and workload changes are submitted to the Legislature during even numbered years.

Internal University of Hawai‘i budget preparations procedure guides the development of the College’s budget request. After receiving the Board of Regent’s policies and procedures and the University’s Budget Instructions, the College began to build its budget requests by soliciting input from faculty, staff, students, administrators, and community groups via the Leeward Community College Strategic Plan. This plan sets campus priorities and is based on the UH System Strategic Plan and the UH Community Colleges Strategic Plan. The budgeting process at the College must also comply with the UH Community College System Assessment Planning, and Budget Development Activities. (Appendix C, of Leeward CC’s Progress Report to ACCJC, September 9, 2005)

After the adoption of the Leeward CC Strategic Plan 2002 -2010, the campus determined that a yearly revisit, based on assessment results of the previous year’s action plans, would be an effective way to accomplish the College’s mission-driven goals and objectives. The annual revisit at the beginning of each calendar year makes the plan a continuously evolving one that supports changing student and community needs. Beginning in the Spring of 2003, programs, areas, units and disciplines were asked to submit action plans that were complied and made public through an Open Forum, email distribution, and posting on the Strategic Plan Website, http://emedia.leeward.hawaii.edu/sp/.

Actions plans were prioritized by campus vote. Each action plan specified the following:

• the nature of the action
• the rationale
• intended results and how they will be assessed,
• the fiscal impact, and
• the source of funding

The results of the prioritization were forwarded to the campus’s governing bodies, the Faculty Senate and Campus Council, for review. The Administrative Team used the priorities to shape the budget, which was forwarded to the UHCC and UH System for reprioritization. The budget was then returned to the College for review and shifting of resources before it was submitted to the state legislature.
The budgeting process has evolved as the College implemented its original *Policy on Program and Unit/Area Review*. Ongoing revision of this assessment-based process led to the development and implementation of the current *Annual Review* process, which is described under Standard III.B.1.

**Self Evaluation**
One of the intended outcomes of the *Annual Review* process is to provide the College with data on student learning outcomes that are used as a basis for planning and budgeting. The *Annual Review* templates are shared with the campus community as a means of providing every member of the institution with information on how funding priorities are established in developing the College’s budget. Experiences gained during the implementation of the first *Annual Review* cycle have provided campus leaders with information on parts of the process that need to be improved, such as validating assessment tools used and providing appropriate student achievement data.

**Planning Agenda**
- The College will improve its assessment tools and focus on obtaining student achievement data that can be better correlated with its assessment of student learning in courses, programs, and support areas.
Standard IV: Leadership and Governance

The institution recognizes and utilizes the contributions of leadership throughout the organization for continuous improvement of the institution. Governance roles are designed to facilitate decisions that support student learning programs and services and improve institutional effectiveness, while acknowledging the designated responsibilities of the governing board and the chief administrator.

IV.A. Decision-Making Roles and Processes

IV.A.5. The role of leadership and the institution’s governance and decision-making structures and processes are regularly evaluated to assure their integrity and effectiveness. The institution widely communicates the results of these evaluations and uses them as the basis for improvement.

Descriptive Summary

The governance and decision-making structures of the College are centered around the leadership of the administration and the recommending governance bodies of the Faculty Senate and Campus Council. The Faculty Senate serves as the policy-recommending and advisory body of the faculty and makes recommendations on behalf of the faculty. The Campus Council functions as the recommending and advisory body of the College in matters relating to the priorities of the College and makes recommendations on behalf of the various constituencies of the College. The Charters and By-Laws of the Faculty Senate and Campus Council may be found at http://home.lcc.hawaii.edu/docs/govern/

According to BORP Section 9-14, Part IV (Conditions of Service), the University President establishes the criteria and procedures for evaluating all Executive/Managerial (E/M) positions. All E/Ms undergo an annual evaluation by their supervisors during the March-June timeframe for performance and accomplishments. The annual 360 Assessment/Evaluation is another formal process for the evaluation of the College’s administrators. The 360 Assessment results are not made public to the campus community.

Self Evaluation

The College does not have a formal process to evaluate the effectiveness of the Faculty Senate or the Campus Council. Although all Executive/Managerial personnel undergo annual evaluations by their supervisors, these evaluations, including the 360 Assessment, and evidence of any improvement in performance, are not communicated to the faculty and staff.

Planning Agenda

• The College will formalize evaluative processes for the Faculty Senate and the Campus Council. The College will also develop a process that informs the campus of improvements made by these governance bodies and by administrators in response to assessments of their performance. This process will be incorporated within the Annual Review process that is designed to allow all members of the campus to assess what they do and to provide input for change that leads to improvement.
IV.B. Board and Administrative Organization

In addition to the leadership of individuals and constituencies, institutions recognize the designated responsibilities of the governing board for setting policies and of the chief administrator for the effective operation of the institution. Multi-college districts/systems clearly define the organizational roles of the district/system and the colleges.

Descriptive Summary

In 1907, the University of Hawai‘i was established on the model of the American system of land-grant universities created initially by the Morrill Act of 1862. In the 1960s and 1970s, the University was developed into a system of accessible and affordable campuses.

These institutions currently include the following:

A research university at Mānoa offering a comprehensive array of undergraduate, graduate, and professional degrees through the doctoral level, including law and medicine.

A comprehensive, primarily baccalaureate institution at Hilo, offering professional programs based on a liberal arts foundation and selected graduate degrees.

An upper division institution at West O‘ahu, offering liberal arts and selected professional studies.

A system of seven open-door Community Colleges spread across the islands of Kaua‘i, O‘ahu, Maui, and Hawai‘i, offering quality liberal arts and workforce programs. In addition to the seven colleges, outreach centers are located on the islands of Molokai and Lanai (administered by Maui CC), on the island of Hawai‘i in Captain Cook (administered by Hawai‘i CC), and in the Wai‘anae/Nānākuli area of O‘ahu (administered by Leeward CC).

The University of Hawai‘i Community College system, led by the Vice President for Community Colleges, is located on the UH Mānoa campus on O‘ahu.

The University of Hawai‘i System has undergone several administrative reorganizations since the 2000 comprehensive visit. The following briefly outlines the major events:

University System Reorganization – 2002

As part of a University system administrative reorganization, the University of Hawai‘i Board of Regents (BOR) received a proposal in November 2002 that included the elimination of the Office of the Chancellor for Community Colleges and reassigned the functions of the office to various system-level vice presidential offices and to the Community Colleges. This reorganization proposal was approved by the BOR in December 2002. The reorganization changed the title of the college chief executive officer (CEO) and the reporting relationship between the CEOs of the individually accredited Community Colleges and the University system. Each newly titled Community College chancellor assumed the responsibility and authority previously delegated to the Chancellor for Community Colleges including, within the scope of BOR and University Executive policies, the following: making faculty and
staff appointments, approving faculty promotions and tenure, approving out-of-state travel, approving campus budget requests and external grant applications, executing the campus annual expenditure plan, approving Certificates of Completion, approving internal staff and fiscal re-allocations, etc. UH Community College coordination was facilitated through designated Community College Associate Vice Presidents reporting to the UH System Vice Presidents for Academic Affairs and Administration.

The reorganization created the Council of Chancellors, reporting directly to the President. The council included the chancellors of each of the ten individual campuses within the UH system. Four additional key decision making/consultative groups were established: President's senior staff, the University Executive Council, the President’s Advisory Council, and the Council of Chief Academic Officers. Existing policy guidance provided to the campuses through the Community Colleges Chancellor’s Memorandum (CCCM) were to be evaluated by the Community Colleges Executive Council (composed of CC Chancellors, Vice Chancellors and Deans, and Associate Vice Presidents) to determine which to continue so as to provide a core of common practices across the Community College campuses.

The BOR-approved reorganization was sent forward to the Accrediting Commission for Community and Junior Colleges (ACCJC) in compliance with the Commission's Substantive Change approval process in January 2003. In spring 2003, the ACCJC gave conditional approval to a Substantive Change Request.

Change in University System Leadership – 2004
As noted in the Accrediting Commission for Senior Colleges and Universities Special Visit (March 2004) to the UH System Office, the “relationship between the Board and the President had deteriorated significantly, and in turn, had affected other elements of the University.” The BOR rescinded authority to the President in several areas related to budget and personnel. In the summer of 2004, the President resigned from the University and an Interim President was named by the BOR.

University System Reorganization – 2004
The Interim President requested and the BOR approved a reorganization of the President’s office reducing the number of direct executive reports and re-describing other executive positions. The UH Council of Chancellors, which is not an administrative unit, continued to report directly to the President and met on a regular basis to provide advice on strategic planning, program development and other matters of concern. The Vice President for Academic Planning and Policy convened the Council of Chief Academic Officers, and the agenda included items of system-wide academic concern. The delegation of authority from the BOR to the President and the President’s designees that began immediately after the appointment of the Interim President has continued.
Community Colleges System Reestablished – 2005
In granting its approval with reservations to the 2002 reorganization of the University of Hawai`i system, the ACCJC acted to require the UH Community Colleges to provide reports to the Commission in August and November 2003, and in April 2004. The November and April reports were followed by a team visit to validate the reports and examine the degree to which the University of Hawai`i Community Colleges had developed effective administrative systems to allow it to meet accreditation standards, and to insure the University of Hawai`i system had adequate means to support the mission and operation of the Community Colleges.

As a result of the series of reports and visits from the ACCJC, it became increasingly clear that the new organization presented significant challenges in the colleges’ ability to continue to meet the Commission's standards in a number of areas.

Following a review of several alternative organizational models and discussion and consultation, the Interim President recommended a reorganization that reestablished a Community Colleges system administration.

In June 2005 the BOR approved a reorganization of the Community Colleges including the creation of a Vice President for Community Colleges who is responsible for executive leadership, policy decision-making, resource allocation, development of appropriate support services for the seven Community Colleges, and also called for the re-consolidation of the academic and administrative support units for the Community Colleges (June 2005 President's System Level Reorganization -- Community Colleges http://www.hawaii.edu/vpaa/posts/053105-signed-cc-reorg.pdf). A dual reporting relationship was created whereby the Community College chancellors report to the Vice President for Community Colleges for leadership and coordination of Community College matters, and concurrently report to the President for University system-wide policymaking and decisions impacting the campuses. The dual reporting relationship preserves previous BOR action, which promoted and facilitated campus autonomy in balance with system-wide academic and administrative functions and operations. College chancellors retained responsibility and control over campus operations, administration, and management.

The June 2005 reorganization created no other organizational or functional changes to the system wide offices. All ten chancellors continue to report to the President and collectively meet as the Council of Chancellors to advise the President on strategic planning, program development, and other matters of concern. The Community College chancellors meet as the Council of Community College Chancellors to provide advice to the President of the University and Vice President for Community Colleges on Community College policy issues and other matters of Community College interest.

BOR Committee Reorganization – 2005
At its September 16, 2005 meeting, the BOR enlarged the Community College standing committee and clarified its duties to allow the BOR to address ACCJC standards without impacting the other business of the BOR in its governance of the University system and the baccalaureate campuses. The newly reorganized committee increased the number of members to six and adopted quarterly meetings independent of the full BOR meetings.
IV.B.1. The institution has a governing board that is responsible for establishing policies to assure the quality, integrity, and effectiveness of the student learning programs and services and the financial stability of the institution. The governing board adheres to a clearly defined policy for selecting and evaluating the chief administrator for the college or the district/system.

IV.B.1.a The governing board is an independent policy-making body that reflects the public interest in board activities and decisions. Once the board reaches a decision, it acts as a whole. It advocates for and defends the institution and protects it from undue influence or pressure.

**Descriptive Summary**

Governance of the University of Hawai‘i is vested in a 12-member BOR appointed by the Governor of Hawai‘i, with the approval of the State Legislature. Membership on the BOR is controlled by State Law (Chapter 304-3, Hawai‘i Revised Statutes - §304-3). Hawai‘i Statutes ([http://www.capitol.hawaii.gov/hrscurrent/Vol05_Ch0261-0319/HRS0304/HRS_0304-0003.htm](http://www.capitol.hawaii.gov/hrscurrent/Vol05_Ch0261-0319/HRS0304/HRS_0304-0003.htm)). That statute states that the “affairs of the university shall be under the general management and control of the Board of Regents.” That statute indicates that the members of the BOR are appointed by the Governor of the State of Hawai‘i, and also indicates the size of the BOR, how the members are selected, their terms of office, when the BOR is expected to meet, and how they are compensated.

Board of Regents By-Laws and Policies define the duties and responsibilities of the Board and its officers and committees. The BOR is responsible for the internal organization and management of the University, including, but not limited to, establishing the general mission and goals of the system and approving any changes to them; adopting academic and facilities planning documents for the system and the campuses; adopting broad policy that guides all aspects of University governance; appointing and evaluating the President; establishing the administrative structure and approving major administrative appointments; approving all major contractual obligations of the University; approving new academic and other programs and major organizational changes; reviewing all fiscal audits of University operations; and approving the University budget, long-range financial plans, and budget requests for state funding.

The BOR appoints and evaluates the President of the University and approves other executive appointments, including vice presidents, chancellors, and deans. In November 2000, the citizens of Hawai‘i approved a constitutional amendment to give greater autonomy to the University of Hawai‘i. Although the Constitution had previously granted the BOR of the University authority to manage the University, a clause “in accordance with law” had been interpreted to mean that the BOR could not take action unless legislation specifically permitted the action. The constitutional amendment removed that clause. ([http://www.capitol.hawaii.gov/hrscurrent/Vol05_Ch0261-0319/HRS0304/HRS_0304-0004.HTM](http://www.capitol.hawaii.gov/hrscurrent/Vol05_Ch0261-0319/HRS0304/HRS_0304-0004.HTM) Powers of the BOR)

The BOR and administration are currently working with external and internal constituents to establish and carry out the principles that will guide the changed relationship the University seeks with the State.
The BOR elects its own officers and hires its own staff. Currently, the BOR has two professional staff members (the Executive Administrator and Secretary to the BOR and the Executive Assistant) and three secretaries. System administrative staff also provides support to the BOR as needed.

BOR Policy Chapter 9, Part III, addresses recruitment and appointment of Executive and Managerial personnel. BOR Policy Chapter 2 details the evaluation of the President. BOR Policies: http://www.hawaii.edu/offices/bor/policy/index.html

In accord with the State's Sunshine Law (Sunshine Law, http://www.capitol.hawaii.gov/hrscurrent/Vol02_Ch0046-0115/HRS0092/HRS_0092-.HTM), all meetings are public, except those involving discussion of personnel and legal matters. Board of Regents By-Laws and Policies—as well as agenda and minutes of meetings—are publicly available at the BOR's website, http://www.hawaii.edu/offices/bor/

Self Evaluation
The College meets the standard. The Board of Regents is the organization vested with the governance of the University of Hawai‘i. It has gained increased autonomy to make those important decisions concerning the internal organization and management of the University System. Its composition and adherence to its policies and by-laws ensure that this governance body reflects the public interest. The Board appoints and evaluates the President of the University, approves all other executive appointments, and follows the University administrative procedures regarding all other Executive/Managerial personnel. The Board conducts public meetings on a regularly scheduled basis at a number of campuses and posts its agendas and minutes on its website.

Planning Agenda
- No changes are needed to address this standard.

IV. B.1.b. The governing board establishes policies consistent with the mission statement to ensure the quality, integrity, and improvement of student learning programs and services and the resources necessary to support them.

Descriptive Summary
BOR policies are implemented through administrative policies and procedures and delegations of authority published and promulgated by means of the University of Hawai‘i System-wide Executive Policies and the University of Hawai‘i System-wide Administrative Procedures Manual. These documents are available on the Web at: Systemwide Administrative Procedures. http://www.svpa.hawaii.edu/svpa/apm/sysap.html.

BOR Policy Chapters 4 and 5 detail BOR planning and evaluation policies BOR Programs (http://www.hawaii.edu/offices/bor/policy/borpch5.pdf). At the September 2005 BOR meeting, the BOR changed its committee structure to more fully address ACCJC’s concerns raised during the series of reports and visits from Commission staff following the 2002 reorganization. The reorganized and expanded Community College Standing Committee (http://www.hawaii.edu/offices/bor/cc/) conducts quarterly meetings in addition to the full BOR meetings. The meetings are designed to focus on the following areas:
• The broad Community College mission (November 4, 2005)
• The financial health of the Community Colleges (April 21, 2006)
• Program review and assessment (July 21, 2006)
• Planning directions for the next year (August 25, 2006)

The University of Hawai‘i Community Colleges Strategic Plan 2002-2010 (http://www.hawaii.edu/ccc/Docs/CC_Strategicpl/strategic plan.pdf), adopted by the BOR November 22, 2002, (http://www.hawaii.edu/offices/bor/regular/minute/20021122.regular.html) states that within the overall mission of the University of Hawai‘i, the Community College, have as their special mission:

• Access: To broaden access to postsecondary education in Hawai‘i, regionally, and internationally by providing open-door opportunities for students to enter quality educational programs within their own communities.

• Learning and Teaching: To specialize in the effective teaching of remedial/developmental education, general education, and other introductory liberal arts, pre-professional, and selected baccalaureate courses and programs.

• Work Force Development: To provide the trained workforce needed in the State, the region, and internationally by offering occupational, technical, and professional courses and programs which prepare students for immediate employment and career advancement.

• Personal Development: To provide opportunities for personal enrichment, occupational upgrading, and career mobility through credit and non-credit courses and activities.

• Community Development: To contribute to and stimulate the cultural and intellectual life of the community by providing a forum for the discussion of ideas; by providing leadership, knowledge, problem-solving skills, and general informational services; and by providing opportunities for community members to develop their creativity and appreciate the creative endeavors of others.

• Diversity: By building upon Hawai‘i’s unique multi-cultural environment and geographic location, through efforts in curriculum development, and productive relationships with international counterparts in Asia and the Pacific, UHCC students’ learning experiences will prepare them for the global workplace.

Self Evaluation
The College meets the standard. Board policies support the Community College mission and establish their role in ensuring the integrity, quality, and continuous improvement of all educational programs within the University System. The newly formed Community College Standing Committee of the Board is an appropriate step that is intended to improve awareness of the issues, initiatives, and needs unique to two-year institutions. It is hoped that the Board’s increased awareness will result in the development of the appropriate policies to address improvement of student learning programs and services and the resources necessary to support them.

Planning Agenda
• No changes are needed to address this standard.
IV.B.1.c. The governing board has ultimate responsibility for educational quality, legal matters, and financial integrity.

**Descriptive Summary**

The descriptive summary for Standard IV.B.1.b. above described the BOR’s responsibility for educational quality. Regarding legal matters and financial integrity, the BOR is responsible for the internal organization and management of the University. Increased autonomy granted to the University by the Legislature over the past decade guarantees that the University has the right to determine where budgets will be cut or reallocated when state appropriations are reduced. Implementation of BOR policies is the responsibility of the President and the Executive and Managerial team.

Upon approval by the BOR, the University’s operating and Capital Improvement Projects (CIP) budget requests are submitted simultaneously to the Governor for review and incorporation into the executive budget request for the State and to the Legislature for informational purposes. The executive budget request for the State is submitted to the Legislature in December for consideration in the regular session of the Legislature in January. Appropriations by the Legislature (General or Supplemental Appropriations Act) are usually passed in May and transmitted to the Governor for approval. Upon approval by the Governor in June, allocation notices are transmitted to all state agencies, including any restrictions imposed on Legislative appropriations. The Governor can impose restrictions at any time of the year based on economic conditions.

Legislative appropriations for operating funds are specifically designated by fund type for major organizational units (UH-Mānoa, UH-Hilo, West O‘ahu, Community Colleges, System-wide Programs, etc.). State law allows the Governor to withhold or restrict Legislative appropriations. General fund allocations are made to each major organizational unit, less any restrictions imposed by the Governor. The President is authorized to determine distributions of general fund restrictions as well as reallocations between major organizational units. The Vice President for Community Colleges and the Community College Chancellors determine the general fund allocations to the individual Community Colleges, normally maintaining established levels of current service funding.

Due to declining levels of State funding support, it has become necessary to assess each campus a pro rata share of certain unfunded costs that are administered on a system-wide basis. These costs include the risk management program costs (including legal settlements), private fundraising costs, and workers’ compensation/unemployment insurance premiums.

In terms of financial integrity, external auditors audit the University of Hawai‘i annually. The University’s financial statements are prepared in accordance with generally accepted auditing standards and Government Accounting Standards (GASB) principles. In July of 2005, with changing auditing standards, the ACCJC accepted “…the presentation of a combined balance sheet and income statement of the Community College system as supplemental information to the University’s consolidated financial statements with an opinion on such supplemental information in relation to the University’s consolidated financial statements taken as a whole …” as documentation of audit requirements for the University of Hawai‘i Community Colleges.
**Self Evaluation**
The College meets the standard. State Law and BOR policies and by-laws clearly delegate the ultimate responsibility for educational quality, legal matters, and financial integrity to the Board. A step in the right direction is the formation of the BOR Community College Committee. However, it is imperative that those who comprise this committee become informed of the Community College mission and challenges that face the Community College system.

**Planning Agenda**
• No changes are needed to address this standard.

---

**IV.B.1.d.** The institution or the governing board publishes the board bylaws and policies specifying the board’s size, duties, responsibilities, structure, and operating procedures.

**Descriptive Summary**
The BOR maintains a web site on which the bylaws, policies, and meeting minutes are regularly posted. All of the policies mentioned in this Standard are published on this site, [http://www.hawaii.edu/offices/bor/policy/index.html](http://www.hawaii.edu/offices/bor/policy/index.html)

**Self Evaluation**
The College meets the standard. The Board maintains a website that allows public access to all of its policies, by-laws, meeting agendas, and minutes.

**Planning Agenda**
• No changes are needed to address this 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.

**Descriptive Summary**
The BOR conducts meetings and administers the business of the University System in accordance with the State Sunshine Law. BOR minutes are maintained and published following each meeting and are available on the website, [http://www.hawaii.edu/offices/bor/](http://www.hawaii.edu/offices/bor/). BOR policy does not include a system for evaluating and revising its policies on a regular basis. The administration submits recommendation for policy and policy revisions as necessary. The most recent comprehensive BOR policy review was conducted in October 2002.

In the October 2004 BOR self study workshop, the BOR suggested regular review of its own performance.
There are many instances of BOR actions that conform to this standard. Following are a few examples of such situations:

- In October 2002 the BOR approved an amendment to its policies “in light of the University's autonomy and to add clarity as well as to update the current BOR policies following the separation of the President and Mānoa Chancellor's office.” BOR 10/18/2002 meeting: [http://www.hawaii.edu/offices/bor/regular/minute/20021018.regular.html](http://www.hawaii.edu/offices/bor/regular/minute/20021018.regular.html)

- In May 2005 the BOR approved a change in its policy regarding University employees working at the Legislature. In particular, this new policy “provides that University employees working at the Legislature shall comply with applicable Executive Branch policies.” BOR 5/19/2005 meeting: [http://www.hawaii.edu/offices/bor/regular/minute/20050519.regular.pdf](http://www.hawaii.edu/offices/bor/regular/minute/20050519.regular.pdf)

When the BOR decides not to follow its own policies, they identify it as an exception to policy.

- For example, on October 22, 2004 the BOR approved, as an exception to policy on graduate programs, the establishment of a College of Pharmacy at University of Hawai‘i at Hilo. BOR 10/22/2004 meeting: [http://www.hawaii.edu/offices/bor/regular/minute/20041022.regular.pdf#page=2](http://www.hawaii.edu/offices/bor/regular/minute/20041022.regular.pdf#page=2)

**Self Evaluation**

The College partially meets this standard. The Board revises its practices and policies as necessary, but not on a regular basis. However, the Board suggested in Fall 2004, that a review of its performance be conducted on a regular basis.

**Planning Agenda**

- The College and the OVPCC will work with the BOR to establish regular review of BOR policies and procedures.

---

**IV.B.1.f. The governing board has a program for board development and new member orientation. It has a mechanism for providing for continuity of board membership and staggered terms of office.**

**Descriptive Summary**

Governance of the University of Hawai‘i is vested in a 12-member BOR appointed by the Governor of Hawai‘i, with the approval of the State Legislature. Hawai‘i Revised Statutes - §304-3 ([http://www.capitol.hawaii.gov/hrscurrent/Vol05_Ch0261-0319/HRS0304/HRS_0304-0003.htm](http://www.capitol.hawaii.gov/hrscurrent/Vol05_Ch0261-0319/HRS0304/HRS_0304-0003.htm)) sets the term of office as four years for all members (except the student member, whose term is two years). The statue does not specifically provide for “staggered terms of office” but it does ensure that new BOR members will be selected whenever a term expires.

That statue does not describe a program for “BOR development” or “new member orientation.” The President conducts an annual briefing for new Regents. The briefing involves the UH System Vice Presidents and uses the BOR Orientation Manual, Nov 1, 2004, as the foundation.
At the September 2, 2004 regular meeting, the BOR were presented an overview of an “Orientation Manual.” BOR 9/2/2004 meeting: http://www.hawaii.edu/offices/bor/regular/minute/20040902.special.pdf. The developer of the manual explained to the BOR that the manual is primarily designed for new Regents.

**Self Evaluation**
The College partially meets the standard. With the exception of an Orientation Manual that is provided to new members, the Board does not have a formal process or specific orientation workshops for new Regents.

**Planning Agenda**
- The BOR and the OVPCC, with faculty from each college, will develop an appropriate program for BOR development and new member orientation.

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.

**Descriptive Summary**
Although BOR policy does not appear to call for regular self-evaluation, at its October 2004, self-study workshop, the BOR agreed to self-study on a three-or-four year cycle.

**Self Evaluation**
The College does not meet the standard. The Board does not have a process for self-evaluation.

**Planning Agenda**
- The College and the OVPCC will work with the BOR to develop and implement a clearly defined process for evaluation and assessment of BOR performance.

IV.B.1.h. The governing board has a code of ethics that includes a clearly defined policy for dealing with behavior that violates its code.

**Descriptive Summary**
BOR Policy, Article X, and HRS Chapter 84 address the BOR’s stated process for dealing with unethical behavior.

At the November 4, 2005 meeting, the University’s General Counsel stated that there may have been examples, but these were related to personnel matters and conducted in executive session. The General Counsel stated that he would need to review the minutes for releaseability. Additionally he stated that BOR members recuse themselves as required.
**Self Evaluation**
The College meets the standard. The BOR has a policy and process for dealing with unethical behavior.

**Planning Agenda**
- No changes are needed to address this standard.

---

**IV.B.1.i.** The governing board is informed about and involved in the accreditation process.

**Descriptive Summary**
In response to ACCJC Recommendation No. 7, the BOR expanded the Community College Standing Committee and adopted quarterly meetings. The Standing Committee will include training and information about the accreditation process at their quarterly meetings (see IV.B.1.c). At the November 4, 2005 meeting, the BOR was provided a binder and presentations on the accreditation process. In addition, the Standard IVB workgroup (composed of representatives from all seven colleges and staff from the Office of the VPCC) in attendance at the meeting reviewed the standards and engaged in discussion with the BOR on the accreditation process.

**Self Evaluation**
Although the BOR Community College Standing Committee has held its first two quarterly meetings, further evidence is required to fully evaluate BOR involvement in the Community College accreditation process.

From the meeting held in November 2005, it was evident that members of the BOR did not have a full appreciation of ACCJC standards and issues facing the Community Colleges. At this point, it is difficult to gauge the commitment to becoming informed as required by the current ACCJC accreditation standards

**Planning Agenda**
- The College and the OVPCC will work with the BOR to assist the BOR in becoming more involved and informed with the accreditation process.
IV.B.1.j. The governing board has the responsibility for selecting and evaluating the district/system chief administrator (most often known as the chancellor) in a multi-college district/system or the college chief administrator (most often known as the president) in the case of a single college. The governing board delegates full responsibility and authority to him/her to implement and administer board policies without board interference and holds him/her accountable for the operation of the district/system or college, respectively.

In multi-college districts/systems, the governing board establishes a clearly defined policy for selecting and evaluating the presidents of the colleges.

**Descriptive Summary**

The President of the University of Hawai‘i System has full responsibility and authority for execution of the policies authorized and established by the BOR. BOR Policy Chapter 2 provides for the duties and evaluation of the President of the University of Hawai‘i System.

The BOR approves the appointment of the Vice President for Community Colleges, who is evaluated by the President of the University System.

The BOR approves the appointment of each college Chancellor, who is evaluated by the Vice President for Community Colleges. As the Chancellors have dual reporting to the President of the University of Hawai‘i, the President will also evaluate the Chancellors.

**Self Evaluation**

The College meets the standard. There is clearly defined policy and process for the selection and evaluation of the Chancellor.

**Planning Agenda**

- No changes are needed to address this standard.
IVB.2.a. The president plans, oversees, and evaluates an administrative structure organized and staffed to reflect the institution’s purposes, size, and complexity. He/she delegates authority to administrators and others consistent with their responsibilities, as appropriate.

Descriptive Summary
Since the University of Hawai‘i system-wide reorganization in the summer of 2002, Leeward Community College’s Chief Executive has had the title of Chancellor. The Chief Academic Officer (CAO) has the title of Vice Chancellor of Academic Affairs (VCCA). The Chancellor provides overall leadership to the campus, with a particular focus on external relations. The Vice Chancellor also provides leadership to the campus community, with a particular focus on affairs internal to the campus. In June 2005, the former Provost/Chancellor resigned his position, and the Vice Chancellor was appointed in his place. In May 2006, he was appointed by the BOR to serve as Leeward CC’s Chancellor. Directly under the Chancellor’s direction are the following Deans and Directors:

- Vice Chancellor of Academic Affairs/Chief Academic Officer
- Dean of Student Services
- Director of Administrative Services
- Assistant Dean, Instruction
- Assistant Dean, Instruction
- Assistant Dean, Academic Support
- Director of Continuing Education and Workforce Development

Working through the College’s administrative staff, the Chancellor exercises leadership in setting college goals, plans, budget, and other matters through cooperation with the following campus constituency groups:

- Faculty Senate
- Campus Council
- Division Chairs
- Institutional Researcher
- Leeward CC Assessment Team

The Chancellor holds regular meetings with the executive committee of the Faculty Senate and the Campus Council to consult on various issues related to the College’s Strategic Plan implementation, Program and Annual Reviews, and other concerns that might arise. The Chancellor also meets weekly with the administrative staff, as well as bi-weekly with Division Chairs and administrators. At such times, the Chancellor is not only afforded a chance to engage in dialogue, but also to ensure that campus plans are understood and followed, and that each major Unit of the College is aware of the activities of the others. These meetings also allow the Chancellor to monitor progress toward achieving the goals and mission of the College. With the filling of the Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs (VCAA) position, however, some of these contact points may be handled more often by the VCAA.
Leeward Community College
Organizational Chart
as of June 2006
Both the former Provost/Chancellor and current Chancellor have made themselves available to further explain College policies at individual Division meetings, Faculty Senate meetings, and other campus forums.

An example of recent leadership initiatives of Leeward CC’s Chancellors is the college reorganization. The former Provost/Chancellor worked through both the Campus Council and Faculty Senate to devise an orderly, inclusive process for campus reorganization. Constituency groups were intimately involved in the process, and the campus community as a whole was also informed of the progress through a constantly updated web page (http://home.lcc.hawaii.edu/docs/reorg/). Faculty and other constituency concerns in the Summer of 2004 led the current Chancellor to initiate further review of the reorganization and incorporate many of these concerns in the final proposal. This latest reorganization proposal is scheduled to be submitted to the BOR in Fall 2006 for their review and approval.

**Self Evaluation**

Both the former Provost/Chancellor and the current Chancellor have appropriately delegated authority to administrators and to the campus’ governance organizations, the Faculty Senate and the Campus Council.

The recent implementation of the Annual Review process continues to evolve under the leadership of the Chancellor. In addition to adding the input of an Executive Planning Committee, the second phase of the Annual Review process calls for more governance and Phase II committee input (including staffing, technology, and space allocation) in the planning process for the College. The intent is to include more segments of the campus community in the process to achieve multiple perspectives on prioritization and to enhance shared governance.

**Planning Agenda**

- No changes are needed to address this standard.
IV.B.2.b. The president guides institutional improvement of the teaching and learning environment by the following:

- establishing a collegial process that sets values, goals, and priorities;
- ensuring that evaluation and planning rely on high quality research and analysis on external and internal conditions;
- ensuring that educational planning is integrated with resource planning and distribution to achieve student learning outcomes; and
- establishing procedures to evaluate overall institutional planning and implementation efforts.

**Descriptive Summary**

Much of the Chancellor’s time is devoted to acquiring and sharing the data needed to adequately plan and prioritize. For this reason, the College’s Institutional Researcher has his office near to the Chancellor’s office. As the College is in a time of transition, budget and enrollment data are essential for adequately assessing the College’s present and past situation, and planning for future priorities.

The Chancellor communicates the College’s goals, values, and direction to the general campus community through a variety of means:

- Weekly Campus Bulletin
- Faculty and Staff mass emails
- Yearly statistical bulletin issued by the Institutional Researcher
- Regular presentations at Fall and Spring convocation
- Campus forums—both open and at the Division level—for critical issues facing the campus (such as Program Review, Accreditation, etc)

The former Provost/Chancellor, in 2004, called on the campus community to engage in revision of the College’s mission. In early 2005, he led efforts to revisit the Strategic Plan, stressing the need to emphasize student learning as the driving force of the college’s purpose. A web site was established ([http://emedia.leeward.hawaii.edu/sp/](http://emedia.leeward.hawaii.edu/sp/)) for use by the campus community as it revised the Strategic Plan.

The current Chancellor is particularly focused on the Program and Annual Review processes. The nature of Program Review, the requisite forms, and the evolving process are communicated in the following manner:

- Website for Program Review ([http://emedia.leeward.hawaii.edu/cs/ProgReview/](http://emedia.leeward.hawaii.edu/cs/ProgReview/))
- Website for Planning ([http://emedia.leeward.hawaii.edu/cs/planning/](http://emedia.leeward.hawaii.edu/cs/planning/))
- Fall 2005 Leadership Retreat devoted to these topics
- Progress in posting planning and budget documents on the College web site ([http://emedia.leeward.hawaii.edu/cs/planning/](http://emedia.leeward.hawaii.edu/cs/planning/))
- Use of a template for Annual Reviews and Program Review that reflects the Chancellor’s concern that all reviews be data-driven
Annual Review Process

**PROGRAM REVIEW**
AA, AS, AAS Degrees, OCEWD

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program Overview</th>
<th>Student Learning and Achievement</th>
<th>Faculty &amp; Staff</th>
<th>Curriculum</th>
<th>Support</th>
<th>External</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Description</td>
<td>SLO Assessment</td>
<td>Response to Mission</td>
<td>Innovations</td>
<td>Technology</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mission</td>
<td>Program &amp; Course SLOs</td>
<td>Professional Development</td>
<td>Challenges</td>
<td>Library &amp; Learning Resources</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Demographics</td>
<td></td>
<td>Issues</td>
<td>Facilities</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Student Needs</td>
<td></td>
<td>Trends</td>
<td>Equipment</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Enrollment Data</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Marketing</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Transfer Numbers &amp; Efficiency</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Professional Development</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>GPA, Course &amp; Program Completion</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Other Resources</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Retention and Persistence Rates</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Advisory Boards</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Input from above Academic Program Review drives Support Area reviews

**Support Area Reviews**
- Student Services Area Review
- Academic Support Area Review
- Institutional Support Area Review

**ANALYSIS**

**PLANNING LISTS**
Prioritization and Budget Implications

**STRATEGIC PLAN**
Annual Up-dating of Strategic Plan

**ANNUAL REVIEW**
Institutional Research Data and Assessment Data provided

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Student Learning</th>
<th>Faculty and Staff</th>
<th>Curriculum</th>
<th>Support Issues</th>
<th>External Factors</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Strengths</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Weaknesses</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Opportunities</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Threats</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**PLANNING LISTS**

**Academic Plan**
**Student Services Plan**
**Academic Support Plan**
**Institutional Support Plan**
**College Plan**
Self Evaluation
The Chancellor has made clear to the campus community that the Annual Review process connects data, assessment, and planning. The diagrams on the facing page representing the planning process illustrate the integrated quality of this process.

Planning Agenda
• No changes are needed to address this standard.

IV.B.2.c. The president assures the implementation of statutes, regulations, and governing board policies and assures that institutional practices are consistent with institutional mission and policies.

Descriptive Summary
The Chancellor insures College compliance with statutes, regulations, and governing board policies through participation in UH and UHCC system-wide administrative meetings. Frequently, these meetings are used to review Board and other managerial guidelines to insure that all campuses use the same policies. All hiring, academic, and fiscal practices conform with Board of Regents policies, which are referred to in administrative and governance settings to insure compliance. At the campus level, the planning process insures that decisions and resource allocation are connected with the College's mission and the goals and objectives of the Strategic Plan.

Self Evaluation
Both the former Provost/Chancellor and the current Chancellor have guided institutional improvement through collegial processes, setting appropriate goals and priorities for the College. The Chancellor is committed to establishing a culture of evidence as the basis for decision-making.

Planning Agenda:
• No changes are needed to address the standard.

IV.B.2.d. The president effectively controls budget and expenditures.

Descriptive Summary:
The College obtains its fund through two main sources:

1. General Funds. Allocated by the State Legislature on a biennial basis, this is the major source of funds for salaries and other fixed costs. The Chancellor determines the College's needs and makes his request to the State Legislature through the College President's office.

2. Tuition receipts based upon enrollment. Financial requirements not covered by the General Fund are met with these moneys.
When these two funding sources are not adequate to finance the College’s expenses and initiatives, the Chancellor must undertake efforts to obtain grants, donations, and other funding sources. Both the former Provost/Chancellor and the current Chancellor have expended much of their leadership efforts in the community to raise these additional funds. Indeed, a major portion of the job description for the Chancellor of the College involves fundraising.

The Chancellor, in the 2005-2006 academic year, has undertaken an expanded procedure for obtaining accurate information regarding the College’s budgeting needs. Division Chairs and other campus leaders play a more direct role in determining budget allocation. In particular, all College Units are expected to utilize Program Review as a tool for budget requests, as reflected in the Annual Review process.

**Self Evaluation**

With the College continuing to depend primarily on General Fund revenues for its operations, the Chancellor’s leadership in working with the community, the UH System offices, and the Legislature remains of utmost importance. Regarding budget and expenditures on the Leeward College campus, the Chancellor has taken an active role in efforts in making this process more rational, open, and inclusive of the various Units of the College community. In particular, he has stressed the importance of using the Strategic Plan and Program and Annual Review to determine the College’s budget priorities and allocation. The Annual Review process is a comprehensive mechanism that integrates assessment, planning, and budgeting and includes input from the entire campus community. Implemented in Spring 2006, the first phase of the process resulted in a prioritized list of actions for discussions, involving all four operational areas of the College.

**Planning Agenda**

- The College will implement the second phase of the Annual Review process.

---

**IV.B.2.e. The President works and communicates effectively with the communities served by the institution.**

**Descriptive Summary**

The Chancellor is establishing strong partnerships with the College’s communities through on- and off-campus activities. He invites business and community representatives to the campus to discuss the College’s challenges and the possibility of partnerships, and goes into the community to address and interact with a variety of groups. These include area businesses, current and potential donors, community leaders, institutional partners, and area legislators. The Chancellor also attends a variety of lunches and social functions, networking for possible connections and opportunities for the College. These interactions serve to introduce the College and its resources to the community and to establish dialogue with them.

In the past year, the Chancellor has made formal presentations to groups such as the Kapolei and West Pearl Harbor Rotary Clubs, the Higher Education Committee of the state legislature, US Senator Inouye’s office, and the Waipahu Neighborhood Board. During these presentations, the Chancellor provides an overview of the programs and services offered by the College and asks, “How can the College better serve our community?” After his presentation to the Kapolei
Rotary, several members, including the Vice President of James Campbell Company, one of the largest real estate companies in the state, requested follow-up meetings.

Through meetings and interactions, the Chancellor has established strong working relationships with community partners and businesses, such as NorthStar Scientific, MAO Farms, and the Wai’anae Maritime Academy. During these discussions, a number of initiatives have been proposed and are currently being developed:

- contract training for electronics technicians for NorthStar Scientific
- a new program in food safety with MA’O Farms
- potential connections with Cal Maritime Academy and Wai’anae Maritime Academy

The Chancellor has also attended meetings with the Hawai’i Association for Future Teachers, Oregon State University’s Degree Partnership Summit, and educational units of the University of Hawai’i System, to pursue partnership that will benefit our students.

The Chancellor’s one-on-one meetings with state legislators during the past budget hearings resulted in the inclusion of a line item that had been deleted in earlier drafts of the budget for academic equipment replacement. Based on a partnership with UH-Mānoa, the College also received $50,000 to plan the infrastructure for an Observatory Park on campus.

A final example of the Chancellor’s effectiveness is the campus’ selection by US Senator Inouye’s office as the host campus for the O’ahu component of the Rural Development Program, bringing more than $1 million dollars and two funded positions to help develop workforce development programs for our service area.

When administrative staffing is complete, the Chancellor will have the additional time to expand these vital interactions with the communities.

**Self Evaluation**

The College meets this standard. The Chancellor works closely and effectively with the communities served by the College.

**Planning Agenda**

- No changes are needed to address the standard.
IV.B.3. In multi-college districts or systems the district/system provides primary leadership in setting and communicating expectations of educational excellence and integrity throughout the district/system and assures support for the effective operation of the colleges. It establishes clearly defined roles of authority and responsibility between the colleges and the district/system and acts as the liaison between the colleges and the governing board.

IV.B.3.b. The district/system provides effective services that support the colleges in their missions and functions.

Descriptive Summary
The Office of the Vice President for Community Colleges provides centralized support services in the areas of Administrative Affairs and Academic Affairs. The Associate Vice President for Community Colleges Academic Affairs (AVPCCAA) is responsible for providing leadership in internal operational policy-making that has impact on the development and implementation of Community College system-wide academic plans, goals, objectives, and assessments. The office provides leadership, assistance, and coordination in the areas of 1) Academic Support Services, 2) Academic Planning, Assessment, and Policy Analysis, 3) Career and Technical Education, 4) Student Affairs, and 5) Workforce Development. June 2005 Reorganization Functional Statement: http://www.hawaii.edu/vpaa/system_aa/accreditation/reorg.pdf

The Office of the Associate Vice President for Community Colleges Administrative Affairs (AVPCCADA) is responsible for facilitation and coordination in all aspects of administrative affairs for Community Colleges including budget, human resources, facilities planning and management, and equal opportunity employment/affirmative action. The office provides leadership, assistance, and coordination in the areas of 1) Physical Facilities, Planning and Construction, 2) Budget and Planning, 3) Finance and Operations, 4) Human Resources, and 5) Equal Employment Opportunities/Affirmative Action. The University of Hawai‘i Capital Improvements Projects (CIP) is managed at the System level by the Office of Capital Improvements. The BOR established the Office of Capital Improvements in 2002 to manage major CIP projects on University campuses. Overall Community College repair and maintenance and capital improvement are under the AVPCCADA. Colleges have responsibility for routine maintenance, and health and safety issues. Colleges work with consultants to develop Long Range Development Plans (LRDP), which are used by the system to develop capital improvement plans. June 2005 Reorganization Functional Statement: http://www.hawaii.edu/vpaa/system_aa/accreditation/reorg.pdf

The VPCC is codifying best working practices into policy which are posted to the newly created a Community College website with links to meeting minutes, system-wide initiatives and other resources. UHCC system homepage: http://www.hawaii.edu/offices/cc/index.html

Self Evaluation
The creation of the Office of the VPCC is viewed as a hopeful step in the right direction in terms of creating a system that can effectively provide services to support the Community Colleges in their missions and functions while maintaining the responsibility and accountability for institutional effectiveness and student learning outcomes at the college.
Currently, there are no systematic assessments, other than individual personnel evaluations of administrators that measure the effectiveness of offices in meeting their functional responsibilities.

**Planning Agenda**

- The College will work with the OVPCC to develop methods for evaluating the UHCC System Office.

---

**IV.B.3.c.** The district/system provides fair distribution of resources that are adequate to support the effective operations of the colleges.

---

**Descriptive Summary**

In accordance with State law, the University submits a biennial budget request, program, financial plan, and program performance reports to the Governor and Legislature for consideration by the Legislature when it convenes in regular session in every odd-numbered year. A supplemental budget request to amend any appropriation for the current fiscal biennium may also be submitted to the Legislature for approval when it convenes in regular session in even-numbered years. Operating and Capital Improvement Projects (CIP) funds for the University are appropriated by major organizational units (UH Mānoa, UH Hilo, UH West O‘ahu, UH Community Colleges, System-wide Support, etc). The statutes governing the State of Hawai‘i budget preparation process are primarily reflected under Chapter 37 of the Hawai‘i Revised Statutes, [http://www.capitol.hawaii.gov/hrscurrent/Vol01_Ch0001-0042F/HRS0037/](http://www.capitol.hawaii.gov/hrscurrent/Vol01_Ch0001-0042F/HRS0037/).

The UHCC system office coordinates the budget development and request process for the UHCC system, which is viewed as a single unit in the University of Hawai‘i budget. The budget process is grounded in the strategic plans of the University of Hawai‘i system, the UH Community College System, and the individual College strategic plan. The Community College Strategic Planning Council (SPC) is the primary body for assuring system-wide participation in the UHCC strategic planning process. 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 the Community College. The SPC develops a planning context that identifies system budget request categories/clusters by UHCC Strategic Plan goals and objectives. The Community College Strategic Academic Planning Process is codified in UHCCP 4.101 ([http://www.hawaii.edu/offices/cc/policies.html](http://www.hawaii.edu/offices/cc/policies.html)).

The development process of the college budget request is described earlier in the self study. At the UHCC system level, the seven Community College Chancellors with support from the Associate Vice Presidents and their staff collaboratively review, categorize, and prioritize the individual college budget requests. Although budget details are maintained at the individual college level, the Community College budget is summarized and consolidated at the University of Hawai‘i Community College system level.
All major organizational units participate in the University’s “Stock-taking” process and present budget proposals to the UH System Biennium Budget Advisory Committee (http://www.hawaii.edu/vpaa/vpaa_memo/042106_BienniumBudget.pdf). The “Stock-Taking” process provides periodic status and progress reports on the Community Colleges planning and budget development process. The VPCC and Chancellors give a Stock-Taking presentation that is designed to explain how the UHCC system/college is aligning their mission and strategic, academic, and budget plans. The presentations were requested to address four questions: How can you better meet State needs? How can you increase student participation and success? How will you know when you have succeeded? How will you fund new initiatives? 2007-2009 presentations are posted at Stocktaking Presentations, http://www.hawaii.edu/offices/app/aa/. The Biennium Budget Advisory Committee formulates and submits recommendations to the University Executive Budget Committee. The University Executive Budget Committee formulates a draft system-wide budget proposal, subject to consultation on a system-wide basis, and then submits a recommended biennium budget proposal to the President for consideration. The President reviews the budget proposal, and then submits the recommended budget proposal to the BOR for final approval. The University’s final BOR-approved budget is presented to the Governor and Legislature for consideration and approval. At their discretion, the Governor and Legislature may add budget items to address high priority areas of concern of the State.

Although position counts and funding are appropriated by the Legislature at the University’s major organizational level (Community College System), details on decisions related to individual campus budget requests are provided on Legislative worksheets. The practice of the UHCC system has been to appropriate college funds in accordance with Legislative Intent. While State general funds provide the most significant funding resource for the colleges, other funding resources (e.g. Special funds, Revolving funds, Extramural Funds, UH Foundation, etc.) are also generated and retained by each college.

The VPCC, in consultation with the Council of Community College Chancellors, has begun discussions on how to allocate UHCC system resources based on program review. In the current legislative session, the University of Hawai‘i Community Colleges requested funds and positions to directly support accreditation program review/assessment processes at the campuses, as well as flexible resources to differentially allocate across the colleges according to the needs identified in the program review process. UHCC Legislative Request Jan 2006: http://www.hawaii.edu/offices/eaur/govrel/briefings/2006/uoah800_cc_wam_fin_briefing_011206.pdf. Although the request was only partially funded, it provided resources to consider a limited allocation of resources at the UHCC system level that will be based on a system-wide program review process.

The Vice President for Community Colleges has functional responsibility for providing a fair distribution of resources that are adequate to support the effective operations of the Community Colleges. June 2005 Reorganization Functional Statement: http://www.hawaii.edu/vpaa/system_aa/accreditation/reorg.pdf. The Vice President’s work is reviewed by the President for results and effectiveness.
Self Evaluation

The UHCC planning and resource allocation process has broad system-wide participation and is grounded in the various levels of strategic planning. The UHCC system is considering an equitable process with alternatives for the allocation of limited resources based upon program review, while maintaining campus appropriations based on Legislative intent.

Planning Agenda

- The Office of the VPCC, working with the Community Colleges Council of Chancellors, will develop a documented process for allocating specified resources based upon program review at the UHCC system level.

IV.B.3.d. The district/system effectively controls its expenditures.

Descriptive Summary

The statutes governing the State of Hawai‘i budget execution process are primarily reflected under Chapter 37 of the Hawai‘i Revised Statutes: [http://www.capitol.hawaii.gov/hrscurrent/Vo101_Ch0001-0042F/HRS0037/]. As required by State law, the University implements the budget execution process as provided in the Governor’s Budget Execution Policies (available in the Office of the VPCC). While the University is exempt from some of the special requirements set forth in the instructions, the primary fund allocation and control processes are maintained as required. The maintenance of allocations, ceilings, quarterly allotments, Form A-19 approval process, etc., provide appropriate monitoring, controls, and safeguards in the budget executive process.

The Financial Management Information System (FMIS) of the University of Hawai‘i was implemented on July 1, 1996 and provides the basic mechanism to monitor and control the financial resources of the University of Hawai‘i. FMIS assures observance of legal requirements, aids in the exercise of budgetary and management controls, and provides financial information pertaining to the various functions of the University. FMIS is designed to adhere to Federal, State, and University requirements; address management information needs; and comply with accounting principles for colleges and universities. ([UH Administrative Procedures Accounting General, http://www.hawaii.edu/apis/apm/a8600.html](http://www.hawaii.edu/apis/apm/a8600.html))

The quarterly allotment (Form A-19) monitoring and control requirements are programmed in FMIS with transactions edit rejections currently maintained at the campus/fund level. A separate project based, expenditure category, “contracts and grants” module is in place to administer these types of funds. Other funds (e.g. endowments, agency, bond, financial aid, etc.) are also maintained and controlled as appropriate under FMIS.

The VPCC has functional responsibility for ensuring that the Community College system effectively controls its expenditures. [June 2005 Reorganization Functional Statement: http://www.hawaii.edu/vpaa/system_aa/accreditation/reorg.pdf](http://www.hawaii.edu/vpaa/system_aa/accreditation/reorg.pdf). The Vice President’s work is reviewed by the President for results and effectiveness.
**Self Evaluation**
The College meets the standard. The financial system and the policies and procedures in place sufficiently ensure that the system controls its expenditures.

**Planning Agenda**
- No changes are needed to address this standard.

**IV.B.3.e.** The chancellor gives full responsibility and authority to the presidents of the colleges to implement and administer delegated district/system policies without the chancellor’s interference and holds them accountable for the operation of the colleges.

**Descriptive Summary**
The 2005 reorganization of the President’s office, the creation of the Office of the Vice President for Community Colleges, and the realigning of functions established a new organizational infrastructure for the University of Hawai‘i system of Community Colleges while retaining the integrity of the individually accredited colleges. In the June 2005 presentation to the BOR, the President stated, “the new Vice President for Community Colleges will be responsible for Community College-related system policies, resource allocation within the Community Colleges, and central service and support for the seven Community Colleges.” When asked who would control the funding at each of the Community Colleges, the President responded that, “funding would be influenced by the Vice President's decision but campus operations and management would be the responsibility of the Chancellors. The decision as to how the money is distributed to each of the campuses ultimately would rest with the University President.” BOR Minutes June 2005: [http://www.hawaii.edu/offices/bor/regular/minute/20050621.regular.pdf](http://www.hawaii.edu/offices/bor/regular/minute/20050621.regular.pdf).

Community College Chancellors have authority and leadership responsibility for the immediate operation, management, administration, and governance of their campuses within BOR governing and Presidential administrative policy.


The position description of a Chancellor (GE102) gives full responsibility and authority to the chancellor for all administrative and academic matters of the campus.


The Vice President for Community Colleges has functional responsibility ensuring that Community College chancellors have full responsibility and authority to implement and administer delegated system policies without interference and holds the chancellors accountable for the operation of the colleges. The Vice President evaluates Community College Chancellors. June 2005 Reorganization Functional Statement: [http://www.hawaii.edu/vpaa/system_aa/accreditation/reorg.pdf](http://www.hawaii.edu/vpaa/system_aa/accreditation/reorg.pdf). The Vice President’s work is reviewed by the President of the University for results and effectiveness.
**Self Evaluation**
The polices and procedures of the University give full responsibility and authority to the chancellors to implement and administer delegated district/system polices without interference and holds them accountable for the operation of the college.

The current (2003) Chancellor description (GE102) does not include the dual reporting to the President and VPCC reflecting the June 2005 Reorganization.

**Planning Agenda**
- The College will work with the OVPCC to review and revise the Chancellor position description to reflect the dual reporting to the President and VPCC.

---

**IV.B.3.f.** The district/system acts as the liaison between the colleges and the governing board. The district/system and the colleges use effective methods of communication, and they exchange information in a timely manner.

**Descriptive Summary**

The VPCC serves as an Administrative Representative to the BOR Community College Standing Committee. When presentations regarding the Community College System are made to the standing committee or to the full BOR, it is the VPCC who speaks for the system (November 2005 and April 2006 BOR Standing Committee minutes, full BOR minutes, [http://www.hawaii.edu/offices/bor/](http://www.hawaii.edu/offices/bor/)). Items forwarded to the BOR for approval, such as College Strategic Plans and College Self Studies are forwarded under the signature of the VPCC. The functional road map provides more detail. Functional Roadmap: [http://www.hawaii.edu/vpaa/system_aa/accreditation/UHCC_Map_of_College-System_Functions_05_08_06.pdf](http://www.hawaii.edu/vpaa/system_aa/accreditation/UHCC_Map_of_College-System_Functions_05_08_06.pdf).

The VPCC is a member of the President’s executive council as well as a member on the 10-campus Council of Chancellors. The VPCC convenes regular meetings of the seven campus Council of Community College Chancellors.

[UHCC Council Chancellors Minutes](http://www.hawaii.edu/vpaa/system_aa/cccc.htm)

**Self Evaluation**
By position description and functional organization, the Office of the VPCC acts as liaison between the Community Colleges and the BOR. However, the July 2005 organization is not reflected in all University policies and procedures.

**Planning Agenda**
- The College will work with the OVPCC and UH system to review and revise written policies and procedures to reflect the 2005 Reorganization
## Organization Documents and Websites

### Standard I

2007–09 College Plan
- **Web**: [http://emedia.leeward.hawaii.edu/cs/planning/budget/](http://emedia.leeward.hawaii.edu/cs/planning/budget/)
- **Print**: following Evidence List, page 462 and Evidence Room

- **Web**: [http://emedia.leeward.hawaii.edu/cs/planning/](http://emedia.leeward.hawaii.edu/cs/planning/)
- **Print**: Evidence Room

### Standard II

- **Web**: [http://emedia.leeward.hawaii.edu/cs/planning/](http://emedia.leeward.hawaii.edu/cs/planning/)
- **Print**: Evidence Room

CCCM #11100, February 1, 1994: Guidelines for Borrowing Library Materials

Hawai‘i Library Consortium (HLC) Bylaws

*Leeward CC 2005-2006 Catalog*
- **Web**: [http://www.lcc.hawaii.edu/catalog](http://www.lcc.hawaii.edu/catalog)
- **Print**: Evidence Room

Leeward CC Learning Resource Center
- **Web**: [http://emedia.leeward.hawaii.edu/lrc/](http://emedia.leeward.hawaii.edu/lrc/)

Leeward CC Library
- **Web**: [http://www.lcc.hawaii.edu/lib/](http://www.lcc.hawaii.edu/lib/)

*Policy on Program Reviews* (2005)
- **Web**: [http://home.lcc.hawaii.edu/docs/policies](http://home.lcc.hawaii.edu/docs/policies)
- **Print**: Evidence Room

*Report on Program Reviews & Support Area Reviews*, Sept. 2004
- **Print**: Evidence Room

Results of the 2004 and 2005 Assessments

University of Hawai‘i Library Council Bylaws
**Standard III**

360 Assessment document print Evidence Room

*Academic Development Plan (ADP) 1996-2002*
web http://documents.leeward.hawaii.edu:8080/docushare/dsweb/View/Collection-1020
print Evidence Room

Act 115 (See Session Laws of Hawai‘i 1998, as codified in chapter 304, Hawai‘i Revised Statutes.)

Board of Regents Policies, Section 9-14, Executive/Managerial (E/M) Personnel Policies
web: http://www.hawaii.edu/offices/bor/policy/index.html

Board of Regents Policies, Section 9-14, Part IV (Conditions of Service)
web http://www.hawaii.edu/offices/bor/policy/index.html

Board of Regents Policies, Section 9-15 (Evaluation of Board of Regents Appointees), October 16, 1981
web http://www.hawaii.edu/offices/bor/policy/index.html

Chancellor for Community Colleges Memorandum, CCCM 7200
Faculty Evaluation Procedure, March 19, 1982

Committee for Learning Resources and Information Technology
web http://emedia.leeward.hawaii.edu/clrit/

DocuShare site
web http://documents.leeward.hawaii.edu:8080/docushare/dsweb/HomePage

Educational Media Center
web http://emedia.leeward.hawaii.edu/emc

Educational Media Center Assessment
web http://emedia.leeward.hawaii.edu/clrit/3_year_plan/EMC_Plan.pdf

web http://www.svpa.hawaii.edu/svpa/ep/e9/e9203.pdf

*Guidelines for Tenure and Promotion University of Hawai‘i Community Colleges 2005-06*
web http://home.lcc.hawaii.edu/docs/faculty

Information Technology Group
web http://emedia.leeward.hawaii.edu/itg
Kākoʻo ‘Ike Office
web http://emedia.leeward.hawaii.edu/kiprogram/

Leeward CC Learning Resource Center
web http://emedia.leeward.hawaii.edu/lrc/

Leeward CC Learning Resource Center Assessment
web http://emedia.leeward.hawaii.edu/clrit/3_year_plan/LRC_plan.pdf/

Leeward CC Library
web http://www.lcc.hawaii.edu/lib/

Leeward CC Library Assessment
web http://emedia.leeward.hawaii.edu/clrit/3_year_plan/Library_Plan.pdf

Long Range Development Plan (LRDP)
print Director of Administrative Services Office

Policy on Program Reviews
web http://home.lcc.hawaii.edu/docs/policies

UH AP A9.300, Position descriptions for Civil Service employees of the University
web http://www.hawaii.edu/svpa/apm/pers/a9300.pdf

UH AP A9.540, Recruitment and Selection of Faculty
and Administrative, Professional and Technical (APT) Personnel
web http://www.hawaii.edu/svpa/apm/pers/a9540.pdf

UH AP 9.210, Classification and Compensation Plan APT Personnel
web http://www.hawaii.edu/svpa/apm/pers/a9210.pdf

UHCC May 1, 2001 memorandum entitled
“Revised Faculty Minimum Qualifications and Salary Placement Guidelines
print Evidence Room

University of Hawai‘i Community College Contract Renewal Suggested Guidelines
web http://home.lcc.hawaii.edu/docs/faculty
print Evidence Room

University of Hawai‘i Strategic Plan for Information Technology 2002-2010

University of Hawai‘i System Strategic Plan 1997-2007
print Evidence Room

University of Hawai‘i Community Colleges Strategic Plan 1997-2007
print Evidence Room
University of Hawai'i: Systemwide Administrative Procedures Manual
web  http://www.svpa.hawaii.edu/svpa/apm/sysap.html

Standard IV
Board of Regents (BOR) website
web  http://www.hawaii.edu/offices/bor/

BOR Meeting Minutes Nov 2002
web  http://www.hawaii.edu/offices/bor/regular/minute/20021122.regular.html

BOR “Orientation Manual.”
web  http://www.hawaii.edu/offices/bor/regular/minute/20040902.special.pdf

BOR Policy Chapter 2, Evaluation of the President
web  http://www.hawaii.edu/offices/bor/policy/index.html

BOR Policy Chapters 4 and 5, Planning and Evaluation Policies
web  http://www.hawaii.edu/offices/bor/policy/borpch5.pdf

Campus Council, Charters and By Laws (September 28, 2000)
web  http://home.lcc.hawaii.edu/docs/govern/

Faculty Senate Charter and By-Laws (October 15, 1999)
web  http://emedia.leeward.hawaii.edu/senate/charter.html

Community College Standing Committee BOR CC Committee
web  http://www.hawaii.edu/offices/bor/cc/

Constitutional Amendment UH Autonomy
web  http://www.capitol.hawaii.gov/hrscurrent/Vol05_Cho261-0319/HRS0304/HRS_0304-0004.HTM

Membership on the BOR, State Law (Chapter 304-3, Hawai'i Revised Statutes - §304-3)

UHCC System Reorganization Functional Statement, June 2005
web  http://www.hawaii.edu/vpaa/system_aa/accreditation/reorg.pdf

State's Sunshine Law
web  http://www.capitol.hawaii.gov/hrscurrent/Vol02_Ch0046-0115/HRS0092/HRS_0092-.HTM

Stocktaking Presentations
web  http://www.hawaii.edu/offices/app/aa/
Administrative Procedures Manual
web http://www.svpa.hawaii.edu/svpa/apm/sysap.html

UH Biennium Budget Committee
web http://www.hawaii.edu/vpaa/vpaa_memo/042106_BienniumBudget.pdf

Hawai‘i Budget Preparation Statutes
web http://www.capitol.hawaii.gov/hrscurrent/Vol01_Ch0001-0042F/HRS0037/

UHCC Legislative Request Jan 2006

University of Hawai‘i Community Colleges Strategic Academic Planning (4.101)
web http://www.hawaii.edu/offices/cc/policies.html Select 4.101
pdf http://www.hawaii.edu/offices/cc/docs/policies/UHCCP_4.101_CC_Strategic_Academic_Planning.pdf

VPCC Position Description
pdf http://www.hawaii.edu/ohr/bor/classpdf/cc100.pdf

University of Hawai‘i Community Colleges Functional Roadmap
web http://www.hawaii.edu/vpaa/system_aa/accreditation/UHCC_Map_of_College_System_Functions_05_08_06.pdf

UHCC Council Chancellors Minutes
web http://www.hawaii.edu/vpaa/system_aa/cccc.html

UH President’s System Level Reorganization--Community Colleges, June 2005
web http://www.hawaii.edu/vpaa/posts/053105-signed-cc-reorg.pdf

University of Hawai‘i Community Colleges Strategic Plan 2002-2010

Leeward CC Reorganization Proposal
web http://home.lcc.hawaii.edu/docs/reorg
print evidence Room

Leeward CC Assessment Documents
web http://documents.leeward.hawaii.edu:8080/docushare/dsweb/View/Collection-14

Leeward CC Program Review
web http://emedia.leeward.hawaii.edu/cs/ProgReview/

Website for Revisit of Leeward CC’s Mission
web http://emedia.leeward.hawaii.edu/sp/evidence.htm
Dialogue

to engage in inclusive, informed, and intentional dialogue
to purposefully guide institutional change
to participate in reflection and exchange about institutional quality
to achieve ongoing self-reflection and conscious improvement

discussing student learning and institutional effectiveness
The standards are designed to facilitate college engagement in inclusive, informed, and intentional dialogue about institutional quality and improvement. The dialogue should purposefully guide institutional change. All members of the college community should participate in this reflection and exchange about student achievement, student learning, and the effectiveness of its processes, policies, and organization. For the dialogue to have its intended effect, it should be based on reliable information about the college’s programs and services and evidence on how well the institution is meeting student needs. Information should be quantitative and qualitative, responsive to a clear inquiry, meaningfully interpreted, and broadly communicated. The institutional dialogue should result in ongoing self-reflection and conscious improvement.
**Standard I Institutional Mission and Effectiveness**

I.A.I. The institution establishes student learning programs and services aligned with its purposes, its character, and its student population.

**Descriptive Summary**

The development and subsequent revisions of Leeward Community College’s mission have been based on broad-based and extensive dialogue that resulted in a collective understanding of the institution’s purpose and how it intends to serve its communities. The major sources of information that were used as the basis for informed discussions throughout the entire campus included the following:

- demographic changes: geographic shifts favoring population growth in this region, age-related factors projecting potential numbers of students over the next decade; urban vs. rural populations, race, culture, and first language;
- socioeconomic changes: changing job outlooks, occupational trends, underserved populations, access to postsecondary education, increased urbanization, shifts in the economic base of the communities;
- student characteristics: long-term assessments of all entering students’ goals, needs, and readiness in math and writing, obtained during the pre-registration period prior to each semester.

Leeward Community College’s current mission statement, adopted by the campus and approved by the Board of Regents in 2004, was developed through meetings and discussions with input from representatives of the Administration, Staff, and Faculty of the College. The Accreditation Evidence website provides evidence of the extensive dialogue that occurred during the revision process. The current mission organizes the purpose of the institution in six broad principles: access, learning and teaching, work force development, personal development, community development, and diversity. The mission statement was later amended within a year to include a sentence that emphasized the college’s commitment to student learning. The amended mission was approved by the Faculty Senate and Campus Council in 2005 and is currently awaiting approval by the Board of Regents in Fall 2006.

The *Leeward Community College Strategic Plan 2002-2010* was developed through similar informed and inclusive dialogue as was the mission and serves as the major planning document for the campus. The *Strategic Plan*, through its goals, objectives, and action plans, describes in detail how the College intends to implement the statements embodied in its mission in measurable ways. At the time of its adoption, the College agreed to revisit the *Strategic Plan* on a yearly basis. Prior to each revisit, the co-coordinators of the *Strategic Plan* met with each individual who had implemented an action plan during the previous year to track its progress and assessment. The results of these informal dialogues were summarized and reported as a means of informing the campus of the diverse ways by which student needs were being addressed.

Ongoing dialogue led to the development and adoption of the *Policy on Unit/Area Program Reviews* in Spring 2003 and its subsequent revision in Spring 2005. ([http://home.lcc.hawaii.edu/docs/policies](http://home.lcc.hawaii.edu/docs/policies)) The overall focus of the *Program Review* process is the systematic collection of data from which the College can assess, make improvements, and determine resource needs.
allocations in support of student learning. The process is designed to ensure quality through continuous improvements in the institution's educational programs, and to determine how well student and community needs are met. Program Review is intended to establish a culture of evidence that provides data for decision-making.

The experiences gained during assessment of courses, programs and Support Areas prompted changes for improvement in the process. Extensive discussions during Fall 2004 and all of 2005 led to the development and implementation of the Annual Review process in Spring 2006. Annual Review at Leeward is a comprehensive planning process that is intended to integrate assessment, planning for improvement, and budgeting. Annual Review relies on inclusive dialogue that focuses on the analysis of data provided by the program reviews of student learning and institutional effectiveness from all units within the College. The process provides a mechanism for focused discussions connecting assessment with standards of good practice; requires all segments of the College to discuss their strengths, weaknesses, opportunities, and threats; and uses this information to arrive at a prioritized planning list that serves as the basis for the College’s annual budget request.

Self Evaluation
Through dialogue, the College has taken into account internal and external factors that define the College’s purpose of supporting student learning, as described in its mission. The institution’s Strategic Plan is driven by the mission and states the goals, objectives, and
action plans that guide its programs and services in addressing the needs of its students and community. The Program Review and Annual Review processes are rooted in ongoing, extensive dialogue that informs the campus about the College’s efforts toward meeting student learning needs and provides the College with a comprehensive evaluation of its efforts regarding student learning outcomes and institutional effectiveness.

Planning Agenda
• No changes are needed to address this standard.

I.A.2. The mission statement is approved by the governing board and published.

Descriptive Summary
The purposes of the earlier revision of the mission statement in 2003 were to accomplish the following:

• align with the current mission statements of the UH System, UH Community Colleges, and Board of Regents and State of Hawai‘i policy and law relating to missions;
• embrace the goals of the current Strategic Plans of Leeward CC, of the UH Community Colleges, and of the UH system; and
• meet the requirements of the new Accreditation Standards of the ACCJC.

The revision of the mission statement was discussed at length between April 8, 2003 and Feb. 26, 2004, first in committee and finally in the Faculty Senate and Campus Council. Evidence of the extensive dialogue that occurred during the development of the revised mission is provided by a chronology of events at http://emedia.leeward.hawaii.edu/sp/evidence.htm

The College’s self-study, based on the ACCJC Accreditation Standards (adopted in 2002), led the campus to realize that Leeward’s commitment to, and emphasis on, student learning should be directly stated in the College’s mission. An amendment proposal was publicized to the campus at large and feedback was requested. The Campus Council and Faculty Senate approved the revision in 2005, and it is expected that the Board of Regents will approve this amendment in Fall 2006.

Self Evaluation
Although Leeward CC’s mission statement as published the College’s annual catalog reflects some modifications, primarily for aesthetic reasons, the changes were not substantive until 2003. For undetermined reasons, the mission statement printed in the 2003-2004 catalog included statements that were not the result of a college-wide consensus and remained that way until its revision. In the Fall of 2003, the former Provost/Chancellor formally charged a representative group comprised of a student representative, faculty, staff, and administrators to revise the College’s mission. This group involved the entire College in both formal and informal meetings concerning the mission statement. This extensive dialogue took place via e-meetings, the College Leadership Retreat, Campus-wide Open Forums, Mission Statement Committee meetings, meetings with the former Provost/Chancellor, meetings with the executive committees of the Campus Council and Faculty Senate, meetings of the entire Faculty Senate,
and distribution of the amended mission statement to the entire campus. The revised mission was adopted by the College and approved by the BOR in Spring 2004.

**Planning Agenda**
• The College will establish and follow guidelines that are based on inclusive dialogue in future revisions of the mission.

---

**I.A.4.** The institution’s mission is central to institutional planning and decision making.

**Descriptive Summary**
Leeward’s *Strategic Plan (SP)* embodies and details the College’s mission statement and is the central document that guides institutional planning and decision-making. The former Provost/Chancellor wrote in his introduction, “Our *Strategic Plan* provides a blueprint that is guided by the visions of the communities we serve.” The history of the current *Strategic Plan* is one of dialogue and collaboration. Beginning in May 2001, an Ad Hoc Committee for Pre-Planning the *Strategic Plan* was created, and faculty, staff, administration, and students were invited to contribute their mana‘o (thoughts) to the creation of the *Plan*. Comprised of more than twelve members from all Divisions, the Ad Hoc Committee solicited input from the campus and the community. More in-depth conversation on the *Strategic Plan* took place in August 2001 at the Leadership Retreat, and at the College’s 2001 Convocation, the former Provost/Chancellor invited participation in the planning process. Through the fall of that year, subcommittees such as the Trends and the Strategic Plan Steering Committees met weekly; and over the winter, Divisions met to discuss the *Plan*. In April and May of 2002, a draft of the *Strategic Plan* was completed, with the provision that the *Plan* be revisited annually.

The adoption of the *Strategic Plan* by the campus and its approval by the Board of Regents initiated an annual cycle of the implementation, assessment, and evaluation, followed by changes for improvement and prioritization during each revisit. The process continued to evolve with the implementation of the College’s *Program Review* process in 2004. The annual revisit of the *Strategic Plan* in 2005 incorporated additional changes as the entire campus was actively involved in a systematic assessment of their efforts. The first involved the requirement that all action plans be based on the assessment of student learning as the College was actively engaged in program, Support Area, and course assessments. The second change called for action plans to be divided among four categories: Capital Improvement Projects (CIP), Full Time Equivalent positions (FTE), and Academic, Professional, and Technical (APT) positions, and non-recurring items. A popular vote was still used to obtain campus-wide input, and the administrative team decided upon the final prioritization after consultation with Division and Unit Heads. An evaluation of this process prompted the campus to refine its planning and budgeting cycle to better meet its new *Program Review* model.

As described in the response to Standard I.A.1., College leadership worked continuously from Fall 2004 to Summer 2005 to develop a more comprehensive approach to integrate assessment, planning, and budgeting. The result was the *Annual Review* process. In August 2005, the current Chancellor presented a template for the process to the Administrative Staff, the Assessment Team, participants in the College’s Leadership Retreat, and the campus as a whole at Convocation. The *Annual Review* process is intended to provide the College with a comprehensive planning process that is inclusive, data-based, and collegial.
Student Learning and Achievement

Describe major actions taken as a result of assessments. (IIA.2.e, f) What has been learned from assessments? What plans are there for changes in the future?

What evidence do you have that students actually are achieving your stated learning outcomes?

Discuss the success of your students when they transfer and the degree to which your division is meeting the learning and employment needs of students (IIA.1a, b).

Discuss how the division approaches class scheduling to meet student needs and the level of student demand for course offerings. (IIA1a, b)
As the *Annual Review* Division Template and diagrams on the preceding page show, the Divisions use the tool for focused discussions informed by SLO and student achievement data, SWOT (strengths, weaknesses, opportunities, threats) analysis and are guided by questions derived from ACCJC standards. The resulting Division/Unit plans are then consolidated by discussions among representatives of the four major Units of the College, resulting in a prioritized planning list that is used as the basis of the College budget proposal. The *College Plan* provides evidence that dialogue is being translated into action (see page 462).

The second phase of the *Annual Review* process focuses on the continued assessment and refinement of planning and budgeting activities. To involve more of a cross section of the campus in the dialogue, the second phase calls for the creation of Phase II committees that focus on the areas such as: Space Allocation and Use, Staffing, Information Technology, External Issues and Equipment.

These committees will discuss the planning lists resulting from *Program Reviews* and will recommend priorities, based on their area of expertise. The prioritized lists will be submitted to the Executive Planning Committee, composed of the Faculty Senate and Campus Council Executive Committees, the Deans of Arts and Sciences, Career and Technical Education, and Academic Support, and the Director of Administrative Services and Vice Chancellor.

**Self Evaluation**

Extensive dialogue that occurred among individuals, instructional Divisions, and Support Areas/Units was basis of the development of the College’s mission, its *Strategic Plan*, and the *Program and Annual Review* processes. Broad-based collaboration and constant feedback has been an integral part of the institution’s planning and decision-making processes.

**Planning Agenda**

- The new *Program Review* and *Annual Review* processes will be monitored to insur that the mission is central to all decision-making. Changes needed in these processes will ensure that activities to improve student learning and assessment of that learning are appropriately budgeted.
I.B. Improving Institutional Effectiveness

The institution demonstrates a conscious effort to produce and support student learning, measures that learning, assesses how well learning is occurring, and makes changes to improve student learning. The institution also organizes its key processes and allocates its resources to effectively support student learning. The institution demonstrates its effectiveness by providing 1) evidence of the achievement of student learning outcomes and 2) evidence of institution and program performance. The institution uses ongoing and systematic evaluation and planning to refine its key processes and improve student learning.

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

Descriptive Summary

The College has relied on inclusive, ongoing dialogue to develop all of its major policies and practices. The development and revision of its mission, Strategic Plan, and Program and Annual Review processes were based on both informal and intentional discussions, as described in Standard I.A.1. and I.A.4. Additional evidence is provided by the following.

The Policy on Program Reviews (rev. 2005) states as objectives eight points, of which two explicitly address the matter of dialogue as the means to understanding and improving student learning and institutional processes:

2. To promote campus dialogue necessary for the continued exchange of ideas and identification of improvements.

4. To create an avenue for changes and improvements that leads to budget and allocation decisions.

The Program Review model focuses on the College’s degree programs, including the Associate of Arts (AA), Associate of Science (AS) and the Associate of Applied Science (AAS) degrees, as well as on the Support Areas. A major component of Program Review involves assessing Student Learning Outcomes (SLOs) in degree programs and courses. These SLOs have been and are discussed in forums large and small. AA Degree General Education assessment focuses on written and oral communication, quantitative reasoning, critical and abstract thinking, and information retrieval. Baseline measures in each of these areas were collected in Spring 2004 and assessment results were part of ongoing dialogues among those who participated in the assessments, as well as with the College’s Assessment Team. As most efforts run across the curriculum, a rich dialogue among teachers from various disciplines has resulted. Assessment of student writing, for example, is in its fifth cycle, with representation on the committee from all Divisions, from Support Units, and from Administration. The results include increased understanding of our expectations of our students and our role in supporting their writing development.

Throughout the school year, various workshops and working sessions have been provided for faculty and staff to talk about the processes of teaching and learning in the institution. Among these sessions were the following:
Five “Dialogue Sessions” held in Spring 2004 (Feb. 19-Apr. 8) examined student learning, the strategic plan, assessment, and designing and assessing student learning outcomes.

At Convocation on January 4, 2005, four dialogue sessions focused on two topics: revision to Leeward’s AA degree core curriculum and a proposal for reorganization. A total of 59 people attended these sessions, about two-thirds of them faculty, and also including Administration, Student Support Services, Academic Support, Clerical, and (provide spelled out first) APT.

Also at Convocation in January 2005, all participants grouped with other members of their discipline to brainstorm on SLO’s, existing and suggested, relative to critical thinking for classes in their Divisions. The goal of this collaborative exercise was to sketch out “curriculum grids,” graphic representations that show the relationship between course and General Education student learning outcomes.

Weekly workshops held on Fridays during 2005-2006 called “TGIF for New Faculty” brought faculty and staff together to discuss issues such as classroom teaching techniques, technology resources, and course assessment techniques. An average of 10 people per session attended these workshops, including faculty, academic support staff, student services staff, clerical services, APTs, and administration.

GIFT, the Great Ideas for Teaching Day, on March 4, 2005, brought together 85 faculty and staff, representing every Division and Support Unit on campus to share ideas in an informal day-long setting.

SAGE workshops focused on what moves students to learn and what barriers exist to their learning. In a subsequent workshop, faculty and staff from all community colleges in the state brainstormed and learned how to reach students more effectively.

“Solving the Retention Puzzle” brought together faculty and staff from Leeward CC and UH West O’ahu to clarify the problems that cause students to leave school and to strategize ways to solve those problems.

“Teaching Squares” groups interested faculty into sets of three or four to observe and spread good teaching ideas and methods.

Course, program, and Support Area SLO assessments prompted continuous and widespread discussions within and among individual faculty and Units throughout the College. In addition, formal and intentional dialogue was prompted by meetings of the College’s Assessment Team with each of the groups that completed the first round of assessment, with a focus on the evaluation of the assessment tools used and an analysis of the data obtained. The dialogue continues, as the Program and Course Assessment Coordinators meet with each instructional and support units to increase understanding of assessment. The Annual Review process, now required of all segments of the College, relies on use of assessment data and dialogue to design planning lists for improvement and to develop the College’s annual and biennial budgets.

Self Evaluation
Through dialogue the Colleges continues to refine its policies and practices to improve student learning. Under the provisions of the Annual Review process, assessments of student learning inform discussions about the strengths, weaknesses, opportunities and threats in
each instructional Division and Support Area. An evaluation of these factors informs every segment of the College of its performance level. Planning lists for improvement derived from these analyses are further discussed, consolidated, and prioritized at combined meetings of all Division/Unit heads and administrators. These prioritized planning lists are then incorporated in the College’s supplemental and biennium budget requests.

Planning Agenda

• Administrators will develop a clear policy and timeline describing the elements, connection, and assessment of Program Review, Annual Review, and supplemental and biennium budget requests. A document illustrating the history of each prioritized item will be published and distributed prior to the start of the academic year.

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.

Descriptive Summary

The goals, objectives, and action plans of Leeward’s Strategic Plan are based on the mission of the College and were arrived at through many months of dialogue that occurred at all levels of the College. Objectives to support those goals were carried through via action plans that were presented to the campus community and prioritized each spring since 2003. As an indication of the extent of participation in this process, there were more than a hundred action plans that were proposed to achieve the objectives of the Strategic Plan at the time of its adoption in 2002 and remained at this level until after the 2004 revisit. Informal discussions and open forums were the means by which the campus was informed about these proposed actions before a campus-wide voting process was used to prioritize them. Up until 2004, none of the priorities resulting from the action plans that required allocation of general funds were implemented due to the lack of funds. However, many new initiatives that did not depend on funds from the College’s operational budget were implemented, leading to improvement of institutional effectiveness. These action plans were tracked and their impact on student learning was reported to the campus each year by the co-coordinators of Strategic Plan. In the 2004 revisit of the SP, three action plans out of a hundred emerged as top priorities: a full-time faculty position as Job Developer for the College’s Job Placement Office, a position devoted to planning and assessment, and assigned time for two faculty members to plan and carry through speech assessment across the curriculum and an online writing assessment. The request for the new positions was incorporated the College’s budget request for the upcoming year and funds for assigned time were obtained by reallocation of the existing budget.

The number of action plans decreased by about half during the 2005 and 2006 revisits as the College implemented its Program Review process and stipulated that all action plans be based on the assessment of student learning and/or institutional effectiveness. As in the previous revisits formal and informal dialogue served as the basis for information leading to prioritization.
Self Evaluation
Although resources have been limited, where possible, prioritized action plans have been supported and have led to improvement of institutional effectiveness via Leeward’s process for the prioritization of action items used up until 2005. However, concerns about the prioritization process and its limited success in securing additional funds for improvement led to its replacement with a process based on Academic Divisions and Support Areas relying upon evidence and assessment-driven discussions. The implementation of Annual Review has provided a set of interactive engagements that more accurately link assessment with planning and allocation as shown as College Plan that was used as the basis of the College’s latest budget request. (See page 462, “College Plan.”) The resulting process is broad-based and offers opportunities for input by faculty, staff, and administrators.

Planning Agenda
• As with previous prioritizing process, the Annual Review process will be assessed and changes for improvement made as needed.
Standard II: Student Learning Programs and Services

II.A. Instructional Programs

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.

Descriptive Summary

Leeward CC provided instruction to approximately 6000 students each semester of the 2005-2006 academic year. Day and evening instructional programs are planned each year that include credit and non-credit options to serve a diverse student body. Dialogues about appropriate delivery systems and modes of instruction occur at the College, Division, and Discipline levels. In Spring 2004, for example, the College engaged in five campus-wide dialogue sessions about student learning, the design and assessment of student learning outcomes, and the benefits of different modes of instruction. Weekly workshops for faculty, like TGIF and Great Ideas for Teaching (GIFT) have brought faculty together to discuss teaching techniques, resources, and assessment.

The Annual Review process requires Divisions and Disciplines to review their delivery systems and modes of instruction, as well as their objectives of the their curriculum. Dialogue has occurred informally and as part of the Annual Review about technology-mediated and hybrid courses to meet the needs of Leeward students. The Annual Review includes looking at Division strengths, weaknesses, threats and opportunities in meeting student needs. Data from sources such as the Research Report on the Needs of Incoming Students Fall 2005 (Rossi, 2005) as well as other sources can be included in these discussions.

The course assessment/review process requires Discipline faculty to discuss the modes of instruction and their appropriateness for the course. This includes discussion of the various delivery systems by which the course is taught.

Self Evaluation

Appropriate dialogue has occurred about modes of instruction and delivery systems as they relate to the needs of students.

Planning Agenda

• No changes are needed to meet this 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 the results to make improvements.

**Descriptive Summary**
Student learning outcomes for individual courses are designed through dialogue by faculty who teach those courses. Each of the six major Divisions has various Disciplines within them, and each Discipline is responsible for the creation of student learning outcomes and appropriate assessments of these outcomes for each of their courses. Student learning outcomes for degree programs like the AA are based upon UHCC System agreements that are the result of dialogue involving faculty from all campuses. The student learning outcomes for other programs were developed in a process that included program faculty and advisory committee members.

Six open workshops were held in the Spring 2005 to help faculty identify and assess SLOs for their courses. *A Handbook on Outcomes Assessment for Two-year Colleges* (by Edward Morante) was provided at these workshops to help give faculty the tools necessary to identify and assess student learning outcomes.

Discipline and program faculty have engaged in dialogue as part of the assessment process required for course assessment, Program Review, and Annual Review processes. Course SLO assessment is currently being implemented, and Disciplines have begun the process of dialogue about the results of these assessments, and ways to use the results to make improvements.

**Self Evaluation**
Significant dialogue on identifying and assessing SLOs has taken place in individual Discipline meetings, and within Divisions as part of the Annual Review process. The completed course assessment revisions of core course outlines can be found on Curriculum Central, and course SLO assessment results can be obtained from the Course Assessment Coordinator.

Substantial evidence exists that dialogue has guided the assessment of student learning outcomes in Leeward’s degree programs. Program/Support Area reviews (2005) are available at the College’s DocuShare site at http://documents.leeward.hawaii.edu:8080/docushare/dsweb/View/Collection-14

All OCEWD courses list student learning outcomes (http://www.lcc.hawaii.edu/ocewd). These outcomes are evaluated at the end of the course on the Student Course Evaluation forms. Due to the constantly changing needs for non-credit courses, course reviews are not completed on a regular schedule, but are done when the course needs updating or when course evaluation forms indicate that changes are necessary.

Based on the evidence provided in the descriptive summary, the College meets this standard.

**Planning Agenda**
- No changes are needed to address this standard.
II.A.2.d. The institution uses delivery modes and teaching methodologies that reflect the diverse needs and learning styles of its students.

Faculty and staff, individually or through dialogue with their peers, have responded to the diverse needs of the students by offering a variety of delivery systems both within and beyond the classroom. Some faculty prefer the lecture-discussion method, while others use “smart carts” equipped with laptops and PowerPoint projectors. Within Divisions, faculty discuss with Discipline colleagues the best combination of methods and technology to fit the needs of the students.

Core course outlines list the various teaching methods used for each course, the result of Discipline discussions at the time the core course outline was proposed. As part of the course assessment process, faculty are required to indicate (#27 on the core course outline) what discussions have taken place as to the effectiveness of these methods. As part of the course assessment process, Discipline faculty are also required to assess student achievement of the course SLOs, a process that requires considerable dialogue as to the appropriateness of teaching methods in student SLO achievement. Core course outlines can be found on Curriculum Central.

With the push toward alternate course delivery systems, administration has offered numerous training sessions and workshops as well as assigned time for faculty to learn about new approaches to delivering their courses, including Cable TV, OLELO, and Distance Education (DE). Extensive dialogue has occurred between faculty and technology trainers from the Educational Media Center, in the form of workshops, one-on-one mentoring, and summer WebFun training sessions. Discussions include topics such as how to successfully convey course content using the various possible delivery modes.

Faculty teaching Distance Education courses have had both formal and informal discussions about developing effective teaching methodologies using DE technology, particularly WebCt. More formal discussions and sharing sessions have taken place via the Distance Education Committee, as well as continued informal discussions both in person and via email. All faculty who teach distance education courses responded during the 2005-2006 academic year to questions in the core course outline, designed to ensure the same content and rigor in distance education courses as more traditional courses. Distance Education questions are in blue in Curriculum Central. As course SLOs are assessed, faculty teaching DE sections of a course will be able to directly compare the effectiveness of various delivery systems in terms of student SLO achievement.

Self Evaluation
The College employs various teaching methodologies and delivery systems that reflect the diverse needs and learning styles of our students. However, no systematic attempt is made to assess student learning styles, or to assist students in finding courses or delivery systems appropriate to their individual learning styles.

Planning Agenda
• The College will make available to all students a quick survey assessment of learning style, either as part of new student orientation/counseling, or as a voluntary service for students. In addition, an annual workshop on learning styles will be offered, perhaps as part of new faculty orientation.
II.A.2.i. The institution awards degrees and certificates based on student achievement of a program’s stated learning outcomes.

**Descriptive Summary**

Dialogue about learning expectations of students for degrees or certificates occurs first among members of a Discipline whose courses contribute to the degree or certificate, and with external advisory committees for some programs. Once agreement has been reached at the Discipline and Division level, Program Coordinators work with respective Curriculum Committee members who facilitate the curriculum review process, and eventually discussion occurs with the Faculty Senate for approval. Thus dialogue occurs on multiple levels. Discussion also occurs between campuses, particularly between the community colleges and upper division campuses in the UH System, to articulate courses for acceptance as transfer credit. Student Services’ Counseling and Guidance Unit also works with other campuses when there are questions of Leeward courses meeting their program and degree requirements. Faculty teaching the respective courses may also be involved in these discussions with other campuses.

As a result of the above process, all programs have student learning outcomes (published in the *Leeward CC Catalog* for 2005-2006). For the Associate of Arts degree, actual assessment of these outcomes began prior to 2000, and committees working with each major SLO (writing, communication, critical thinking, etc.) have been discussing refinements to the process of SLO assessments. Members of specific SLO committees have also met with each other, and have shared methods of assessment and problems of interpreting the results, particularly for the SLO writing, oral communication, and information and retrieval committees. In these committees, discussion has also occurred regarding changes in curriculum that would ensure a higher success rate among students in SLO achievement.

As part of Leeward CC’s *Policy on Program Reviews* (rev. 2005), all programs assess student SLO achievement and are involved in discussions regarding changes in program or course requirements to improve student learning outcome achievement.

**Self Evaluation**

As described above, the College is engaged in discussions regarding assessing student learning outcomes for all its programs, and the possible modification of course and curriculum requirements to improve student achievement. Degrees are awarded on the basis of the successful completion of a required series of courses designed to ensure the student meets student learning outcomes for the program. As student learning outcome data accumulates for all programs, the College will need to initiate discussions as to whether awarding certificates and degrees on the basis of successful completion of a series of courses ensures that students are meeting the student learning outcomes for that degree or certificate. As a start to this process for the AA degree, twenty-one courses were identified as those most often taken by our AA graduates. Faculty in these identified courses were required to complete a Curriculum Grid, where all faculty teaching a specific course discussed which General Education outcomes were met by the course, and at what level (Introductory, Practiced, or Demonstrated).

**Planning Agenda**

- The College will develop a plan to assess the extent to which graduates achieve program SLOs.

- The Curriculum Grid will be extended to include all courses that satisfy the AA General Education core.
II.A.7.a. Faculty distinguish between personal conviction and professionally accepted views in a discipline. They present data and information fairly and objectively.

**Descriptive Summary**
Several college practices, as well as university policy, address this standard. The UH Executive Policy 5.211 covers the ethical expectations of faculty. Discipline peers, as part of the curriculum proposal and course review process, discuss and establish the course content and the expected student learning outcomes for the course. The content and student learning outcomes for the course become part of the core course outline, and the syllabi of everyone teaching that course. For courses that are part of the AA degree, faculty can also compare course SLOs to the AA competencies, found on pages 64-65 of the *Leeward CC 2005–2006 Catalog*. These competencies, which were developed as a result of discipline discussions involving all community colleges in the UH System, provide an understanding of what courses in natural sciences, social sciences, arts and humanities, etc. should provide students. In social science, for example, faculty are to discuss within their courses “the alternative theoretical frameworks used to offer meaningful explanation of social phenomena within a discipline.” (*Leeward CC Catalog* p.65)

The process of peer and student review encourages faculty to present information fairly and objectively. When faculty members apply for contract renewal, promotion and tenure, they must include in these applications, peer evaluations based on observations of their classes. The purpose of the evaluations is to provide feedback on teaching effectiveness and methodology, and faculty members engage in dialogue with their peers based on these observations and evaluations. Faculty members must also present their teaching philosophies as part of the evaluation process, and an understanding of the fairness and objectivity in presentation are discussed individually, as the need arises. Students also provide feedback on teaching effectiveness and objectivity in course evaluations.

**Self Evaluation**
The College meets this standard.

**Planning Agenda**
- No changes are needed to address this standard.
II.B. Student Support Services

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.

Descriptive Summary

The Office of Student Services is comprised of six units:

1. Admissions and Records
2. Counseling
3. Financial Aid
4. Career Development/Job Prep Services
5. Campus Health Center
6. Student Activities Office

All Unit Heads fall under the Dean of Student Services (DOSS). Within the Units, formal dialogue is evidenced by DOSS weekly meetings with Unit Heads to promote communication about issues facing the Unit. The Program Review process, started in 2004, has spurred dialogue to facilitate the achievement of student learning outcomes. The DOSS and Unit Heads have engaged in many discussions to create outcome measures and tools to assess the effectiveness of the Division and its parts. Informal discussions between staff members and students helped to create and implement appropriate assessment. The DOSS and Unit Heads analyze the assessment tools created and used by the Units. Formal and informal dialogue is ongoing to complete this process.

At the Unit level, evidence of dialogue to assure the quality of services is abundant. Discussions occur at scheduled staff meetings and with focus groups, advisory committees, system-wide committees, and through correspondence with professional organizations at regional and national levels. A brief description of the use of dialogue to assure the quality of student services follows:

Admission & Records

At the campus level, committees and advisory boards engage in informal discussions to assure the quality of services. In formulating its Program Review, the Admissions & Records Office used dialogue to create assessment tools to gauge the effectiveness and quality of its services. Student surveys are now used to measure student satisfaction of services, with results analyzed at staff and Unit Head meetings.

Counseling

Dialogue plays a major role in the Program Review process in Counseling. Beginning in 2003, formal weekly meetings were held, with presentations by counselors on the development of assessment tools. Surveys were designed to measure student satisfaction with counseling services, which were followed by weekly meetings among counselors to assess the initial results. Current policies and procedures
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have been adjusted and new ones created based on the results from the surveys. The Unit will continue to use dialogue in weekly meetings to assess the validity of the instruments created.

Financial Aid
Staff discussions are the basis of the design of the financial aid website, as well as workshop presentations on financial aid issues. This Unit’s goal is to educate students more fully about the financial aid process, and dialogue between staff members and Student Services’ Units facilitates this process. However, the increased complexity of the student financial aid process has made it difficult for this Unit to measure and maintain the quality of its services. Due to limited staffing, dialogue is greatly limited, as each staff member needs to complete so many tasks.

Career Development/Job Prep Services
Discussions have occurred between the Job Prep Services (JPS) and individual faculty members regarding services offered, including employment opportunities and job readiness workshops. The JPS office staff meets monthly to discuss servicing students in their employment and career needs and on upcoming events (e.g. high school outreach activities, employer recruitment tables).

Satisfaction surveys are given to three different groups—students, faculty, and employers at the end of each school year. During the summer, JPS’s staff discusses the results of these surveys and comes up with ideas to improve services. Job Prep Services completes an annual report on the year’s activities that is submitted to the administrative staff and is used in the planning for the next school year’s grant.

Campus Health Center
To assure the quality of its services, dialogue is evident at three levels. First, since the School of Nursing manages the Health Center, regularly scheduled discussions/meetings take place with the Dean of the School of Nursing. Second, as the Health Center is supported by grants coordinated through the Department of Health (DOH), statistics must be maintained and reports created and filed with the DOH on a regular schedule. Third, through its student services/outreach initiatives, the Health Center meets and discusses community health issues with local organizations. The Health Center staff meets monthly to discuss procedures, policies, and event coordination.

Student Activities
Dialogue about access, progress, learning, and success occurs for this Unit at Advisory Board, Unit Head, Division, and Counseling meetings. The coordinator holds bi-annual dialogues with the Student Activities Advisory Board to discuss progress, objectives, challenges/opportunities, and strategy. At Unit Head and Division meetings, dialogue is related to program updates and progress. Dialogue with students includes informal, open-ended, and spontaneous discussions. In response to the Program Review process, the Campus Center Facilities Use Plan report was written, which highlights the resource needs of the Office of Student Activities to create a constructive learning environment.
Self Evaluation
The Program Review process has encouraged the Units in Student Services to make assessment of their programs a priority, with formal and informal dialogue needed to develop appropriate assessment tools. Analysis of data requires ongoing dialogue among staff members, Unit Heads, and the DOSS. In addition to Program Review, Student Services has participated in the Annual Review process, which integrates the results of these assessments with student achievement data and internal analyses of the Division’s strengths, weaknesses, opportunities, and threats. These have become the basis of the College’s Annual Review planning and budgeting efforts.

Planning Agenda
• The College will assess its Program and Annual Review processes to determine their effectiveness in supporting student learning needs through Student Services

II.B.3.b. The institution provides an environment that encourages personal and civic responsibility, as well as intellectual, aesthetic, and personal development for all of its students.

Within Student Services, the Office of Student Activities engages in dialogue to provide avenues for the development of personal and civic responsibility and intellectual, aesthetic, and personal development of Leeward students. The results include the following student activities:

1. Campus clubs initiated by students. At the Opening Day Experience, new students are invited to either join existing clubs or to launch new clubs with the help of the Office of Student Activities. Clubs engage in outreach activities throughout the year.

Among the chartered campus clubs are the following:

  Bahai Club - To inform the community about the Bahai Faith and offer assistance to Bahai students attending Leeward CC
  Gay-Straight Alliance - To ally students, faculty, and staff who identify as gay, lesbian, bisexual, and transgender with straight communities
  Information Technology Club - To provide support to club members in obtaining their goals by sharing common experiences through projects, activities, and work exposure
  International Club - To integrate multi-ethnic and multi-cultural students into a united camaraderie that harmonizes and positively impacts the community
  Kahiau - To promote the integration of Hawaiian culture values such as Aloha and Malama through various activities, events, and meetings that foster involvement and promote awareness through Ke Kulanui Kaiaulu o Ewa (Leeward CC) and the community
  KASAMA - To promote the learning and appreciation of Philippines and Filipino culture, arts, history, and language
  Leeward CC Auto Tech Car Club - To educate members about automobile service and performance, and to provide learning experiences in leadership and social interactions in a work-related area
Leeward CC Children’s Center Families & Friends Club - To promote quality child care and early education on campus, provide responsive, high quality program at Center, plan events for families of young children enrolled at Center, seek financial assistance for early education and care services
Phi Beta Lambda - To bring business and education together in a positive working relationship, promote business relationships, establish career goals, and facilitate the transition from school to work
Phi Theta Kappa - To develop leadership and service, scholarship programs, and cultivate fellowship among qualified students

2. Co-curricular involvement. The Student Activities Coordinator advises Student Government and the DOSS convenes the Board of Student Publications (BOSP).

Service Learning (SL) is another College-supported program that provides opportunities for growth in personal and civic responsibility. Many student clubs sponsor SL activities, such as collecting clothing for shelters and assisting with the annual Food Drive. The Volunteer and Internship Fair has been created to encourage students to engage in activities that promote civic responsibility. Faculty offer SL options within their courses, which usually requires 20 hours of service during the semester, a reflection journal, and a reflective essay about their experience.

Dialogue is essential in the development and implementation of Service Learning activities. Formal dialogue is used to introduce the concepts of Service Learning to students. SL sponsored colloquia are held once or twice a semester, with speakers, panels and presentations hosted by faculty, students, and off campus resources. The Corporation of National Community Service, Learn and Serve, and Campus Compact document how SL adds to a good learning environment.

Self Evaluation
The Student Activities Office has appropriate processes in place to promote a good learning environment to support civic responsibility and personal development. This Unit is actively engaged in the Program Review process and uses dialogue effectively to conduct on-going assessment activities of its stated learning outcomes. Results of program assessments are fed into Student Services’ Annual Review process.

Service Learning uses formal and informal dialogue effectively to create, implement, and evaluate its activities. The dialogue is ongoing and takes place among students, faculty, and community groups.

Planning Agenda
• No changes are needed to address this standard.
II.C.1.a. Relying on appropriate expertise of faculty, including librarians and other learning support services professionals, the institution selects and maintains educational equipment and materials to support student learning and enhance the achievement of the mission of the institution.

**Descriptive Summary**

**Library**

Dialogue about Library resources occurs at multiple levels, from Academic Support Division meetings to informal discussions with students, faculty, administrators, and other educational organizations. These discussions result in ongoing self-reflection and conscious improvement of the Library program and its selection of materials and equipment.

Review of user statistics and dialogue with instructional faculty are the basis for selection of new electronic resources. Frequent discussions with faculty and students before, during, and after Library instruction classes have guided librarians in revising teaching strategies and seeking out new technologies to improve the educational experience. These discussions have led to increased use of wireless laptops to provide hands-on experience during classes, relocating the instructional area to a more secluded part of the Library, and developing an online post-semester evaluation form for faculty. As dialogue is a two-way exchange of ideas and information, faculty members have noted that they have learned new information about resources, services, and conceptual viewpoints about the role of the Library.

The need to support Distance Education (DE) has led to collaboration between a librarian and a WebCT instructor. The experience has allowed both faculty and librarians to consider ways in which the Library could better support online distance education students.

**Learning Resource Center and Kākoʻo ʻIke (KI)**

Assessment of LRC/KI student learning needs is discussed through the LRC Advisory Committee and informally with individual faculty. Feedback from student users and discussion with student staff also play an important role in assessing quality and sufficiency of these items. The need for additional purchases is discussed with administration, and requests are submitted for Perkins funding, special grants, Student Government funds, and action plan items for the campus Strategic Plan. The LRC Coordinator presented KI action plan items at a recent campus forum for sharing of these plans.

**Educational Media Center and Information Technology Group**

Dialogue about educational equipment and materials needed to support student learning includes input from faculty and from the Distance Education coordinator. Input is also sought from HelpDesk workers.

**Math Lab**

Selection of equipment and materials is discussed by the Math Lab Advisory Committee and Math and Sciences faculty. Data on tutoring and use of resources are the basis for these discussions.
Self Evaluation
Equipment and materials needed to support student learning emerge from the Program and Annual Review processes that are currently in place. These analyses have become the basis of the campus’ planning and budgeting efforts and have caused a shift in decision-making based on past practices to those based on analysis of data.

Planning Agenda
• No changes are needed to address this standard.

II.C.1.b. The institution provides ongoing instruction for users of Library and other learning support services so that students are able to develop skills in information competency.

Descriptive Summary
The Library uses the nationally recognized standards of information literacy put forward by the Association of College and Research Libraries and offers information literacy classes for students and faculty. These standards have been discussed with the Leeward CC Library Advisory Council and with faculty and are addressed in the Library skills classes offered. Based on discussions with the Language Arts Division and individual faculty in other divisions, Library skills tutorials have been placed on the Library web page.

The Library has participated in the assessment of the General Education outcomes relating to information literacy. The Head Librarian has related certain weaknesses in the outcomes to the institution, which may result in an institutional information literacy vision statement.

LRC-sponsored information competency workshops include those on the research process, research skills and tools, and plagiarism. Some of these workshops are presented in collaboration with Leeward Librarians, and the LRC and Library are engaged in ongoing dialogue about the best ways to present these topics. Training and supervision of writing tutors also includes dialogue on topics of research and plagiarism, and tutors are encouraged to discuss these matters with the students they tutor.

Self Evaluation
The Library and LRC provide sufficient ongoing instruction to students to develop skills in information competency. The instruction is based on dialogue with advisory councils, faculty, and administration.

Planning Agenda
• The Head Librarian will develop an institutional information literacy vision statement in collaboration with the administration.
Standard III. Resources

Standard III.A. Human Resources

III.A.1.a. Criteria, qualifications, and procedures for selection of personnel are clearly and publicly stated. Job descriptions are directly related to institutional mission and goals and accurately reflect position duties, responsibilities, and authority. Criteria for selection of faculty include knowledge of the subject matter or service to be performed (as determined by individuals with discipline expertise), effective teaching, scholarly activities, and potential to contribute to the mission of the institution. Institutional faculty play a significant role in selection of new faculty. Degrees held by faculty and administrators are from institutions accredited by recognized U.S. accrediting agencies. Degrees from non-U.S. institutions are recognized only if equivalence has been established.

Descriptive Summary
In most situations, faculty within each Discipline participate in discussions regarding criteria and qualifications of faculty positions within the Discipline, although some position descriptions are established at the System level. Faculty members also serve on screening (interview) committees that engage in substantial discussions to select new faculty.

Many non-faculty positions also involve selection committees and similar discussions. Position descriptions are designed by the Human Resources Office, the College, the System, and State of Hawai‘i personnel regulations.

Self Evaluation
Dialogue is integral to the hiring process, particularly for faculty members and administrators.

- Responses to a survey of Division Chairs about faculty hiring practices revealed considerable uniformity in the extent of dialogue in this area.
- Records of numerous open forums demonstrate the prevalence of dialogue in administrative hiring.
- Minutes of Faculty Senate and Campus Council provide evidence of the important role of dialogue in the proposed campus reorganization.

Planning Agenda
- No changes are needed to address this standard.
III.A.1. The institution assures the integrity and quality of its programs and services by employing personnel who are qualified by appropriate education, training, and experience to provide and support these programs and services.

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.

The topic of student learning outcomes has prompted extensive dialogue and varying levels of controversy as the College began to align its efforts with the current accreditation standards. The development and adoption of Leeward Community College’s Policy on Unit/Area Program Reviews in 2003, in response to one of Accrediting Commission’s recommendations, was based on extensive, sometimes, heated discussions. These discussions intensified and resulted in some resistance by faculty as the College required that agreed upon (or common) student learning outcomes be listed in the syllabi of all courses offered by the institution. Beginning in Spring 2004, ongoing formal and informal dialogues focusing on the development and writing of student learning outcomes as a means of improving learning, helped to lessen the controversy and facilitated the assessment of courses, programs, and Support Areas.

With the implementation of Program Review in Spring 2004, a growing number of faculty members have joined the dialogue and are now actively engaged in the process of developing, assessing, and implementing changes to improve student learning outcomes. Within Disciplines, faculty are involved in thinking and discussions about these processes. The course and program assessments vary in form and method, ranging from assessments of lab reports and other forms of writing, to traditional tests. Assessments have resulted in changes of course requirements, content, and teaching strategies.

The adoption of the Annual Review process, which requires that all requests for resource allocation be based on the assessment of student learning outcomes, has prompted increased participation by every segment of the campus community. A significant number of faculty and staff who have become involved in this systematic assessment process can now address, in their contract renewals and tenure-promotion documents, their participation in course and program assessment, as well as any other assessment of student learning outcomes they have designed for their own classes.
However, as both course and program SLO assessment are in their early implementation stages at the College, faculty and staff are still struggling to address the question of how the effectiveness of producing student learning would be factored in faculty evaluations. For this reason, the Faculty Senate (FS) took issue with the draft of the self-study write up, which included Standard III.A.1.c. that was made available to the campus in January 2006. On January 25, 2006, the governance body unanimously passed Motion 06-03: “To accept and approve the recommendations of the Faculty Committee that the purpose of SLO is to assess programs and courses and not to evaluate faculty. Faculty evaluation is covered by UHPA/BOR Agreement. It is not appropriate to combine the two.” In February 2006, through Motion 06-09, the FS charged its Faculty Committee with conducting an exploratory study of “the principles and practices of the legitimate use of SLO for faculty assessment and evaluation,” which was the focus of an April 17, 2006 Open Forum. The Faculty Senate’s April 19, 2006 Motion 06-44 that recommends “widespread conversations among faculty to take place to ensure the integrity of decision making at LCC; that the Accreditation Self Study Committee be tasked to review its document to eliminate or correct contents that may contradict Motion 6-03; and to accept and incorporate feedback ("Proposed Revision to III.A.1.c taken from theme: Institutional Commitment draft approximately page 25-26 regarding Commitment theme of 2006 Accreditation Self Study"). The College’s Accreditation Liaison Officer appeared before the Faculty Senate on May 10, 2006 to explain the standard and the approach that would be taken in the self-study write up. During a closed executive session, Faculty Senators unanimously accepted the draft of the entire self study, with specific recommendations regarding the standard’s write up, “including a sixth recommendation that the spirit of these recommendations be reflected in other theme sections” (Motion 06-57).

Self Evaluation
The College partially meets this standard. The practice of using course and program SLO assessment results to make improvements in student learning, and the policies governing this practice, are still evolving. Dialogue has certainly been evident in the College’s attempt to address the manner in which achievement of student learning outcomes is used in faculty evaluations. However, at this point, dialogue at the College has not resulted in changes in faculty evaluation requirements.

Planning Agenda
• The College will continue the dialogue resulting in the development of a common understanding of the definition, development, and assessment of student learning outcomes and their place in faculty evaluation.

• The College will work with the system-wide Human Resources Office to recommend revision of the guidelines for contract renewal and tenure and promotion to reflect an emphasis on producing student learning outcomes.

• The College will revise and standardize lecturer evaluation guidelines and include references to effectiveness in producing student learning outcomes.
III.A.4.a. The institution creates and maintains programs, practices and services that support its diverse personnel.

**Descriptive Summary**
Leeward CC support its personnel through the following:

- Campus workshops and presentations educate faculty, staff and administrators on a broad range of diversity-related topics such as Gay, Lesbian, Bisexual, Transgender, Intersex (GLBTI) students, learning and physical disabilities, sexual harassment, and workplace violence. These sessions include dialogue in the form of Q&A sessions and often lead to subsequent informal discussions among faculty and staff.

- Academic Support Units (Learning Resource Center, KI disabilities support program, Library, Educational Media Center, Innovation Center for Teaching & Learning, and Information Technology Group) initiate dialogue to determine the diverse needs of faculty, staff, and students.

- Personnel in all categories have organizations that provide opportunities for group dialogue and member advocacy. These groups include the Faculty Senate; the APT group for Administrative, Professional, & Technical support staff; the Clerical Staff Council for clerical employees; the Lecturers group for adjunct faculty; the O&M group for operations and maintenance staff.

**Self Evaluation**
Many students and employees comment favorably about the open, accepting atmosphere they find at Leeward CC. Numerous opportunities exist for faculty and staff to receive training on diversity issues through well-publicized workshops. Overall, Leeward's campus climate encourages equity and respects diversity. Still, there is room for improvement. Some faculty and staff choose not to attend presentations on diversity and equity topics or are unavailable when the sessions are held, so they are less informed about these issues.

**Planning Agenda**
- The College will ensure that materials related to important topics such as those listed above are posted on the College website so that they are accessible to those who are unable to attend the workshops.
III.A.5.a. The institution plans professional development activities to meet the needs of its personnel.

**Descriptive Summary**

Leeward's Innovation Center for Teaching and Learning (formerly the Staff Development Office) plans and organizes a wide range of professional development activities to meet the needs of Leeward CC faculty and staff. The Innovation Center's organizational structure was created through a dialogue process among interested faculty and staff under the guidance of the Staff Development Coordinator. Many programs are planned and run by small groups, and a majority of the programs and activities sponsored by the Center are interactive and dialogue-intensive. Examples include the following:

- The Hawai'i National Great Teachers Seminar draws faculty from around the country to an annual intensive, 5-day retreat.
- The TGIF series, begun in Spring 2005, introduces new faculty and staff to campus programs and issues and provides opportunities for questions and discussion. In Fall 2005, the TGIF planning group included newer faculty who attended the spring sessions.
- The annual Leadership Retreat activities feature extensive dialogue related to major campus issues and initiatives.
- The Teaching Squares program brings together groups of four faculty members for mutual classroom observations and follow-up discussions.
- Community Safaris are “field trips” that afford an opportunity for interaction between campus and community.

**Self Evaluation**

Dialogue is infused into the planning and delivery of professional development activities at Leeward CC. The College Colloquia Schedule and the Innovation Center organizational structure provide evidence of the vital role played by dialogue.

**Planning Agenda**

- No changes are needed to address this standard.

III.A.5.b. The institution systematically evaluates professional development programs and uses the results of these evaluations as the basis for improvement.

**Descriptive Summary**

The Innovation Center periodically distributes campus surveys to provide faculty and staff with an opportunity to express their professional development needs. All Center-sponsored events include evaluation forms to assess their effectiveness. After major activities such as the Hawai'i National Great Teachers Seminar and the Leadership Retreat, follow-up sessions are held to evaluate the program and discuss future improvements.
Self Evaluation
Evaluative dialogue plays a key role in the cycle of planning, implementation and evaluation of professional development programs at Leeward. Evidence includes surveys and evaluation forms as well as evaluation meetings scheduled.

Planning Agenda
• No changes are needed to address this standard.

Standard III. B. Physical Resources

III.B.1.a. The institution plans, builds, maintains, and upgrades or replaces its physical resources in a manner that assures effective utilization and the continuing quality necessary to support its programs and services.

Descriptive Summary
In the early to mid 1990’s, dialogue among all campus constituent groups served as the basis the College’s Long Range Development Plan (LRDP). This document identified the College’s priorities for facilities and physical resources based on its Educational Development Plan (1987-1993) and its Academic Development Plan (1993-1996), which was later re-conceptualized into College’s Strategic Plan (2002-2010). The LRDP was a comprehensive view of facilities’ use, capabilities and potentialities relative to student learning while considering safety, accessibility, and effective usage. When it was approved in 1996, the College lacked Capital Improvement Project (CIP) Funds with which to construct and/or renovate its facilities.

Most of the physical facilities on campus are more than 35 years old and were not adequately maintained due to budget constraints over the past 15 years. Ongoing concerns about the safety of these aging structures over a number of years resulted in appropriations beginning in 2004 of about $10 million dollars to reduce the backlog of repairs and renovations. These improvements were primarily aimed to address safety and access issues, including the following:

• Re-roofing
• New railings
• ADA compliancy: expanded parking stalls on main level
• Maintenance and acquisition of equipment
• Electrical/network project
• Lighting improvement of parking and building corridor areas.

To accommodate increased enrollment and added programs since 2000, the College relied on a combination of Federal and State general funds for the renovation of existing structures to keep pace with increased enrollment and added programs. However, classroom, meeting, and conference rooms are still in short supply, and the LRC, Library, and EMC have limited space for student use. Over the years the College continued its discussions with the Community College System Facilities Planning Office to justify the expansion of its facilities. This ongoing effort resulted an appropriation of funds, in 2006, for the design of the College’s next planned building.
Self Evaluation
As described in Standards I.A.4. and I.B.4., extensive, informed dialogue and broad-based collaboration characterizes the College's evolving planning and decision-making process as it attempts to better allocate its limited financial resources to helping students learn. Prior to the implementation of Program and Annual Review, usage and planning for improvements of the College's physical resources was done on a rather informal basis without clearly stated guidelines. Discipline and Unit coordinators, after discussing needs with faculty and staff in their Disciplines/Units, submitted priorities to their respective Division Chairs or Deans for needed facilities and equipment. Each Division and Support Area relied on past practices to accommodate requests for space and equipment from within their units utilizing facilities and funds that were traditionally allotted to them. Requests for space or equipment that exceeded the Unit’s allocation were prioritized and submitted to the appropriate Dean or director. The lists were then prioritized through joint discussions among the administrative staff.

The Annual Review attempts to replace these traditional practices with a systematic process that focuses on the analysis of data provided by the Program Reviews of student learning and institutional effectiveness from all units within the College. Both the Program and Annual Review processes require the use of dialogue among faculty, staff, and administrators to determine needs, with physical resources as one area of consideration. Together, the goal of this approach is to integrate assessment, planning, and budgeting. The Annual Review process is based on inclusive and collegial dialogue that involves all members of the campus community and is intended to be a collaborative planning and budgeting process to improve institutional effectiveness.

As described in the response to Standard I.A.4., of this theme, the second phase of the Annual Review process focuses on the continued assessment and refinement of planning and budgeting activities. The second phase calls for the creation of a number of Phase II committees, including two committees that will focus on equipment needs and space utilization and allocation. These committees with provide input from the perspective of the overall campus needs in the prioritizing and budgeting process.

Planning Agenda
- The College will assess the effectiveness of the Program and Annual Review processes in providing sufficient physical resources to support student learning programs and services.
Standard IV: Leadership and Governance

IV.A.1 Institutional leaders create an environment for empowerment, innovation and institutional excellence. They encourage staff, faculty, administrators and students, no matter what their official titles, to take initiative to improving the practices, programs, and services in which they are involved. When ideas for improvement have policy or significant institution-wide implications, systematic participative processes are used to assure effective discussion, planning and implementation.

Descriptive Summary
Both of the College’s Chief Executive Officers (former Provost/Chancellor and current Chancellor) have worked personally and through their respective Administrative Teams to lead the institution in its efforts to realize the goals and objectives as stated in the College’s mission and Strategic Plan. At the beginning of each semester, the Chancellor uses Convocation to provide the focus and to set the tone for the entire campus community. Both the former Provost/Chancellor and current Chancellor have recognized the importance of inclusive dialogue, collaboration, and the principles of shared governance. Each has consistently encouraged campus-wide involvement to arrive at a collective understanding of how the College might improve its effectiveness. A record of their efforts is summarized by the following chronology.

- Beginning in 2001, a Steering Committee formed by the former Provost/Chancellor, comprised of students, faculty, staff, and administrators, engaged in extensive campus-wide dialogue to arrive at an understanding of how the College could best implement the goals stated in its mission. The resulting Strategic Plan provided a framework of goals, objectives, and prioritized action plans that was consistent with the concepts of a Program Review model recommended by the Commission. Members of the College also agreed with the recommendation of the strategic planners and the former Provost/Chancellor that a revisit of Strategic Plan occur on an annual basis beginning in 2003, with the purpose of using campus-wide dialogue in the cycle of ongoing evaluation, planning, and improvement.

- In 2003, the former Provost/Chancellor, citing the need for increased flexibility for the institution to address emerging needs with new initiatives, started a campus-wide dialogue to revise the College’s mission. The revised mission statement was approved by the Board of Regents in Spring 2004. The mission was amended in Spring 2005 to include one sentence that reflects the College’s focus on student learning. This version is expected to receive approval by the BOR during Fall 2006.

- Based on a number of recommendations made by the Accrediting Commission for Community and Junior Colleges (ACCJC), the former Provost/Chancellor formed seven Accreditation Implementation Committees (AICs) and charged each with the task of addressing, through dialogue, the Commission’s recommendations. Although these committees were able to address most of the Commission’s concerns by 2004, the rate of progress with Program Review and technology and learning resources, as evidenced by a lack of specific timelines, resulted in the College being sanctioned by the Commission.
The Spring of 2004 marked the beginning of intense dialogue and action spurred by the ACCJC sanction. The former Provost/Chancellor, working through his administrative team, directed the campus effort toward implementing the College’s Policy on Unit/Support Area Program Reviews. Members of the College responded by engaging in discussions about appropriate assessments of student learning outcomes for degree programs, Support Areas, and courses. The findings and experiences of the assessment effort were used to revise the original Policy, resulting in an evolving and constantly improving process.

Changes at the top administrative levels within the University of Hawai‘i System in 2001 resulted in added responsibility for administrators at the campus level. Citing this situation and linking the excessive workload with the College’s history of administrative turnover, the former Provost/Chancellor submitted a proposal for administrative reorganization, requesting an additional executive/managerial position as well as changes in titles for existing administrative levels in Spring 2004. This action caused a controversy at the College that was eventually resolved by the efforts of a Reorganization Committee made of members from all major constituencies on campus during the Fall of 2004. As this committee engaged in dialogue with the administrators toward a solution, the entire campus community was provided with continuous updates of the Committee’s discussion and decisions and was given ample opportunity to provide input based on two hearings and two votes, first by Campus Council and second, by Faculty Senate. The modified proposal by these campus governance organizations is scheduled to be submitted to the Board of Regents in Fall 2006.

Beginning in Fall 2004, the current Chancellor assumed a major role in modifying the College’s approach to its Program Review model. He hired a consultant to work with a small group of campus leaders and the administrative team to correct a number of misconceptions and to broaden the scope of the process that the College had used to review its programs and support areas. The modified approach was presented to the College in open forums and small group meetings of faculty and staff conducted by the current Chancellor, who encouraged every member of the College to become actively involved in assessment activities and dialogue intended to improve student learning. As the College carried through its assessments, the Program Review process was continuously modified. It now provides the mechanism by which course, program, and Support Area assessment data become the basis for planning and budgeting decisions in the newly designed Annual Review process. Based on assessment, the process calls on Academic Divisions and Support Areas to engage in conversations to develop prioritized lists to support student learning and institutional effectiveness.
Self Evaluation
Leadership at Leeward Community College is based on inclusive dialogue and collaboration. Each Chief Executive Officer and members of their Administrative Teams have created an environment that encourages faculty and staff to participate in the decision-making process. Campus leaders and governance structures develop processes and policies that are based on extensive dialogue at all levels within the College. An example is the Annual Review process, which is designed to allow every member of the campus to assess what they do and to provide input for change that leads to improvement. The success of this approach will depend on the commitment of the entire campus to sustain their assessment efforts on an ongoing basis.

Although campus leaders welcome dialogue to assist in creating an environment for decision-making, innovation, and excellence, this dialogue seems to flow in one direction (constituents and governing organizations to the Administrative Team) rather than in a full circle. Through meeting agendas and minutes circulated in the Campus Bulletin or posted to the College’s homepage, campus members can trace the use of dialogue within organizations and committees. Tracing the process and outcomes of dialogue within the Administrative Team, however, is not as clear.

Planning Agenda
• The Administrative Team will document and share information so that campus members can see the effect of planning and policy-making.
Dialogue Documents and Website

Standard I

Annual Review process (2006)
  web  http://emedia.leeward.hawaii.edu/cs/planning/
  print  Evidence Room

Leeward Community College Strategic Plan 2002-2010
  web  http://emedia.leeward.hawaii.edu/sp
  print  Evidence Room

Policy on Unit/Area Program Reviews (May 8, 2003)
  web  http://home.lcc.hawaii.edu/docs/policies
  print  Evidence Room

Policy on Program Reviews (rev. 5/05),
  web  http://home.lcc.hawaii.edu/docs/policies
  print  Evidence Room

Revision of Mission Statement
  web  http://emedia.leeward.hawaii.edu/sp/evidence.htm

Standard II

Campus Center Facilities Use Plan
  print  Evidence Room

Curriculum Central
  web  http://emedia.leeward.hawaii.edu/central

Educational Media Center
  web  http://emedia.leeward.hawaii.edu/emc/

Handbook on Outcomes Assessment for Two-year Colleges (by Edward Morante)
  print  Evidence Room

Information Technology Group
  web  http://emedia.leeward.hawaii.edu/itg

Kāko‘o ‘Ike Office
  web  http://emedia.leeward.hawaii.edu/kiprogram/

Learning Resources Center
  web  http://emedia.leeward.hawaii.edu/lrc
Leeward CC 2005-2006 Catalog
web http://www.lcc.hawaii.edu/catalog
print Evidence Room

Library
web http://www.lcc.hawaii.edu/lib

Math Lab
web http://emedia.leeward.hawaii.edu/mathlab/

Office of Continuing Education and Workforce Development Course SLOs
web http://www.lcc.hawaii.edu/ocewd/
(Refer to the link on the website program pages.)

Policy on Program Reviews (rev. 5/05),
web http://home.lcc.hawaii.edu/docs/policies
print Evidence Room

Policy on Unit/Area Program Reviews (May 8, 2003)
web http://home.lcc.hawaii.edu/docs/policies
print Evidence Room

Research Report on the Needs of Incoming Students Fall 2005, Rossi, 11/05
web http://emedia.leeward.hawaii.edu/cs/planning/IR
print Evidence Room

Results of Program/Support Area Reviews (2005)
web http://documents.leeward.hawaii.edu:8080/docushare/dsweb/View/Collection-14

Student Services’ 2004 Assessment Report and SLOs
web http://emedia.leeward.hawaii.edu/cs/planning/reports/
print Evidence Room

UH Executive Policy 5.211
web http://www.hawaii.edu/offices/cc/policies.html Select Policy 5.211
pdf http://www.hawaii.edu/offices/cc/docs/policies/UHCCP_5.211_Statement_on_Professional_Ethics.pdf

Standard III

Academic Development Plan (ADP) 1996-2002
web http://documents.leeward.hawaii.edu:8080/docushare/dsweb/View/Collection-1020
print Evidence Room

Annual Review process (2006)
web http://emedia.leeward.hawaii.edu/cs/planning/
print Evidence Room
**Educational Development Plan (1987-1993)**
web http://documents.leeward.hawaii.edu:8080/docushare/dsweb/View/Collection-1020
print Evidence Room

**Long Range Development Plan**
print Director of Administrative Services Office

**Policy on Unit/Area Program Reviews (May 8, 2003)**
web http://home.lcc.hawaii.edu/docs/policies
print Evidence Room

**Leeward CC Strategic Plan, 2002-2010**
web http://emedia.leeward.hawaii.edu/sp
print Evidence Room

**Standard IV**

Leeward CC Reorganization Proposal
web http://home.lcc.hawaii.edu/docs/reorg

**Leeward CC Strategic Plan, 2002-2010**
web http://emedia.leeward.hawaii.edu/sp
print Evidence Room

**Policy on Unit/Area Program Reviews (May 8, 2003)**
web http://home.lcc.hawaii.edu/docs/policies
print Evidence Room
Institutional Integrity

- concern with the clarity, accessibility, and appropriateness
- honest appraisal of student performance
- regard for issues of equity and diversity
- self-reflection and honesty in all operations

- demonstrating honesty and truthfulness
Integrity

This theme deals with the institution’s demonstrated concern with honesty, truthfulness, and the manner in which it represents itself to all stakeholders, internal and external. This theme speaks to the intentions of an institution as well as to how it carries them out. It prompts institutional assessment of the integrity of its policies, practices, and procedures and to how it treats students, employees, and its publics. It asks that the institution concern itself with the clarity, understandability, accessibility, and appropriateness of its publications; that its faculty provide for open inquiry in their classes as well as student grades that reflect an honest appraisal of student performance against faculty standards. It has an expectation of academic honesty on the part of students. It requires that the institution demonstrate regard for issues of equity and diversity. It encourages the institution to look at its hiring and employment practices as well as to its relationship with the Commission and other external agencies. Finally, it expects that an institution be self-reflective and honest with itself in all its operations.

Institutional Integrity

Standard I
Standard II
Standard III
Standard IV

List of Evidence
Documents and Websites
**Standard I: Institutional Mission and Effectiveness**

The institution demonstrates strong commitment to a mission that emphasizes achievement of student learning and to communicating the mission internally and externally. The institution uses analyses of quantitative and qualitative data and analysis in an ongoing and systematic cycle of evaluation, integrated planning, implementation, and re-evaluation to verify and improve the effectiveness by which the mission is accomplished.

I.A. Mission: The institution has a statement of mission that defines the institution’s broad educational purposes, its intended student population, and its commitment to achieving student learning.

I.A.1. The institution establishes student learning programs and services aligned with its purposes, its character, and its student population.

**Descriptive Summary**

Leeward Community College’s primary service areas are the Leeward Coast and the Central region of the island of O‘ahu. The six principles of Leeward Community College’s mission statement delineate the school’s educational purposes and are appropriate for an institution of higher learning.

As one of the seven community colleges of the University of Hawai‘i, Leeward Community College serves to:

- Broaden access to quality post-secondary education over a wide community.
- Specialize in effective teaching strategies that reflect the institution’s commitment to the achievement of student learning.
- Prepare a trained workforce in the state, the Asia-Pacific region, and internationally.
- Provide opportunities for “personal enrichment, occupational upgrading and career mobility.”
- Contribute to community development.
- Prepare students for diversity in the workplace.

The College’s mission describes its students: “the residents of our diverse communities, with particular attention to the Hawaiian population; communities actively transitioning from an agricultural base to a more diversified economic base; and communities making up the fastest growing middle-income suburban population on O‘ahu.” A number of the school’s programs, because of their uniqueness or their excellence, draw students from outside the College’s primary service area. Students come from more than 25 states and 15 countries.
The institution provides remedial/developmental education, introductory liberal arts, preprofessional, and baccalaureate courses. The College's role in higher education has continued to evolve with the goal of seamless articulation and transfer within the University of Hawaiʻi system.

The College also provides specialized programs in Career and Technical Education such as Accounting, Automotive Technology, Business Technology, Culinary Arts and Food Service, Digital Media, Information & Computer Science, and Television Production. Academic subject certificates are awarded in Creative Media, Digital Art, Educational Assistance in Special Education, Music, Philippine Studies, Pre-Business, and Hawaiian Studies. Leeward Oʻahu contains the largest population of native Hawaiians on Oʻahu, and Leeward Community College has a special role in the study and preservation of the Hawaiian culture.

The College’s ongoing faculty/staff development activities in both teaching and learning, the Curriculum Central course creation and maintenance tool, alternative modes of course delivery, and tutoring services provide examples of how the College ensures the quality and integrity of its program and services. Dialogue sessions intended to mentor faculty in the writing of student learning outcomes were conducted during the Spring 2004 term. The information presented in these sessions was incorporated in a self-paced learning module and posted on the College’s website (http://emedia.leeward.hawaii.edu/slo/). These steps were taken to ensure that all course syllabi, regardless of mode of delivery, are consistent over all sections of a course, as well as to facilitate the assessment of student learning outcomes in each course.

Teaching Guidelines and Issues for Faculty (T.G.I.F.) sessions are offered weekly as part of the Faculty Development Series of workshops sponsored by the Innovation Center for Teaching and Learning. The College also sponsors a professional development day each year, such as the Great Ideas for Teaching (GIFT) Day held on March 4, 2005. In addition to traditional classroom courses, the College provides Distance Education via television or the Internet. The Learning Resource Center (LRC) offers tutoring in writing and other content areas, and the Math Lab offers tutoring in mathematics. These efforts are supplemented by several “learning labs” that are maintained by faculty and aides in biology, chemistry, and physics to increase student access to peer tutors and study groups.

In Spring 2004 the College implemented its Policy on Unit/Area Reviews to evaluate its efforts in carrying out its mission. This marked the beginning of a systematic assessment of student learning and institutional effectiveness in all of its courses, programs, and Support Areas. The Program Review process served as a source of ongoing, extensive dialogue that informed the campus about the College's commitment to student learning. In Fall 2004, the College amended its mission, which had just been recently revised, by including the following statement: “The College is committed to student learning.” This amendment was approved by the Faculty Senate and Campus Council in the Spring of 2005 and is scheduled to be submitted to the Board of Regents this Fall.
Self Evaluation
Leeward Community College’s mission clearly states its educational purposes that are appropriate to the College’s intended student population and to an institution of higher learning. The College has begun a conscientious effort to realize its intentions by offering diverse educational programs and has appropriately directed its resources and efforts to support student learning. Assessments of learning and institutional effectiveness are conducted openly as the College attempts to make an honest appraisal of its efforts as the basis for continuing improvement.

Planning Agenda
• No changes are needed to address this standard.

I.A.2. The mission statement is approved by the governing board and published.

Descriptive Summary
The current mission statement was developed through meetings and discussions with input from representatives of the administration, staff, and faculty of the College. Numerous documents, emails, and memorandums attest to the thoroughness of the process to review and update the mission statement. The evidence for Accreditation website provides the revision chronology and documentation of the process. (See http://emedia.leeward.hawaii.edu/sp/evidence.htm)

The mission statement is available to all interested parties in the College Catalog and was mailed to all Faculty and Staff on February 26, 2004. The mission statement can also be found on page 5 of the Leeward CC 2005–2006 Catalog.

Self Evaluation
Over the years since 2000, Leeward CC’s mission statement as published the College’s annual catalog reflects some modifications; however, the changes were not substantive until 2003. For undetermined reasons, the mission statement printed in the 2003-2004 catalog included additional statements that were not the result of a college-wide consensus and remained that way until its revision.

The unilateral modification of Leeward CC’s mission was a cause for concern, but the effects of that breach in integrity were addressed by a campus-wide effort beginning in the Fall of 2003 with a formal process that focused on the review and revision of the existing mission as necessary. This effort involved the entire campus in both formal and informal meetings, open forums, and leadership retreats that resulted in a revised mission statement. The revised mission was adopted by the College and approved by the BOR in Spring 2004.

Planning Agenda
• The College will establish and follow guidelines that are based on inclusive dialogue in future revisions of the mission.
I.B. Improving Institutional Effectiveness

The institution demonstrates a conscious effort to produce and support student learning, measures that learning, assesses how well learning is occurring, and makes changes to improve student learning. The institution also organizes its key processes and allocates its resources to effectively support student learning. The institution demonstrates its effectiveness by providing 1) evidence of the achievement of student learning outcomes and 2) evidence of institution and program performance. The institution uses ongoing and systematic evaluation and planning to refine its key processes and improve student learning.

I.B.5. The institution uses documented assessment results to communicate matters of quality assurance to appropriate constituencies.

Descriptive Summary

Leeward Community College advocates and practices honesty and truthfulness in representing itself to the public and to the college community. Evidence that the College makes a conscientious attempt to carry through on its intentions is provided by its ongoing and evolving effort to achieve its mission. In response to the Accrediting Commission’s recommendations concerning the quality and integrity of programs and services since the College’s last self-study in 2000, Leeward Community College has made significant progress in the way it assesses the effectiveness of its programs and services for improvement and in ensuring that these findings are widely communicated to all of its constituents.

In Spring 2004, the College initiated an ongoing process to assess student learning and institutional effectiveness. The implementation of Leeward’s Policy on Program Reviews prompted an intense and widespread effort to assess courses, programs, and Support Areas. The widespread dialogue that occurred among individuals, instructional Divisions, and Support Area/Units served to inform the entire campus what the College does well and what it needs to do better.

The Report on Program Reviews and Support Area Reviews (http://home.lcc.hawaii.edu/docs/progreview/Program_Review_Report-2004.pdf) summarizes the initial results of the College’s efforts concerning institutional and educational improvement, assessment, and analysis used to guide future institutional planning and resource allocations. A four-year planning and implementation cycle was developed as a result of the ongoing dialogue during that year and is displayed on page 3 of the Report on Program Reviews and Support Area Reviews and below. As stated in the report, the student learning outcomes and institutional objectives will be based on various quantitative and qualitative data, including surveys such as the Community College Survey of Student Engagement (CCSSE).
Campus-wide dialogue to assess the data will guide the action plans for institutional improvement and will set the priorities for budget planning. Each step of the four-year Leeward Community College strategic planning cycle involves dialogue throughout the campus and analytical reports distributed across the campus. Completed Program Review templates will be stored in DocuShare, a repository of College documents (http://documents.leeward.hawaii.edu:8080/docushare/dsweb/View/Collection-92). The Program Review assessments reports will be compiled on an annual basis, with centralized accessibility online for future data assessment and reviews. Publication of the reports in book form is also being planned.

From Fall 2004 to Summer 2005, College leadership developed a more comprehensive approach to integrate assessment, planning, and budgeting. Annual Review is intended to provide the College with a comprehensive planning process that is inclusive, data-based, and collegial. It focuses on the analysis of data provided by Program Reviews of student learning and institutional effectiveness from all Units within the College.

The four-year planning and implementation cycle of the Policy on Program Reviews will now consist of a set of Annual Reviews conducted each year over a period of four years.

This will provide the College with longitudinal data concerning both short- and long-term impact of changes made for improvement. As the Annual Review process is intended to be transparent and widely communicated, all pertinent documents of the process, including budgeting priorities, will be posted on the College website and available to all constituencies of the College.
### Executive Summary

**Student Learning and Achievement**

Describe major actions taken as a result of assessments. (IIA.2.e, f) What has been learned from assessments? What plans are there for changes in the future?

What evidence do you have that students actually are achieving your stated learning outcomes?

Discuss the success of your students when they transfer and the degree to which your division is meeting the learning and employment needs of students (IIA.1a, b).

Discuss how the division approaches class scheduling to meet student needs and the level of student demand for course offerings. (IIA1a, b)

### SWOT Analysis

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strengths</th>
<th>Weaknesses</th>
<th>Opportunities</th>
<th>Threats</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

### Planning Lists

- **Student Learning Plan**
- **Faculty and Staff Support Plan**
- **Curriculum Plan**
- **Support Issues Plan**
- **External Factors Plan**

### References for Student Learning:

- Data
- SWOT: Other Chapters
- Faculty & Staff Curriculum Support
- External

---

**ANNUAL REVIEW**

Institutional Research Data and Assessment Data provided

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Student Learning</th>
<th>Faculty and Staff</th>
<th>Curriculum</th>
<th>Support Issues</th>
<th>External Factors</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Weaknesses</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Opportunities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Threats</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

**PLANNING LISTS**

- Academic Plan
- Student Services Plan
- Academic Support Plan
- Institutional Support Plan
- College Plan
To support these processes, several structures are in place:

The **Curriculum Committee**, a standing committee of the Faculty Senate, provides the means for insuring the College's integrity with regard to quality academic programs and courses. The Curriculum Committee consists of two faculty members from each Academic Division and has the responsibility of reviewing course outlines for all proposed or modified courses. The proposed or modified course is submitted to the Curriculum Committee, followed by a review process that includes input from the disciplines, advisory committees, Divisions, Division chairpersons, the Curriculum Committee itself, the Faculty Senate, and finally administration. This multi-tiered process insures that the quality of education at Leeward Community College is in keeping with its institutional effectiveness. To streamline this process, a web-based system called Curriculum Central provides easy access for College faculty and staff. This centralized online curriculum proposal and maintenance system provides not only the course description, but also addresses a myriad of issues:

- justification for the course
- course's relationship to the College's Strategic Plan and mission
- course's similarities or differences with related courses throughout the UH system
- rigor appropriate to the level of the course
- student learning outcomes.

The web link to Curriculum Central can be found on the Leeward CC homepage.

The **Faculty Senate Program Review Committee** (FSPRC) was originally formed to oversee Program Reviews for all academic courses and programs. Although the FSPRC continues to exist, this supervisory function is now a responsibility of the Assessment Team, who is responsible for campus assessments in both the Academic and Support Areas. The FSPRC chair serves as a liaison between the Faculty Senate and the Assessment Team.

Prior to 2005, the College utilized data for institutional outcome measures from the **Management and Planning Support (MAPS) Report**, a high quality publication of data on various aspects of the institution's operations. Student enrollment numbers, persistence rates, graduation rates, and student demographics are contained in these reports. The **Leeward CC Fact Book** is a quick-reference version of MAPS. From the MAPS reports, information specific to Leeward CC's institutional outcomes were extracted and published in a more concise form as the **Leeward CC Fact Book**. The detailed and copious information in the MAPS report is used to analyze the College's effectiveness and to steer the planning process. Although MAPS continues to be a source of specific and long-term data, **STAR** is the present database enrollment that taps directly into the **SCT Banner system**, a unified online information and support system activated in Fall 2003. The extraction of data elements pertaining to student achievement and learning outcomes common to all campuses from this new system is currently a problem that is being work by the Deans of Instructions and Institutional Research Officers at the University's System level.
**Self Evaluation**

The institution is committed to effective student learning and continually strives to improve its effectiveness. In its pursuit of truth and respect for its constituencies, the College prides itself in a transparent governance structure through open forum dialogues and campus-wide email communications. Students, faculty, staff, and administrators are included in decision-making, planning, and hiring processes, and all feedback is treated with respect. Internal feedback is gathered from the following:

- student government and its representatives
- Faculty Senate and its committees
- Campus Council
- student evaluations of courses/instructors
- Division meetings
- outreach activities
- College surveys

The College believes that this strategic planning model demonstrates Leeward Community College’s integrity to education by facilitating institutional effectiveness and improving student learning.

**Planning Agenda**

- The College publicizes its statistics on student achievement and student learning on the web and through printed materials. Although the information is made available, there is no mechanism currently in place to ensure that communication of quality assurance is occurring between the institution and its students, faculty, staff, and public constituencies. However, the responsibility of developing a mechanism could be logically addressed by a new position. The Director of Planning and Assessment will develop a mechanism to make public evidence on the quality and integrity of the College’s programs.
Standard II: Student Learning Programs and Services

The institution offers high-quality programs, student support services, and library and learning support services that facilitate and demonstrate the achievement of stated student learning outcomes. The institution provides an environment that supports learning, enhances student understanding and appreciation of diversity, and encourages personal and civic responsibility as well as intellectual, aesthetic, and personal development for all of its students.

II.A. Instructional Programs
The institution offers high-quality instructional programs in recognized and emerging fields of study that culminate in identified student outcomes leading to degrees, certificates, employment, or transfer to other higher education institutions or programs consistent with its mission. Instructional programs are systematically assessed in order to assure currency, improve teaching and learning strategies, and achieve stated student learning outcomes. The provisions of this standard are broadly applicable to all instructional activities offered in the name of the institution.

II.A.6. The institution assures that students and prospective students receive clear and accurate information about educational courses and programs and transfer policies. The institution describes its degrees and certificates in terms of their purpose, content, course requirements, and expected student learning outcomes. In every class section students receive a course syllabus that specifies learning objectives consistent with those in the institution's officially approved course outline.

Descriptive Summary
The Leeward Community College 2005-2006 Catalog provides information relating to Course Offerings on pages 111-162. A complete listing of all programs is on page 17, degrees and certificates are defined on page 18, and detailed lists of the requirements and student learning outcomes for the degrees and certificates are on pages 19-63. This information is updated with data from Curriculum Central on a regular basis. Currently, a subcommittee of the Curriculum Committee is investigating methods to standardize catalog Course Descriptions to make them more uniform in structure. Transfer policies are located in the College Catalog on pages 84-87.

Faculty members are required to provide students with course syllabi during the first week of the semester, and to their Division for placement in Division files. Outlines for Fall 2004 are also located on the “e-media Course Outline Archive” located at http://emedia.leeward.hawaii.edu/central/dspcourse.asp. Each course syllabus is required to contain the same student learning outcomes as the approved core course outline for that course.

Students and prospective students can also view all core course outlines by accessing the Curriculum Central website: http://emedia.leeward.hawaii.edu/central.
Self Evaluation
Leeward Community College makes every effort to assure that students and prospective students receive clear and accurate information about educational courses, programs, and transfer policies. Degrees and certificates are clearly described in terms of purpose, content, course requirements, and expected student learning outcomes. Students receive course syllabi that specify learning outcomes consistent with the College's approved core course outlines.

Planning Agenda
• No changes are needed to address this standard.

II.A.6.a. The institution makes available to its students clearly stated transfer-of-credit policies in order to facilitate the mobility of students without penalty. In accepting transfer credits to fulfill degree requirements, the institution certifies that the expected learning outcomes for transferred courses are comparable to the learning outcomes of its own courses. Where patterns of student enrollment between institutions are identified, the institution develops articulation agreements as appropriate to its mission.

Descriptive Summary
The College has clearly stated transfer policies and procedures for students entering from and leaving to other institutions. Pages 84-87 and page 96 of the Leeward CC 2005–2006 Catalog outline the steps students who are transferring from another college in the UH System, as well as from a U.S. or foreign institution, must follow to receive credit for courses taken at other colleges or universities. Executive Policy E5.209 is the basis for the College transfer policy.

The College lists all courses articulated to meet UHM General Education requirements on the following web site: http://www.manoa.hawaii.edu/ovcaa/academics/articulation/courses/leeward-cc.htm.

Transfer requirements to the University of Hawai‘i West O‘ahu are listed on page 86 of the Leeward CC 2005–2006 Catalog. Any student with an AA degree meets all requirements for any baccalaureate program at UHWO. In addition, Leeward’s Accounting and Business Technology programs have articulation agreements with both UH West O‘ahu and Hawai‘i Pacific University. There is also an articulation agreement for the AS in TVPro with Hawai‘i Pacific University. The Associate of Arts in Teaching degree has articulation agreements with baccalaureate programs at Chaminade University in Honolulu, and with City University in Bellevue, Washington. The College also has an articulation agreement with the University of Phoenix for all baccalaureate programs. These agreements were developed in response to student needs, and are reviewed as part of the Annual Review process.
Self Evaluation
The College provides students with procedures and services for the transfer-of-credit to facilitate the mobility of students without penalty. In accepting transfer credits to fulfill degree requirements, Leeward CC certifies that the expected learning outcomes for transferred courses are comparable to the learning outcomes of its own courses. Where patterns of student enrollment between institutions are identified, the institution develops articulation agreements as appropriate to its mission.

Planning Agenda
• No changes are needed to address this standard.

II.A.6.b. When programs are eliminated or program requirements are significantly changed, the institution makes appropriate arrangements so that enrolled students may complete their education in a timely manner with a minimum of disruption.

Descriptive Summary
Leeward follows the Board of Regents Policies 5-l.B.2-3 when programs are eliminated or program requirements are significantly changed. The sections relating to the elimination of programs can be found in Chapter 5, Academic Affairs, http://www.hawaii.edu/offices/bor/policy/index.html.

In relation to the above policy, students who are already in an eliminated program are allowed to finish the required coursework for completion of the program.

Self-Evaluation
Appropriate arrangements are in place when programs are eliminated or program requirements are significantly changed so that enrolled students face a minimum of disruption.

Planning Agenda
• No changes are needed to address this standard.

II.A.6.c. The institution represents itself clearly, accurately, and consistently to prospective and current students, the public, and its personnel through its catalogs, statements, and publications, including those presented in electronic formats. It regularly reviews institutional policies, procedures, and publications to assure integrity in all representations about its mission, programs, and services.

Descriptive Summary
The College makes a conscientious attempt to clearly, accurately and consistently represents itself to the public through various publications, catalogs, statements and electronic forms. The Leeward CC 2005–2006 Catalog and the College website are the two main sources of public information about the College. These sources are regularly updated, with print material reviewed at least one week ahead of production deadline time, and maintained as established by Creative Services policies by the Marketing Officer. The Creative Services policies are clearly defined on the following website: http://emedia.leeward.hawaii.edu/cs/policies.html.
Self Evaluation
The General Catalog has been continuously edited and reformatted in the interest of improving the clarity, accuracy, and consistency by which information about the College is presented. The College website needs to be overhauled to address complaints about its organization and the difficulty of locating information.

Planning Agenda
• To ensure ease of access of students and the public, the College will commit appropriate resources and personnel to redesign the College’s website.

II.A.7. In order to assure the academic integrity of the teaching-learning process, the institution uses and makes public governing board-adopted policies on academic freedom and responsibilities, student academic honesty, and specific institutional beliefs or worldview. These policies make clear the institution’s commitment to the free pursuit and dissemination of knowledge.

Descriptive Summary
Leeward Community College’s Board-approved policies and UH System-wide Executive Policies on academic freedom are readily available to the public online at http://www.svpa.hawaii.edu/svpa/ep/ep.html and http://www.hawaii.edu/offices/bor/policy/index.html. Chapter 9. Board of Regents Policy Section 9-15 provides the following statement related to academic freedom: “In recognition of the special role of faculty in the academic mission of the University, procedures for periodic review of faculty performance must provide safeguards for academic freedom and shall provide the opportunity for participation of faculty peers in the review process.”

UH Executive Policy (E9.201) established the Faculty and Staff Renewal and Vitality Directive, which includes the idea of “an unwavering commitment within the faculty and staff, the administration, and the governing board to academic freedom and a sound concept of academic tenure.”

University of Hawai‘i Community College System CCCM 7200 provides for the evaluation of faculty members, and Section IX of the 2003-2009 agreement between UHPA and the Board of Regents of the UH addresses this issue.

The Board-approved Student Conduct Code for the University of Hawai‘i System can be found at the following website, http://www.hawaii.edu/student/conduct.

Self Evaluation
The existing system-wide policies adequately ensure academic freedom. These, and the policies on student academic honesty, assure the academic integrity of the teaching-learning process.

Planning Agenda
• No changes are needed to address this standard.
II.A.7.a. Faculty distinguish between personal conviction and professionally accepted views in a discipline. They present data and information fairly and objectively.

**Descriptive Summary**

University of Hawai‘i Board of Regents System-wide Executive Policy E5.211 clearly establishes ethical expectations for university personnel as well as providing procedures for dealing with violations of those expectations. The policy can be found at [http://www.svpa.hawaii.edu/svpa/ep/e5/e5211.pdf](http://www.svpa.hawaii.edu/svpa/ep/e5/e5211.pdf). This policy stipulates “Every member of the University is obligated to respond appropriately to any evidence of potential [ethical] irregularities…” In addition, all faculty are required to follow the discipline-approved student learning outcomes for each course taught. As a result, the peer evaluation process provides excellent opportunity for the adherence to professionally accepted views in a discipline as well as providing the potential first step in addressing and rectifying any breach in ethical standards.

Part of the process for faculty contract renewal, tenure, and promotion is the peer evaluation. Each semester, faculty members are required to invite two peers to observe their classes in order to provide feedback on teaching effectiveness and the soundness of their teaching methodology. In addition, faculty must present their teaching philosophies as part of the evaluation process. Contract renewal and tenure and promotion guidelines are listed on the College website at [http://home.lcc.hawaii.edu/docs/faculty](http://home.lcc.hawaii.edu/docs/faculty).

In addition, Section IX.D. of the University of Hawai‘i Professional Assembly (UHPA) contract, “Procedures for Dealing with Alleged Breach of Professional Ethics and/or Conflicts of Interest in Research or Scholarship”, deals with the remedies required for violations of professional ethic standards.

Another valuable resource to the faculty member is the student evaluation, where students provide feedback to faculty relating to teaching effectiveness, fairness, and objectivity. Student evaluations are also part of the peer review process used by Divisional Personnel Committees (DPCs) for contract renewal, and by DPCs and Tenure and Promotion Review Committees (TPRCs) for tenure and promotion. The following questions from the “Student Evaluation of Instructor and Course” address issues of fairness and objectivity:

- The instructor clearly explains the goals, objectives, and overall purpose of the course.
- The instructor appears to know his or her subject.
- The instructor clearly explains complex ideas.
- The instructor allows time for questions and encourages them.
- The instructor asks questions to see if students understand.
- The instructor treats all students fairly.
- The instructor treats students with respect.
- The instructor engages in a healthy exchange of ideas and opinions with students.
- The instructor grades tests fairly.
Self Evaluation
Existing policies clearly establish professional ethical expectations. The peer review process is one avenue of evaluating whether faculty behave professionally and objectively in the classroom. The University of Hawai‘i Professional Assembly (UHPA) contract, “Procedure for Dealing with Alleged Breach of Professional Ethics and/or Conflicts of Interest in Research or Scholarship” deals with the remedies required for violations of professional ethic standards.

Planning Agenda
• No changes are needed to address this standard.

II.A.7.b. The institution establishes and publishes clear expectations concerning student academic honesty and consequences for dishonesty

Descriptive Summary
Student Regulations are included on pages 165-171 of the Leeward CC 2005-2006 Catalog. This section contains a discussion of academic dishonesty and its repercussions. The entire Student Conduct Code for the University of Hawai‘i System can be found at http://www.hawaii.edu/student/conduct. Leeward Community College also includes a link to the Student Conduct Code (http://www.lcc.hawaii.edu/userfiles/file/enroll/student_conduct_code.pdf) on the College’s website.

In addition, faculty members provide information about academic dishonesty as it relates to course expectations as part of their syllabi.

As an information and education resource, the school has prepared an anti-plagiarism module for students, located at http://emedia.leeward.hawaii.edu/resources/plagiarism.

Self Evaluation
The policies regarding academic honesty and consequence for dishonesty are clearly stated. However, since the policies are only available in electronic form, there is concern as to whether they are readily accessible and read by students.

Planning Agenda
• In order to reach those students who do not have a computer or a copy of the College Catalog, the College will inform students about the Student Conduct Code by handing out copies to them at orientation.
II.A.7.c. Institutions that require conformity to specific codes of conduct of staff, faculty, administrators, or students, or that seek to instill specific beliefs or worldviews, give clear prior notice of such policies, including statements in the catalog and/or appropriate faculty or student handbooks.

**Descriptive Summary**
As part of a state public university system, Leeward does not seek to instill specific beliefs or worldviews on its employees or its students. The Leeward CC mission statement (found on page 5 of the *Leeward CC 2005-2006 Catalog*) clearly delineates the school’s focus and areas of emphasis.

Student codes of conduct are included in the *Leeward CC Catalog* on page 165-171. The entire Student Conduct Code for the University of Hawai’i System can be found at [http://www.hawaii.edu/student/conduct](http://www.hawaii.edu/student/conduct). Leeward Community College also includes a link to the Student Conduct Code ([http://www.lcc.hawaii.edu/userfiles/file/enroll/student_conduct_code.pdf](http://www.lcc.hawaii.edu/userfiles/file/enroll/student_conduct_code.pdf)) on the College's website.

Faculty are expected to adhere to the Drug-free Workplace Policy ([http://www.hawaii.edu/ohr/docs/drugfree.htm](http://www.hawaii.edu/ohr/docs/drugfree.htm)), the Workplace Non-violence Policy (Executive Policy E9.210), and the Policy on Sexual Harassment and Related Conduct (Executive Policy E1.203). All of these policies can be viewed through the Human Resources website at [http://www.hawaii.edu/ohr/](http://www.hawaii.edu/ohr/). A *Guidebook for Faculty and Staff* contains general expectations of faculty conduct, and discusses both the Drug-free Workplace Policy and the Policy on Sexual Harassment and Related Conduct. A revision of the *Guidebook* is currently in process, and a discussion of the Workplace Non-Violence Policy will be included in the revision. The *Guidebook* is distributed to all new faculty during new faculty orientation, and is available from the Innovation Center for Teaching and Learning. Once the *Guidebook* is revised, it will be placed on line, linked to the College’s website.

**Self Evaluation**
In addition to written policies addressed above, the Human Resources Office periodically conducts workshops concerning violence in the workplace and sexual harassment. The relevant policies concerning student and faculty conduct are clearly stated and the College makes every effort to insure the policy statements are widely available.

**Planning Agenda**
- No changes are needed to address this standard.

II.A.8. Institutions offering curricula in foreign locations to students other than U.S. nationals operate in conformity with standards and applicable Commission policies.

**Descriptive Summary**
Leeward CC does not offer curricula in foreign locations to students other than US nationals.

**Planning Agenda**
- No changes are needed to address this standard.
II.B. Student Support Services

The institution recruits and admits diverse students who are able to benefit from its programs, consistent with its mission. Student support services address the identified needs of students and enhance a supportive learning environment. The entire student pathway through the institutional experience is characterized by a concern for student access, progress, learning, and success. The institution systematically assesses student support services using student learning outcomes, faculty and staff input, and other appropriate measures in order to improve the effectiveness of these services.

II.B.2. The institution provides a catalog for its constituencies with precise, accurate and current information concerning the following:

II.B.2.a. The institution provides a catalog for its constituencies with precise, accurate, and current information concerning the following: General Information

Descriptive Summary

Leeward Community College makes available a new college catalog every year that clearly identifies important contact information by address, telephone number, and web site. An academic calendar introduces important dates, outlining the beginning of instruction, final exams, withdrawal dates and graduation.

In the Leeward CC 2005-2006 Catalog, the unique educational mission of Leeward Community College and prevailing principles is stated clearly on page 5, declaring a commitment towards success for each student as defined in the college motto “to help people learn.”

All programs of study and degree options are carefully described in detail. An essential overview of each career and technical degree program is followed by a written description of the degree, required courses, elective choices, and identification of the program coordinator. Additionally, prerequisites and specific requirements and additional information are provided. As necessary, information is made available, such as alternative course numbering, career opportunities, preferred course sequencing, and references to academic advising. This information is described in detail and well organized on pages 17-58.

The Associate in Arts degree and General Education requirements are explained in detail on pages 60-69. General Education student learning outcomes and expectations of competencies in identified areas of study are introduced. Required General Education core courses available are clearly listed.

Financial aid information is made available on pages 81-83. The application process and eligibility requirements are outlined. Different types of federal aid, scholarship opportunities, and other resources are identified, as well. Students are encouraged to visit the Financial Aid Office and can also secure additional information through its website.
Learning support services available to students, including the Learning Resources Center, Math Learning Resource Center, Library, and services for student with disabilities are found on pages 100-103. The Student Services Office, including Counseling and Advising, Job Prep Services, and Career Development Center Services, enables students to receive essential academic guidance, career planning, and personal support.

Names, titles, and educational backgrounds of administrators, instructional faculty, and staff associated with Leeward Community College are recognized by Division or Unit in the Leeward CC 2005-2006 Catalog on pages 173-179. In addition, University of Hawai'i Board of Regents and University of Hawai'i system administration are listed, as well as college advisory boards for specific career and technical programs.

Self Evaluation
Leeward Community College publishes a comprehensive college catalog every year to assure that students and prospective students receive clear and accurate information about its programs and services. The 2004-2005 Catalog received the First Place Paragon Award from the National Council on Marketing and Public Relations in March 2005. The catalog is available online at http://www.lcc.hawaii.edu/catalog/

The current Leeward CC 2005-2006 Catalog effectively introduces the College’s educational mission, details all educational programs of study, describes resources for support such as financial aid and learning resources, and introduces the faculty, staff and administration. However, there is some concern that the catalog is not published early enough for students to make informed decisions before they register for classes.

Planning Agenda
• The College, through its Creative Services Office, will ensure that the catalog is produced and made available in a timely manner.

II.B.2.b. The institution provides a catalog for its constituencies with precise, accurate, and current information concerning the following: Requirements

Descriptive Summary
General admissions procedures and appropriate steps for admissions to Leeward Community College are clearly identified for all prospective students on pages 70-76 of the 2005-2006 Catalog. Different categories for student admission delineate specific requirements for international, transfer, or early admission students. These requirements are explained thoroughly and descriptively.

Tuition and fees are clearly identified along with refund policies determined by type of course and time of the semester. Other financial obligations, such as graduation, late registration and transcript request fees are outlined. See pages 77-79.

A compete outline of degree and certificate programs is referenced on pages 59-69. Stated learning outcomes, individual course requirements, and particular degree requirements for all educational programs at Leeward Community College are displayed.
The catalog effectively outlines procedures to assist students in transferring to other institutions within the University of Hawai‘i system. Transfer information is specific and informative for assisting students choosing to transfer to either the University of Hawai‘i at Mānoa or West O‘ahu campuses. See pages 84-87.

**Self Evaluation**  
Prospective Leeward Community College students are afforded the opportunity to review admissions requirements, college expenses, degree availability, and transfer policies through the college catalog.

**Planning Agenda**  
- No changes are needed to address this standard.

---

**II.B.2.c. The institution provides a catalog for its constituencies with precise, accurate, and current information concerning the following: Major Policies Affecting Students**

**Descriptive Summary**  
Policies listed in the *2005-2006 Catalog* include the following:

- **Student Regulations**: Student Conduct Code, Academic Dishonesty, Financial Obligations to the University, Lethal Weapons, Smoking, Illicit Drug and Alcohol (pages 165-166)
- **Student Academic Grievance Procedures** (page 166)
- **Academic Probation and Suspension Policy** (pages 167-168)
- **Educational Rights and Privacy of Students** (pages 168-169)
- **Academic Rights and Freedoms of Students and Nondiscrimination and Affirmative Action Policies** (page 169)
- **Policy on Sexual Harassment and Sexual Assault Policy** (pages 170–171)
- **General Policy involving Non-Students** (page 171)
- **Refund Policy** (page 79)
- **Acceptance of Transfer Credits Information** (pages 95-97)

**Self Evaluation**  
The Student Conduct Code addresses issues of academic dishonesty and financial obligations to the university, and prohibits lethal weapons and the use of drugs and alcohol on campus. The Code further explains a range of possible violations and consequences of such action. Students are informed of grievance procedures and the appropriate steps for possible resolution. Besides inclusion in the catalog, the Code is also distributed to all new students at orientation and is available through the Leeward CC website and the Dean of Student Services Office.
Leeward Community College’s standards of satisfactory academic progress are clearly defined in the catalog. Students are made aware of the consequences of unsatisfactory progress through policies that define academic warning, probation, suspension, and dismissal status.

Policies related to issues of sexual harassment, sexual assault, and non-discrimination on the basis of a disability are stated clearly, with contact personnel listed.

Confidentiality of student records and federal policy on nondiscrimination and affirmative action are insured under the Family Educational Rights and Privacy Act (FERPA). Procedures for discrimination complaints and appropriate campus personnel are identified.

**Planning Agenda**
- No changes are needed to address this standard.

---

**II.B.2.d.** The institution provides a catalog for its constituencies with precise, accurate, and current information concerning the following: Locations or publications where other policies may be found.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Locations of Other Publications/Policies</th>
<th>Publications and Policies</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Leeward CC Homepage: <a href="http://www.lcc.hawaii.edu">http://www.lcc.hawaii.edu</a></td>
<td>Academic Probation &amp; Suspension Policies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Campus Bulletins</td>
<td>Academic Rights and Freedom of Students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brochures</td>
<td>Children in the Classroom</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Affirmative Action and Non-Discrimination</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Computer Lab Policies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Library Policies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Counseling Office</td>
<td>Prior Learning Credit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Advanced Placement Credit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Divisions and Deans' Offices</td>
<td>Policy and Procedures Manual</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>College Credit Equivalencies</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

All publications are to be sent to the Marketing Director/Publications Specialist for recommendations/approval prior to duplicating and distribution.

**Self Evaluation**
Leeward CC’s policies are not centrally located and are sometimes difficult to find. Different departments update their policies, most of which are available at Leeward CC’s website and are regularly updated.

**Planning Agenda**
- To ensure ease of access of students and the public, the College will commit appropriate resources and personnel to redesign the College’s website.
II.B.3.f. The institution maintains student records permanently, securely, and confidentially, with provision for secure backup of all files, regardless of the form in which those files are maintained. The institution publishes and follows established policies for release of student records.

Descriptive Summary
All student records from the Aldrich system were migrated to the new SCT Banner Student Information System. With the adoption of Banner, student records are kept on the Banner computer located at UH Mānoa, whose Information Technology Services are responsible for routine backups of the system. The Banner back up tapes are stored off-site by a professional records Management Company, Crown Pacific that is contracted by UH Mānoa. The company has a secure, climate-controlled facility with surveillance equipment and guards located in Mililani.

Release of student records is regulated by the Family Educational Rights and Privacy Act (FERPA) guidelines. Full documentation can be found in Admissions and Records Office and the Dean of Student Services Office.

The Office of Continuing Education and Workforce Development maintains records that are archived at the end of each term. Data is backed up and stored; hard copy documents are maintained for a period of up to 5 to 7 years, depending on the type of program; and other paper documents, including the course evaluation form and sign in sheets, are filed. The OCEWD Motorcycle Safety Education Program, by federal and state law, keeps permanent records of all student registration information. OCEWD adheres to FERPA regulations and guidelines. Full documentation can be found in the Dean of Student Services Office.

Self Evaluation
The College meets the standard of maintaining student records permanently, securely, and confidentially through its Banner Student Information System. Release of student records is appropriately regulated.

Planning Agenda
- No changes are needed to address this standard.
Standard III: Resources

The institution effectively uses its human, physical, technology, and financial resources to achieve its broad educational purposes, including stated student learning outcomes, and to improve institutional effectiveness.

III.A. Human Resources

The institution employs qualified personnel to support student learning programs and services wherever offered and by whatever means delivered, and to improve institutional effectiveness. Personnel are treated equitably, are evaluated regularly and systematically, and are provided opportunities for professional development. Consistent with its mission, the institution demonstrates its commitment to the significant educational role played by persons of diverse backgrounds by making positive efforts to encourage such diversity. Human resource planning is integrated with institutional planning.

III.A.1.a. Leeward Community College assures the integrity and quality of its programs and services by employing personnel who are qualified by appropriate education, training, and experience to provide and support these programs and services.

Descriptive Summary

Criteria, qualifications, and procedures for selection of personnel are clearly and publicly stated. Job descriptions are directly related to institutional mission and goals and accurately reflect position duties, responsibilities, and authority. Criteria for selection of faculty include knowledge of the subject matter or service to be performed (as determined by individuals with Discipline expertise), effective teaching, scholarly activities, and potential to contribute to the mission of the institution. Institutional faculty play a significant role in selection of new faculty. Degrees held by faculty and administrators are from institutions accredited by recognized U.S. accrediting agencies. Degrees from non-U.S. institutions are recognized only if equivalence has been established.

Available positions are posted on the Internet (http://workatuh.hawaii.edu/) and are advertised in Sunday editions of the Honolulu Star-Bulletin. Some positions are advertised nationally. The College requires that minimum qualifications be met for each applicant who applies for a position at the College. These minimum qualifications are determined as follows:

- Minimum Qualifications for Executive/Managerial positions are determined by the University of Hawai‘i President. The policy governing the process is found in Executive Policy Administration Sept 1983 E9.205 Qualification Requirements for Academic Positions in the Executive/Managerial Classification and Compensation Plan (http://www.svpa.hawaii.edu/svpa/ep/e9/e9205.pdf)

- Minimum Qualifications for Faculty positions are determined by the Community College Deans/Chancellors. The policy governing the process is located in Leeward CC’s Human Resources Office (HRO).
Institutional Integrity

Minimum Qualifications for APT positions are determined by the University of Hawai‘i System Personnel Office. Policies for determining minimum qualifications for APT are listed in the document *Classification and Compensation Plan for Administrative, Professional and Technical (APT) Personnel* (http://www.svpa.hawaii.edu/svpa/apm/pers/a9210.pdf)

Minimum Qualifications for Civil Service positions are determined by the State Department of Human Resources Development. Policies for determining minimum qualifications for Civil Service positions are listed in Department of Human Resources Development Class Specifications (http://www.hawaii.gov/hrd/main/eccd/)

Interviews of job applicants are conducted by committees. These committees are balanced in terms of ethnicity and gender. Additionally, each committee is comprised of experts in that particular area.

In addition to meeting minimum qualifications, applicants for faculty positions are asked to demonstrate effective teaching. This is judged in various ways, which could include a teaching demonstration during the interview process, peer evaluations, and letters of recommendation. Applicants are asked to submit transcripts and references, as well. If transcripts are from non-U.S. institutions, Leeward CC’s Human Resources Office (HRO) has the transcripts translated, with assistance from local experts when needed.

To make sure that the above procedures are consistently applied, *Policy A9.540: Recruitment and Selection of Faculty and APT* is available. This policy lists the recruitment and selection procedures and includes a checklist to ensure that all necessary steps are followed.

Leeward CC follows the UH system’s personnel policies and procedures. Most of these are available on the internet (http://www.hawaii.edu/ohr/).

Self Evaluation

Leeward Community College makes a concerted effort to make job postings available to the general public by advertising both on the internet and the Sunday Honolulu Star-Bulletin, making employment information easily accessible and available to interested applicants. Efforts by the HRO to make employment applications and information available over the internet will enhance the integrity of the application process.

The integrity of the interview and hiring process of prospective applicants is guided by *Policy A9.540: Recruitment and Selection of Faculty and APT*. Along with providing procedures for recruitment and selection, Policy A9.540 includes a checklist to ensure that all necessary steps are followed in the hiring process. These steps include an interview of qualified candidates, review of transcripts, and verification of past job experience by Deans and Directors.

Leeward CC does a commendable job of providing an Affirmative Action Plan (AAP) for ensuring equity and diversity among employees. The EEO officer at Leeward creates a yearly report that provides information about what groups of people are underrepresented at Leeward. This report helps determine which publications to advertise in to best reach the population of underutilized groups.

Planning Agenda

- No changes are needed to address this standard.
III.A.1.d. The institution upholds a state-mandated code of professional ethics for all of its personnel.

**Descriptive Summary**
The state-mandated code is available at [http://www.hawaii.gov/ethics](http://www.hawaii.gov/ethics).

Ethical behavior is fostered in all Leeward employees in a variety of ways. Faculty employees follow CCCM #2600: Statement of Professional Ethics, a statement pertaining to research and scholarly activities. ([http://www.hawaii.edu/ccc/Docs/CCCM_PDF/2600-040198.pdf](http://www.hawaii.edu/ccc/Docs/CCCM_PDF/2600-040198.pdf)) Various workshops pertaining to ethical behavior are provided. For instance, Leeward has provided workshops on legal responsibility in the workplace, copyright, and patent policy.

The Human Resources Office at Leeward CC keeps a record of all complaints and grievances. The HRO also keeps personnel records in a locked file. Faculty and APT employees who want to view their files are able to do so by making an appointment with the HRO. Official personnel records for Civil Service employees and Executive/Managerial are available at the UH Mānoa Human Resources Office.

**Self Evaluation**
Leeward faculty follow CCCM# 2600: Statement of Professional Ethics that offers guidance on research and scholarly activities. The State of Hawai‘i code of professional ethics provides the Leeward faculty and staff with information concerning ethical issues.

**Planning Agenda**
- No changes are needed to address this standard.

---

III.A.3. The institution systematically develops personnel policies and procedures that are available for information and review. Such policies and procedures are equitably and consistently administered.

III.A.3.a. The institution establishes and adheres to written policies ensuring fairness in all employment procedures.

**Descriptive Summary**
Leeward Community College’s Human Resources Office follows the University of Hawai‘i System Administrative Procedures. These policies are available at the Human Resources Office, are on the internet for review (see the web addresses at the end of this theme), and are supplemented by the Chancellor for Community Colleges Memos (CCCMs), which are also available at the Human Resources Office. Changes to Community Colleges’ personnel policies and procedures may be forthcoming due to the reinstatement of a Vice President for Community Colleges, or as needed by the College. Until that time, the Human Resources Office will continue to follow the University of Hawai‘i System Administrative Procedures as well as the CCCMs.
Self Evaluation
The integrity of the personnel policies and procedures is maintained by the consistent use of the policies university-wide. Additionally, as changes are made to the administration that governs the Community Colleges, changes may be made to the personnel policies and procedures pending campus needs and review.

Planning Agenda
- No changes are needed to address this standard.

III.A.3.b. The institution makes provision for the security and confidentiality of personnel records. Each employee has access to his/her personnel records in accordance with the law.

Descriptive Summary
HRO keeps personnel records in a locked file. Faculty and APT employees who want to view their files are able to do so by making an appointment with the HRO. Official personnel records for Civil Service and Executive/Managerial employees are available at the UH Mānoa Human Resources Office.

Self Evaluation
Appropriate provisions are in place for the security and confidentiality of personnel records, including personal access to the employee’s own records.

Planning Agenda
- No changes are needed to address this standard.

III.A.4. The institution demonstrates through policies and practices an appropriate understanding of and concern for issues of equity and diversity.

III.A.4.a. The institution creates and maintains programs, practices, and services that support its diverse personnel.

Descriptive Summary
Leeward Community College maintains appropriate programs, practices, and services for its personnel. The Innovation Center for Teaching and Learning (ICTL) provides monthly colloquia that address professional development. At the end of each colloquium, participants complete evaluations that allow the workshop coordinators to assess effectiveness. Additionally, the Human Resources Office has held workshops for faculty and staff, including one on Legal Responsibilities in the Workplace. Some of the Human Resources staff and some of Leeward’s administrators have attended investigative training workshops to help them better understand and respond appropriately when handling complaints and grievances.
Self Evaluation
Workshops offered by Leeward CC help to ensure the integrity of its employees by keeping them current with such issues as legal responsibility in the workplace, workplace violence, copyright, and patent policy. Additionally, some employees and administrators have attended investigative training workshops to enable a better and more efficient response to any grievance, which allows them to maintain integrity in this process.

Planning Agenda
• No changes are needed to address this standard.

III.A.4.b. The institution regularly assesses its record in employment equity and diversity consistent with its mission.

Descriptive Summary
To address issues of employment equity and diversity, Leeward CC has an Affirmative Action Plan (AAP). The EEO officer at Leeward creates a yearly report that states what groups of people are underrepresented at the College. The AAP is then used if two applicants of the same caliber are finalists for a job, and one is considered underutilized. The underutilized applicant is selected for the position. When jobs become available, the information from the yearly AAP report also helps determine what other publications to advertise a job in besides the Honolulu Star Bulletin and the Internet, so the College can address the equity issue.

Self Evaluation
The AAP report maintains the integrity of the hiring process when it comes to ensuring equity and diversity.

Planning Agenda
• No changes are needed to address this standard.

III.A.4.c. The institution subscribes to, advocates, and demonstrates integrity in the treatments of its administration, faculty, staff, and students.

Descriptive Summary
Leeward Community College has many policies and procedures in place to ensure students and personnel are treated fairly. Students are able to find the grievance procedure information at all Division Offices, the Dean of Student Services Office, the Office of the Chief Academic Officer, the Dean of Arts & Sciences Office, and in the 2003-2004 Student Helpbook. Most personnel have unions (Hawai‘i Government Employees Association (HGEA), United Public Workers (UPW), University of Hawaii‘i Professional Assembly (UHPA) to help with safety issues and grievance procedures. Additionally, the University has policies in place—such as the Workplace Violence Policy and the Sexual Harassment Policy—to ensure fair treatment.
**Self Evaluation**

When a complaint or grievance is issued, the Leeward CC Human Resources Office keeps a record, helping to maintain the integrity of the grievance process. In addition, these records are available for viewing by appointment to affected employees to ensure the fairness of the grievance process.

Employee unions (HGEA, UPW, and UHPA) also assist in maintaining the integrity of the grievance process. Unions have their own procedures in place to handle grievances and also provide support to affected employees.

Students have equal opportunity to file a grievance. Students are able to find the grievance procedure information at the locations listed above.

**Planning Agenda**

- No changes are needed to address this standard.
III.D. Financial Resources

Financial resources are sufficient to support student learning programs and services and to improve institutional effectiveness. The distribution of resources supports the development, maintenance, and enhancement of programs and services. The institution plans and manages its financial affairs with integrity and in a manner that ensures financial stability. The level of financial resources provides a reasonable expectation of both short-term and long-term financial solvency. Financial resources planning is integrated with institutional planning.

III.D.2.a. Financial documents, including the budget and independent audit, reflect appropriate allocation and use of financial resources to support student learning programs and services. Institutional responses to external audit findings are comprehensive, timely, and communicated appropriately.

Descriptive Summary

Financial planning and the management of financial resources at Leeward Community College are strictly guided by a number of long-term documents and from three levels within the University of Hawai‘i System. The two major documents that currently integrate financial planning and institutional planning at Leeward Community College are the Leeward Community College Strategic Plan 2002-2010 and the Leeward CC Long Range Development Plan (LRDP), adopted and remains unchanged since 1996. These plans are driven by the College’s mission and are aligned with two other planning documents: the University of Hawai‘i System Plan 2002-2010 and the University of Hawai‘i Community Colleges Strategic Plan 2002-2010. Together, these plans state the long-range goals, provide the direction, and set the guidelines and priorities for the University of Hawai‘i, UH Community Colleges, and Leeward Community College. The College, as part of the University of Hawai‘i System, undergoes annual external audits, which include audits of fiscal management.

The College depends on three sources to fund its operation: State general funds, student tuition and fees, and special/revolving funds. General funds account for about 72% of the College’s operating budget, student tuition and fees account for approximately 23% of the budget, and special/revolving funds account for the remainder. Special/revolving funds include funds generated from the College’s Summer Session programs and user fees that are charged to external groups for facilities and services provided by the College.

Leeward Community College has followed a process that attempts to widely disseminate financial information concerning the allocation and use of financial resources. All members of the institution are provided financial information at the beginning and during the academic year to inform the campus of its expenditures. Prior to 2002, the administration followed a procedure to ensure widespread participation when prioritizing its annual and biennial budget. Input was sought from the Faculty Senate, Division Chairs, Unit Heads, and the Campus Council. In addition, the Chancellor met with the campus community through open forums and meetings with individual Units. Requests from all parts of the campus were discussed, prioritized, and consolidated into the College’s budget. Once all requests were submitted, the final budget request was prepared, based on the current service base and anticipated additional needs. Between each biennium, the College added to this base by justifying additional appropriations through Program Change Requests (PCRs) to meet program needs.
Beginning in 2002 and up until 2006, in all subsequent annual re-revisits of the Strategic Plan 2002-2010, campus input was solicited in the form of action plans that were widely publicized and prioritized by a campus-wide voting process. These prioritized lists represented an additional source of input that the administrative team used in making decisions about the proposed budget.

The budgeting process continued to evolve with the implementation of the College’s Program Review process in 2004. The annual revisit of the Strategic Plan in 2005 incorporated additional changes as the campus was actively involved in a systematic assessment of their efforts. The first involved the requirement that all action plans be based on the assessment of student learning. This change was logical, as the College was actively engaged in program, Support Area, and course assessments. The second change called for action plans to be divided among four categories: Capital Improvement Projects (CIP), Full Time Equivalent positions (FTE), and Academic, Professional, and Technical (APT) positions, and non-recurring items. A popular vote was still used to obtain campus-wide input, and the administrative team decided upon the final prioritization after consultation with Division and Unit Heads. An evaluation of this voting process prompted the campus to refine its planning and budgeting cycle, resulting in its new Annual Review process, as described in Standard I.B.5.

Self Evaluation

Financial documents, including the budget and independent audits, reflect appropriate allocation and use of financial resources to support student learning programs and services. Institutional responses to external audit findings are comprehensive, timely, and communicated appropriately.

The College effectively manages its budget within the limitations imposed by the State. Since the Governor of the State of Hawai‘i allocates general funds based on legislative appropriations and the Council of Revenue projections, Leeward’s budget is not fixed from year to year. The College attempts to communicate budget plans to the campus at large by posting online summaries of the budget. Additionally, the campus at large hears a report on the budget at the twice-yearly Convocations. These are sufficient methods of disseminating budgetary information.

Audits of the management of the College finances are conducted by external agencies on a regular basis, and the College has responded to all audits in a timely manner, making changes as needed. In sum, the College works to maintain the integrity of its fiscal management.

With respect to general funds, the College’s annual and biennial budget is determined by the State’s legislative budget process. The availability of general funds is based on biennial legislative appropriations, which are subject to the Governor’s allocation. The Governor is required by law to allocate funds that are based on revenues projected by the Council of Revenues. The Legislature appropriates funds specifically to the University of Hawai‘i, and the University of Hawai‘i President allocates the funds within the University of Hawai‘i System. Leeward CC is a small segment of the overall State annual and long-range financial plan. The hierarchy of the State budgetary process from the Legislature, Governor, University of Hawai‘i System, University of Hawai‘i Community College System, and finally to Leeward Community College provides little opportunity for significant changes to the budget; given that, the College’s
The budget has not changed significantly for over a decade. Despite this fact, the College has been able to make significant changes for improvement by the reallocation of existing funds. The assessment-based Annual Review process is intended to improve the way reallocations are done, as well as to better justify increases in the College’s annual and biennial appropriations.

Planning Agenda
• The College will assess the effectiveness of the Program and Annual Review processes in providing sufficient financial resources to support student learning programs and services.

III.D.2.b. Appropriate financial information is provided throughout the institution.

Descriptive Summary
Leeward CC’s budget plan, upon approval by the Campus Council, is made available to the entire campus. Relevant information regarding budget items is available in each Division office. The University System’s Fiscal Management Information System (FMIS) provides each Unit within the College with online access to view account information, budgets, expenditures, and encumbrances. Audit reports are public records and are available from the Office of Administrative Services.

Each year the Administrative team develops an Operational Expenditure Plan (OEP) (http://emedia.leeward.hawaii.edu/cs/planning/reports/) that details how the College’s annual allocation is to be expended. This information is presented to members of the Campus Council for their input and recommendations. The Operational Expenditure Plan, along with the College’s annual budget allocation, is also shared with the entire campus at the beginning of each academic year during the College’s annual Leadership Retreat and Convocation. Expenditures are continuously monitored and discussed during regularly scheduled meetings of the Administrative Team and Division/Unit heads conducted by the Chancellor during each fiscal year. The Annual Review Process now requires that all input and recommendations concerning budget allocations be based on assessment data.

Self Evaluation
The financial planning and budgeting at the campus level is continuously evaluated to clarify and improve the guidelines and processes that are used to acquire and expend the College’s allocation. The College currently uses the prioritized Annual Review planning lists to develop its budget requests and allocate funds appropriated by the State via the University System.

Planning Agenda
• The College will assess the effectiveness of its Program and Annual Review processes in allocating funds to support student learning programs and services.
III.D.2.c. The institution has sufficient cash flow and reserves to maintain stability, strategies for appropriate risk management, and realistic plans to meet financial emergencies and unforeseen occurrences.

Descriptive Summary
The nature of the funding for the College makes it very challenging for the campus to maintain a reliable and sustainable cash reserve policy. As stated earlier, the College receives approximately 72% of its funding from state general fund appropriations and about 23% from tuition and fees. State appropriated funds cannot be carried forward to the following fiscal year, and funds from tuition and fees have typically been expended in full to cover all the costs for that academic year.

In case of need that extends beyond available funding from state appropriations and tuition and fees, the College pools surplus funds from special-funded programs such as Summer Session and Continuing Education. The College can also use the funds from the current semester's tuition. For emergency expenditures that can be funded through insurance claims monies, the College submits requests through the Risk Management Office.

Self Evaluation
Because of the way the money is allocated to the College, it has not been possible to maintain a reliable and sustainable cash reserve from state appropriations and tuition and fees to be used in case of emergency. Despite this fact, in case of an emergency, plans are in place to use funds from special-funded programs should an emergency arise.

Planning Agenda
• No changes are needed to address this standard.

III.D.2.d. The institution practices effective oversight of finances, including management of financial aid, grants, externally funded programs, contractual relationships, auxiliary organizations or foundations, and institutional investments and assets.

Descriptive Summary
An independent certified public accounting firm annually audits the College's financial statements. The University uses a Fund Accounting System, which establishes a cycle to audit each fund separately. The internal control procedures outlined in the Administrative Procedures Manual cut across all of these audits. The auditing procedures provide an objective third party review of internal controls and procedures. The results and recommendations of the audit are then presented to the Board of Regents, with copies to the University President, the Vice President for Community Colleges, and to Leeward’s Administrative Services Officer. The audits confirm whether the College’s financial records are satisfactory, but more importantly, offer suggestions for strengthening internal controls and improving operation efficiency. Other major campus audits include the required Federal Compliance Audit or A-133, the Vocational Education Act Audit, the Financial Aid Audit, various legislative audits, and unscheduled surprise audits performed by the University’s Office of the Internal Auditor.
The College’s most recent audit (Fiscal Year ending June 30, 2003) was performed by a national accounting firm, Price, Waterhouse, Coopers. The College had some audit findings in the area of financial aid administration, which were responded to in a timely manner. A copy of the report and the response are available at the office of the Director of Administrative Services.

Self Evaluation
The College, as part of the University of Hawai‘i System, undergoes annual external audits, which include audits of fiscal management. Most of the findings have been positive. In the recent past, one negative finding regarding financial aid administration was reported. The College responded to that in a timely manner. Personnel at the College work hard to maintain the integrity of its fiscal management.

Planning Agenda
• No changes are needed to address this standard.

III.D.2.e. All financial resources, including those from auxiliary activities, fund-raising efforts, and grants are used with integrity in a manner consistent with the mission and goals of the institution.

Descriptive Summary
Leeward Community College, like all Community Colleges in the University of Hawai‘i System, provides auxiliary services, having separate accounts for the library, student activities, transcripts, diplomas, vending services, food services, transportation services, mailroom services, and other programs that support the College. These accounts are audited concurrently with the College’s financial statements. Additionally, the College maintains responsibility and control over these auxiliary organizations to ensure conformity in support of institutional goals and to address any deficiencies identified by an independent accounting firm.

Monies from scholarships, fundraisers, and donations are audited separately. These accounts are under the umbrella of the University of Hawai‘i Foundation and are monitored by the Foundation’s internal control system. Leeward CC receives copies of the Foundation’s annual financial audit.

The University System Central Accounting Office and the Office of Research Services oversees all grants to ensure that they are managed in accordance with all regulations, internal restrictions, and laws governing the agreements.

Self Evaluation
The College adheres to a strict set of internal and System guidelines to assure the integrity of its management of all financial resources.

Planning Agenda
• No changes are needed to address this standard.
III.D.2.f. Contractual agreements with external entities are consistent with the mission and goals of the institution, governed by institutional policies, and contain appropriate provisions to maintain the integrity of the institution.

**Descriptive Summary**
Contractual agreements between Leeward Community College and external entities range from formal contracts and grants, to Memorandum of Agreements (MOAs), to service contracts for maintenance of equipment. The UH System Offices provide a detailed *Administrative Procedures Manual* on how contractual agreements between Leeward and external agencies are managed. The Manual provides extensive guidelines that describe how the College manages its formal contracts and grants, Memorandum of Agreements (MOAs), and service contracts for maintenance of equipment. The existence of internal policies and practices that are aligned with those at the University and State ensure that every contractual agreement is consistent with the College’s mission and goals. The Office of Research Services approves and executes all contracts and grants. The Office of Procurement and Risk Management reviews service contracts, and administrators review informal MOAs.

**Self Evaluation**
The College has a sufficient system in place to maintain the integrity of its contractual agreements with external entities: the Office of Research Services approves and executes all contracts and grants, the Office of Procurement and Risk Management reviews service contracts, and administrators review informal Memorandum of Agreements.

**Planning Agenda**
- No changes are needed to address this standard.

III.D.2.g. The institution regularly evaluates its financial management processes, and the results of the evaluation are used to improve financial management systems.

**Descriptive Summary**
The College regularly evaluates its fiscal planning methods and process and makes changes for improvement via the continuous dialogue that occurs through all levels of the campus community.

Summaries of the budget (Operational Expenditure Plan) for the fiscal years 02-03, 03-04, and 04-05 are available online at [http://emedia.leeward.hawaii.edu/cs/planning/reports/](http://emedia.leeward.hawaii.edu/cs/planning/reports/).

**Self Evaluation**
The integrity of fiscal management is also maintained by a *Program Review* process that the Leeward CC’s Business Office conducts. This review helps to assure the usefulness of the various budget reports that are distributed to various campus constituencies.

**Planning Agenda:**
- No changes are needed to address this standard.
IV.A. Decision-Making Roles and Processes

The institution recognizes that ethical and effective leadership throughout the organization enables the institution to identify institutional values, set and achieve goals, learn, and improve.

IV.A.1. Institutional leaders create an environment for empowerment, innovation, and institutional excellence. They encourage staff, faculty, administrators, and students, no matter what their official titles, to take initiative in improving the practices, programs, and services in which they are involved. When ideas for improvement have policy or significant institution-wide implications, systematic participative processes are used to assure effective discussion, planning, and implementation.

Descriptive Summary

Leeward Community College has experienced a considerable number of changes in Administration at the College and System levels since the last Accreditation Self Study in 2000. However, both of the College’s Chief Executive Officers (the former Provost/Chancellor and the current Chancellor) have shown ethical and effective leadership to help the campus identify and realize the goals and objectives as stated in the College’s mission and Strategic Plan.

Through each semester’s Convocation, the Chief Executive Officer provides the focus and sets the tone for the entire campus community. Both the former Provost/Chancellor and the current Chancellor have recognized the importance of honest and inclusive dialogue, collaboration, and the principles of shared governance. Each has consistently encouraged campus-wide involvement to arrive at a collective understanding of how the College might improve its effectiveness. Both have been challenged to lead the institution in the midst of decreasing governmental support and increasing demands for accountability, and the Chancellor, in particular, has chosen to address the situation by encouraging and empowering members of the campus community to change from a culture based on past practices, to one based on assessment, evaluation, and planning that leads to improvement. This focus has enabled clear and honest communication with students and the public about the effectiveness of our institution.

A record of our leadership’s efforts is summarized by the following chronology.

- Beginning in 2001, the former Provost/Chancellor formed a Steering Committee comprised of students, faculty, staff, and administrators to engage in extensive campus-wide dialogue on how to best implement the goals stated in the College’s mission. The resulting Strategic Plan provided a framework of goals, objectives, and prioritized action plans that was consistent with the concepts of a Program Review model recommended by Accrediting Commission for Community and Junior Colleges (ACCJC). Members of the College also agreed with the recommendation of the strategic planners and the Chancellor that a revisit of the Strategic Plan occur on an annual basis beginning in 2003, with the purpose of implementing a cycle of ongoing evaluation, planning, and improvement.
• In 2003, the former Provost/Chancellor, citing the need for increased flexibility for the institution to address emerging needs with new initiatives, started a campus-wide effort to revise the College’s mission. The revised mission statement was approved by the Board of Regents in Spring 2004. The mission was amended in Spring 2005 to include one sentence that reflects the College’s focus on student learning. This version is currently awaiting BOR approval. (Update once this has happened.)

• Determined to be in compliance with all ACCJC standards, based on its self-study in 2000, the former Provost/Chancellor formed seven Accreditation Implementation Committees (AIC) in 2001 and charged each with the task of addressing the Commission’s recommendations. Although these committees were able to address most of the Commission’s concerns by 2004, the rate of progress with Program Review and technology and learning resources, as evidenced by a lack of specific timelines, resulted in the College being sanctioned by the Commission.

• The Spring of 2004 marked the beginning of intense dialogue and action spurred by the ACCJC sanction. The former Provost/Chancellor, working through his administrative team, directed the campus effort toward implementing the College’s Policy on Unit/Area Program Reviews. Members of the College responded by initiating assessments of the effectiveness of all degree programs, Support Areas, and courses in terms of their impact on student learning outcomes. The findings and experiences of the assessment effort were used to revise the original Policy, resulting in an evolving and constantly improving process.

• Changes at the top administrative levels within the University of Hawai‘i System in 2001 resulted in added responsibility for administrators at the campus level. Citing this situation and linking the excessive workload with the College’s history of administrative turnover, the former Provost/Chancellor submitted a proposal for administrative reorganization, requesting an additional executive/managerial position, as well as changes in titles for existing administrative levels in Spring 2004. This action caused a controversy at the College that was eventually resolved by the efforts of a Reorganization Committee made up of members from all major constituencies on campus during the Fall of 2004. As this committee worked with the administrators toward a solution, the entire campus community was provided with continuous updates of the Committee’s discussion and decisions to insure the integrity of the process. The campus was given ample opportunity to provided input based on two hearings and two votes, first by Campus Council and second, by Faculty Senate. The modified proposal by these campus governance organizations was forwarded to the Board of Regents in Spring 2005.

• The College continues to take significant steps towards changing its culture under the leadership and guidance of the Chancellor. Beginning in Fall 2004, the current Chancellor assumed a major role in modifying the College’s approach to its Program Review model. The modified approach was presented to the College in open forums and small group meetings of faculty and staff conducted by the Chancellor, who encouraged every member of the College to become actively involved in assessment activities intended to improve student learning.
As the College carried through its assessments, the Program Review process was continuously modified. It now provides the mechanism by which course, program, and Support Area assessment data become the basis for planning and budgeting decisions through its Annual Review process. The Chancellor also worked with institutional research officers at the campus and system levels to ensure the availability of appropriate student achievement data to complement assessments of student learning outcomes.

Self Evaluation
Leadership at Leeward Community College is based on dialogue and collaboration that is inclusive of all members at the institution and adheres to the principles of shared governance. Although the turnover at the administrative levels has been relatively frequent, each Chief Executive Officer and members of the Administrative Teams have strived to create an environment that encourages all faculty and staff to participate in the decision-making process that respects each individual’s honesty and integrity. They have worked with campus leaders and the campus governance structures to develop processes and policies that are based on extensive dialogue at all levels within the College. The Annual Review process is designed to allow every member of the campus to assess what they do and to provide input for change that leads to improvement.

Planning Agenda
• The College will monitor the budget allocations that are based on assessment and Annual Review results to determine the integrity of the process.

IV.A.2. The institution establishes and implements a written policy providing for faculty, staff, administrator, and student participation in decision-making processes. The policy specifies the manner in which individuals bring forward ideas from their constituencies and work together on appropriate policy, planning, and special-purpose bodies.

Descriptive Summary
The Shared Governance Policy of Leeward Community College (http://home.lcc.hawaii.edu/docs/policies/) addresses decision making in the following way:

1. Any individual or group of individuals on campus has the right to provide their views on any issue important to them. The college shall educate the faculty and staff of this right and provide opportunities for faculty and staff to provide input.

2. Administrators shall demonstrate a willingness to incorporate a large amount of faculty and staff input into decision-making especially relating to academic policies, academic procedures, and financial and budgetary matters.

3. Administrators and other decision makers shall provide reasons for decisions that are contrary to the wishes of constituency groups and other recommending bodies. (March 2003)
The *Policy* states that the administration must solicit and consider Faculty Senate input regarding academic policy, curriculum, or procedures of the College and that Campus Council and Faculty Senate recommendations on budgetary priorities should weigh heavily in administrative decision-making. Student, faculty, and staff committees should be selected or nominated by the groups they represent and are responsible for communicating their actions and decisions to their respective groups.

**Self Evaluation**
The *Shared Governance Policy* provides for adequate faculty, staff, administrator, and student participation to insure integrity of its decision-making processes. The policy specifies the manner in which individuals bring forward ideas from their constituencies.

**Planning Agenda**
- No changes are needed to address this standard.

---

**IVA.2.a.** Faculty and administrators have a substantive and clearly defined role in institutional governance and exercise a substantial voice in institutional policies, planning, and budget that relate to their areas of responsibility and expertise. Students and staff also have established mechanisms or organizations for providing input into institutional decisions.

**Descriptive Summary**
At Leeward CC, shared governance is the process by which leaders and decision-makers exchange ideas with those affected by decisions. The **Faculty Senate** and **Campus Council** are two governing bodies that provide the Chancellor with input regarding college policies, priorities, and procedures.

The Faculty Senate is responsible for maintaining and developing the College’s curriculum and for advising the Chancellor on academic policies. Twenty-one Board of Regents faculty members are elected at large, with half of the Senate elected each year.

The Campus Council was established in 1995 as an advisory group representative of all organized constituencies on campus. The Council’s primary purpose is to make recommendations about budget planning and resource allocation and to allow for all campus constituencies to provide input and report back to their constituencies. It does not involve itself with curricular development or academic policy. **Campus Council Charter** and **By-Laws** (September 28, 2000) are available online.

The Board of Regents chartered the **Associated Students of the University of Hawai‘i at Leeward Community College** (ASUH-LCC) to be the primary voice of students. All credit students are members of ASUH-LCC, which elects its own leaders and Senate. Student government has one representative on the Campus Council.

The **Clerical Staff Council**, organized since 1975, is the oldest of staff constituency group on campus. All clerical staff at the College are eligible to join the Council, whose purpose is to promote and improve communication and mutual understanding among the clerical staff, faculty, staff, students, administration, and the community. The Clerical Staff Council has one member on the Campus Council.
Members of the Administrative, Professional, and Technical (APT) classification established the APT Group in 1994 to provide input and advice on campus priorities and to provide a forum for its members to exchange ideas. The group’s objectives are to exchange information relevant to its members, to address their concerns, to participate in Campus Council deliberations and other decision-making committees, and to provide an interpersonal networking environment for all APTs. The Group has one member on the Campus Council.

The Operations and Maintenance Group has been meeting since Fall 1999 to discuss staff development needs and issues. The membership serves the College as security and maintenance workers, groundskeepers, and janitors. The O&M Group has one member on the Campus Council.

The seven Divisions at Leeward each have a Chair that serves as both elected leader of the faculty of their Division and the constituency representative on the Campus Council.

Organized in 1988, the Leeward CC Lecturer Group is composed of adjunct faculty who teach on soft money and do not have Board of Regents appointments. Approximately 60 lecturers are hired each semester, and the group is organized to bring concerns and issues of importance to lecturers to the attention of the College. The Group selects a voting member to the Campus Council and a non-voting member to the Faculty Senate each year.

Academic Support Personnel include staff that work in the Library, Educational Media Center, Innovation Center for Teaching and Learning, Computer Center, Learning Resource Center, Electronic Repair, Duplicating Services, Graphics, Video Production, and the College’s computer labs. They may be classified as faculty; APT, or clerical staff. Those who are faculty may be elected to serve on the Faculty Senate, while those who are APTs may join the APT Group. As a group, they have one seat on the Campus Council.

Leeward Community College Wai‘anae is a satellite campus serving approximately 400 to 500 students each semester. Its director serves as a representative on the Campus Council.

Self Evaluation
Faculty, students, and staff have a clearly defined role in institutional governance and exercise a substantial voice in institutional policies, planning, and budget that relate to their areas of responsibility and expertise. Through this participation, the integrity of decision-making is assured.

Planning Agenda
• No changes are needed to address this standard.
IVA.2.b. The institution relies on faculty, its academic senate or other appropriate faculty structures, the curriculum committee, and academic administrators for recommendations about student learning programs and services.

**Descriptive Summary**

The integrity of the Program Review process, including course, program, and Support Area assessments, depends on the honest engagement of faculty, staff, and administrators in the process. The College participates in course and program assessments in an effort to improve student learning. All faculty are responsible for course assessments, as outlined in the Curriculum Revision and Review Policy approved in March 2003 ([http://home.lcc.hawaii.edu/docs/policies/](http://home.lcc.hawaii.edu/docs/policies/)). Results of these assessments are housed in Leeward CC’s Curriculum Central and are reviewed by two bodies, Leeward’s Assessment Team and the Faculty Senate’s Curriculum Committee. The Assessment Team is composed of the Vice Chancellor/Chief Academic Officer (VC/CAO), Accreditation Liaison Officer, Institutional Researcher, a representative from the Faculty Senate, and others as selected by the VC/CAO, who oversee the review process for the College. Members of this team read through proposed assessment plans and work with individuals on the design and implementation of those plans. The course assessment results are entered into Curriculum Central, and the Curriculum Committee reviews and approves resulting modifications.

Program assessments for the AA, AS, and AAS degree programs are the focus of the Policy on Program Reviews [(May 2005) [http://home.lcc.hawaii.edu/docs/policies/](http://home.lcc.hawaii.edu/docs/policies/)]. Under the leadership of Program Coordinators and Support Area Supervisors, faculty and staff engage in assessment of student learning and institutional effectiveness to provide data for decision-making and budgeting. The Program Review process supports the integration of instructional issues with support areas that result in action plans leading to budget prioritization. Program assessment plans and results are presented to the Assessment Team, who provide support to Program Coordinators and Support Area Supervisors. Results of program assessments are made public [http://documents.leeward.hawaii.edu:8080/docushare/dsweb/View/Collection-14](http://documents.leeward.hawaii.edu:8080/docushare/dsweb/View/Collection-14).

The College’s Annual Review process, which brings together assessment, planning, and budgeting, depends on campus leadership and administrators having honest discussions about how to make student learning better.

**Self Evaluation**

The College relies on faculty, staff, and administrators, its Assessment Team, its Faculty Senate, and its Curriculum Committee for recommendations about student learning programs and services. Appropriate policies are in place to support these efforts.

**Planning Agenda**

- No changes are needed to address this standard.
IVA.3. Through established governance structures, processes, and practices, the governing board, administrators, faculty, staff, and students work together for the good of the institution. These processes facilitate discussion of ideas and effective communication among the institution’s constituencies.

**Descriptive Summary**

In 2003, the Faculty Senate, Campus Council, and Leeward’s former Provost/Chancellor approved a Shared Governance Policy (see standard IV.A.2 above) and a set of Shared Governance Principles that were the basis of dialogues with the campus community.

The principles underlying the policy include a team approach to planning and problem solving, with the Campus Council’s and Faculty Senate’s recommendations on budget priorities given heavy weight in administrative decision-making. The Faculty Senate also provides input before decisions are made about academic policy, procedures, or curriculum. All committee representatives and decision-makers are given responsibility for informing their constituencies.

Leeward’s Policy on Program Reviews (rev. 2005) provides a formal and systematic method for assessing academic programs, Support Areas, and services of the College. All faculty and staff have identified roles in these Program Reviews. The College’s Annual Review process incorporates assessment findings from academic programs and Support Areas in the design of prioritized lists that are incorporated into the budget.

**Self Evaluation**

Leeward CC’s Shared Governance Policy, Shared Governance Principles, Policy on Program Reviews, and Annual Review process specify roles for all faculty, staff, and students. Faculty and staff, through course, program, and support area assessments, are responsible for educational programs and planning. Instructional faculty and support staff have begun to collaborate on the development of action plans to improve student learning. For example, in writing assessment, faculty across the curriculum have collaborated with the College’s IT staff to develop an online system for posting and assessing student writing. Collaboration among faculty and Support Areas is guided by the College’s Program and Annual Review processes.

**Planning Agenda**

- No changes are needed to address this standard.
IV.A.4. The institution advocates and demonstrates honesty and integrity in its relationships with external agencies. It agrees to comply with Accrediting Commission standards, policies, and guidelines, and Commission requirements for public disclosure, self study and other reports, team visits, and prior approval of substantive changes. The institution moves expeditiously to respond to recommendations made by the Commission.

**Descriptive Summary**
Leeward CC has submitted a number of reports to the Accrediting Commission since 2002. An Interim Report in 2002 and a Midterm Report in 2003 document the College’s response to the Commission’s recommendations based on the evaluation of Self-Study Report in 2000. The lack of satisfactory progress with the College’s effort to achieve standards of good practice in a timely manner resulted in the Commission’s decision to place the College on Warning in January 2004. This action catalyzed a campus-wide effort to implement specific plans to address each of the Commission’s recommendations. The College’s progress in an attempt to restore its good standing is documented in the four Progress Reports submitted to ACCJC since February 20, 2004.

**Self Evaluation**
Initially, progress to address the Commission’s recommendations was an example of “planning to plan.” However, since 2004, the College has conscientiously worked towards implementing steps to best achieve standards of good practice. ACCJC’s responses to these efforts have been positive.

**Planning Agenda**
- No changes are needed to address this standard.
IV.B. **Board and Administrative Organization**

In addition to the leadership of individuals and constituencies, institutions recognize the designated responsibilities of the governing board for setting policies and of the chief administrator for the effective operation of the institution. Multi-college districts/systems clearly define the organizational roles of the district/system and the colleges.

**Descriptive Summary**

In 1907, the University of Hawai‘i was established on the model of the American system of land-grant universities created initially by the Morrill Act of 1862. In the 1960s and 1970s, the University was developed into a system of accessible and affordable campuses.

These institutions currently include the following:

- **A research university at Mānoa** offering a comprehensive array of undergraduate, graduate, and professional degrees through the doctoral level, including law and medicine.

- **A comprehensive, primarily baccalaureate institution at Hilo**, offering professional programs based on a liberal arts foundation and selected graduate degrees.

- **An upper division institution at West O‘ahu**, offering liberal arts and selected professional studies.

- **A system of seven open-door Community Colleges** spread across the islands of Kaua‘i, O‘ahu, Maui, and Hawai‘i, offering quality liberal arts and workforce programs. In addition to the seven colleges, outreach centers are located on the islands of Molokai and Lanai (administered by Maui CC), on the island of Hawai‘i in Captain Cook (administered by Hawai‘i CC), and in the Wai‘anae/Nānākuli area of O‘ahu (administered by Leeward CC).

The University of Hawai‘i Community College system, led by the Vice President for Community Colleges, is located on the UH Mānoa campus on O‘ahu.

The University of Hawai‘i System has undergone several administrative reorganizations since the 2000 comprehensive visit. The following briefly outlines the major events:

**University System Reorganization – 2002**

As part of a University system administrative reorganization, the University of Hawai‘i Board of Regents (BOR) received a proposal in November 2002 that included the elimination of the Office of the Chancellor for Community Colleges and reassigned the functions of the office to various system-level vice presidential offices and to the Community Colleges. This reorganization proposal was approved by the BOR in December 2002. The reorganization changed the title of the college chief executive officer (CEO) and the reporting relationship...
between the CEOs of the individually accredited Community Colleges and the University system. Each newly titled Community College chancellor assumed the responsibility and authority previously delegated to the Chancellor for Community Colleges including, within the scope of BOR and University Executive policies, the following: making faculty and staff appointments, approving faculty promotions and tenure, approving out-of-state travel, approving campus budget requests and external grant applications, executing the campus annual expenditure plan, approving Certificates of Completion, approving internal staff and fiscal re-allocations, etc. UH Community College coordination was facilitated through designated Community College Associate Vice Presidents reporting to the UH System Vice Presidents for Academic Affairs and Administration.

The reorganization created the Council of Chancellors, reporting directly to the President. The council included the chancellors of each of the ten individual campuses within the UH system. Four additional key decision making/consultative groups were established: President’s senior staff, the University Executive Council, the President’s Advisory Council, and the Council of Chief Academic Officers. Existing policy guidance provided to the campuses through the Community Colleges Chancellor’s Memorandum (CCCM) were to be evaluated by the Community Colleges Executive Council (composed of CC Chancellors, Vice Chancellors and Deans, and Associate Vice Presidents) to determine which to continue so as to provide a core of common practices across the Community College campuses.

The BOR-approved reorganization was sent forward to the Accrediting Commission for Community and Junior Colleges (ACCJC) in compliance with the Commission’s Substantive Change approval process in January 2003. In spring 2003, the ACCJC gave conditional approval to a Substantive Change Request.

Change in University System Leadership – 2004
As noted in the Accrediting Commission for Senior Colleges and Universities Special Visit (March 2004) to the UH System Office, the “relationship between the Board and the President had deteriorated significantly, and in turn, had affected other elements of the University.” The BOR rescinded authority to the President in several areas related to budget and personnel. In the summer of 2004, the President resigned from the University and an Interim President was named by the BOR.

University System Reorganization – 2004
The Interim President requested and the BOR approved a reorganization of the President’s office reducing the number of direct executive reports and re-describing other executive positions. The UH Council of Chancellors, which is not an administrative unit, continued to report directly to the President and met on a regular basis to provide advice on strategic planning, program development and other matters of concern. The Vice President for Academic Planning and Policy convened the Council of Chief Academic Officers, and the agenda included items of system-wide academic concern. The delegation of authority from the BOR to the President and the President’s designees that began immediately after the appointment of the Interim President has continued.
Community Colleges System Reestablished – 2005

In granting its approval with reservations to the 2002 reorganization of the University of Hawai‘i system, the ACCJC acted to require the UH Community Colleges to provide reports to the Commission in August and November 2003, and in April 2004. The November and April reports were followed by a team visit to validate the reports and examine the degree to which the University of Hawai‘i Community Colleges had developed effective administrative systems to allow it to meet accreditation standards, and to insure the University of Hawai‘i system had adequate means to support the mission and operation of the Community Colleges.

As a result of the series of reports and visits from the ACCJC, it became increasingly clear that the new organization presented significant challenges in the colleges’ ability to continue to meet the Commission’s standards in a number of areas.

Following a review of several alternative organizational models and discussion and consultation, the Interim President recommended a reorganization that reestablished a Community Colleges system administration.

In June 2005 the BOR approved a reorganization of the Community Colleges including the creation of a Vice President for Community Colleges who is responsible for executive leadership, policy decision-making, resource allocation, development of appropriate support services for the seven Community Colleges, and also called for the re-consolidation of the academic and administrative support units for the Community Colleges (June 2005 President’s System Level Reorganization -- Community Colleges [http://www.hawaii.edu/vpaa/posts/053105-signed-cc-reorg.pdf). A dual reporting relationship was created whereby the Community College chancellors report to the Vice President for Community Colleges for leadership and coordination of Community College matters, and concurrently report to the President for University system-wide policymaking and decisions impacting the campuses. The dual reporting relationship preserves previous BOR action, which promoted and facilitated campus autonomy in balance with system-wide academic and administrative functions and operations. College chancellors retained responsibility and control over campus operations, administration, and management.

The June 2005 reorganization created no other organizational or functional changes to the system wide offices. All ten chancellors continue to report to the President and collectively meet as the Council of Chancellors to advise the President on strategic planning, program development, and other matters of concern. The Community College chancellors meet as the Council of Community College Chancellors to provide advice to the President of the University and Vice President for Community Colleges on Community College policy issues and other matters of Community College interest.

BOR Committee Reorganization – 2005

At its September 16, 2005 meeting, the BOR enlarged the Community College standing committee and clarified its duties to allow the BOR to address ACCJC standards without impacting the other business of the BOR in its governance of the University system and the baccalaureate campuses. The newly reorganized committee increased the number of members to six and adopted quarterly meetings independent of the full BOR meetings.
IV.B.3. In multi-college districts or systems the district/system provides primary leadership in setting and communicating expectations of educational excellence and integrity throughout the district/system and assures support for the effective operation of the colleges. It establishes clearly defined roles of authority and responsibility between the colleges and the district/system and acts as the liaison between the colleges and the governing board.

IV.B.3.a. The district/system clearly delineates and communicates the operational responsibilities and functions of the district/system from those of the college and consistently adheres to this delineation in practice.

Descriptive Summary
The University of Hawai‘i Community College system (UHCC) includes the seven Community Colleges. Colleges are located on the main Hawaiian islands of Hawai‘i, Kaua‘i, Maui, and O‘ahu. The islands of Lanai and Molokai are served by Education Centers staffed and operated by Maui Community College. The UHCC office is located on O‘ahu at a central site independent of the seven colleges. The seven colleges of the system form an interdependent network that is nested within the ten institution University of Hawai‘i system.

The BOR approved a reorganization of the University of Hawai‘i system-wide administration on June 21, 2005, creating the position of Vice President for Community Colleges (VPCC) (Position Description: http://www.hawaii.edu/ohr/bor/classpdf/cc100.pdf) and outlining the roles and responsibilities of the President of the University of Hawai‘i, the Vice President for Community Colleges, and the Community College Chancellors. See the June 2005 Reorganization Functional Statement at http://www.hawaii.edu/vpaa/system_aa/accreditation/reorg.pdf. Community College Chancellors have dual reporting to the President of the University of Hawai‘i system for university system-wide policy making and decisions impacting the campuses, and to the Vice President for Community Colleges for leadership and coordinating of Community College matters. The dual reporting relationship is designed to preserve BOR actions promoting and facilitating campus autonomy in balance with system-wide academic and administrative functions and operations. The reorganization responded to ACCJC concerns regarding the substantive change in 2002.

The Office of the VPCC functional statement and the position description for the VPCC include descriptions of the executive leadership work of the Vice President, who provides primary leadership in setting and communicating expectations of educational excellence and integrity throughout the Community College system and assures support for the effective operation of the Community Colleges with staff support. The functional statement also makes clear that the Community College Chancellor has full responsibility and authority to implement and administer delegated system policies and is accountable for the operation of the college. The 2005 organization expands the authority and responsibility of the Chancellor (e.g. personnel decisions).

Through a series of meetings in Spring 2006, the VPCC, the seven Community College Chancellors, and senior staff from the VPCC Office developed and agreed upon a functional roadmap delineating the operational responsibilities and functions of the University of Hawai‘i
System Offices, the UHCC System Office, the BOR, the State of Hawai‘i, and the colleges. See Functional Roadmap: http://www.hawaii.edu/vpaa/system_aa/accreditation/UHCC_Map_of_College-System_Functions_05_08_06.pdf.

There also exists a number of UH system-wide committees/workgroups and UHCC system-wide committees/workgroups where discussion, information sharing, and consultation take place to advise/inform/recommend to the Chancellors and Vice President and the leaders of the system as appropriate.

At the February 2006 BOR meeting and in testimony presented before the Hawai‘i legislative Higher Education Committee March 30, 2006, the President outlined his Devolution Initiative, in which the System will work with the campuses to site more resources at the campuses, closer to the students we serve. As part of that initiative, all System level positions and functions are being reviewed, from vice-presidents on down, to assess which functions should be conducted at the system level, and which at the campus level. On April 7, 2006, in comments to the Council of Chief Academic Officers, the Associate Vice President of Academic Planning and Policy provided an update on the activity to evaluate the roles/functions and number of personnel at the system level in terms of cost effectiveness, efficiency and consideration of system versus campus operations. UH system VPs were asked to review their own units and Chancellors were asked to provide feedback to the system about the system VPs responses by early May 2006.

**Self Evaluation**

The UH system 2005 organization supported by the functional statement of the UH President, the Vice President for Community Colleges, and the Chancellors are more in line with current ACCJC standards. The 2005 organization is an improvement over the 2002 organization, which did not give full responsibility and authority to the college Chancellor to provide campus implementation. The Vice President for Community Colleges allows the Community Colleges to be heard as one voice rather than seven separate campuses. This one voice creates a united front for Community Colleges within the University of Hawai‘i System.

What remains to be seen is how the University of Hawai‘i System, the University of Hawai‘i Community College System, and the individual colleges follow the roles and responsibilities outlined in the functional roadmap. As the organization is new, an assessment of its effectiveness has not occurred.

**Planning Agenda**

- The College and the OVPCC will work with the UH System concerning the UH System Devolution Initiative so that it reflects planning agenda items identified through the self study process as well as administrative review. Implementation should support all major units of the University system.
IV.B.3.g. The district/system regularly evaluates district/system role delineation and governance and decision-making structures and processes to assure their integrity and effectiveness in assisting the colleges in meeting educational goals. The district/system widely communicates the results of these evaluations and uses them as the basis for improvement.

**Descriptive Summary**

The newly reorganized Community College System is compiling best practices and processes into policies that are posted to the Community College website, [http://www.hawaii.edu/offices/cc/policies.html](http://www.hawaii.edu/offices/cc/policies.html). Written policies are aligned with BOR and system executive level polices and provide for regular review and assessment of the policies.

The VPCC and the Chancellors have agreed to and made public a functional roadmap ([http://www.hawaii.edu/vpaa/system_aa/accreditation/UHCC_Map_of_College-System_Functions_05_08_06.pdf](http://www.hawaii.edu/vpaa/system_aa/accreditation/UHCC_Map_of_College-System_Functions_05_08_06.pdf)). One of the system’s first polices (UHCCP 1.102 Community College Council of Faculty Senate Chairs) delineates the role of faculty governance and defines its advisory role to the VPCC ([http://www.hawaii.edu/offices/cc/docs/policies/UHCCP_1.102_CC_Council_Fac_Sen_Chairs.pdf](http://www.hawaii.edu/offices/cc/docs/policies/UHCCP_1.102_CC_Council_Fac_Sen_Chairs.pdf)).

A draft policy on Strategic Academic Planning (4.101) is under review by the Chancellors with final approval by the VPCC expected in June 2006. See 4.101 on [http://www.hawaii.edu/offices/cc/policies.html](http://www.hawaii.edu/offices/cc/policies.html). The policy provides for a process and establishes the Community Colleges Strategic Planning Council (SPC) as the primary body for assuring system-wide participation in the UHCC strategic planning process. The policy identifies roles and responsibilities and includes the relationship to and responsibility of campus academic planning.

**Self Evaluation**

The current system is in the early stages of developing and defining role-delineation and governance and decision-making structures and processes to assure their integrity and effectiveness in meeting educational goals.

Developing system-wide policies, making the policies public, and providing for regular review and assessment of the policies are seen as good progress toward meeting the standard.

**Planning Agenda**

- The College and the OVPCC will continue to develop, make public, and regularly review structures, policies, and procedures for improvement.
Institutional Integrity Documents and Websites

Standard I

Annual Review process (2006)
web  http://emedia.leeward.hawaii.edu/cs/planning/
print Evidence Room

Community College Survey of Student Engagement (CCSSE) Results Report, 2005

Curriculum Central
web  http://emedia.leeward.hawaii.edu/central

Leeward CC 2005-2006 Catalog
web  http://www.lcc.hawaii.edu/catalog
print Evidence Room

Leeward CC Fact Book
web  http://emedia.leeward.hawaii.edu/cs/planning/IR
print Evidence Room

Management and Planning Support (MAPS) documents
web  http://www.hawaii.edu/iro/maps.htm

Leeward CC Interactive Module on SLO
web  http://emedia.leeward.hawaii.edu/slo/

Revision of Mission Statement
web  http://emedia.leeward.hawaii.edu/sp/evidence.htm

Policy on Curriculum Revision and Review
web  http://home.lcc.hawaii.edu/docs/policies
print Evidence Room

Policy on Program Reviews (rev. 5/05)
web  http://home.lcc.hawaii.edu/docs/policies/

Policy on Unit/Area Program Reviews adopted in May, 2003
web  http://home.lcc.hawaii.edu/docs/policies/

Program Review Assessment templates
web  http://documents.leeward.hawaii.edu:8080/docushare/dsweb/View/Collection-14

Report on Program Reviews and Unit Area Reviews Sept 2004
print Evidence Room
Institutional Integrity

SCT Banner system
web http://myuhportal.hawaii.edu

Standard II
Articulated Courses (to meet UHM General Education requirements)
web http://www.manoa.hawaii.edu/ovcaa/academics/articulation/courses/leeward-cc.htm

Board of Regents Policies 5-l.B.2-3, Elimination of Programs
web http://www.hawaii.edu/offices/bor/policy/index.html

Contract renewal and tenure and promotion guidelines
web http://home.lcc.hawaii.edu/docs/faculty

Course Outline Archive
web http://emedia.leeward.hawaii.edu/central/dspcourse.asp

Creative Services Policies
web http://emedia.leeward.hawaii.edu/cs/policies.html

Curriculum Central
web http://emedia.leeward.hawaii.edu/central

Drug-free Workplace Policy
web http://www.hawaii.edu/ohr/docs/drugfree.htm

Leeward CC 2005-2006 Catalog
web http://www.lcc.hawaii.edu/catalog
print Evidence Room

Leeward CC Faculty Handbook
print Evidence Room

Leeward Community College Homepage:
web http://www.lcc.hawaii.edu

Student Conduct Code for the University of Hawai‘i System
web http://www.hawaii.edu/student/conduct

UH Board of Regents System-wide Executive Policy E5.211 Ethical expectations
web http://www.svpa.hawaii.edu/svpa/ep/e5/e5211.pdf

UH Community College System CCCM 7200

Section IX of the 2003-2009 agreement between UHPA and the BOR on Evaluation of Faculty
print Evidence Room
UH Executive Policy E5.209, Faculty and Staff Renewal
 web  http://www.svpa.hawaii.edu/svpa/ep/e9/e9201.pdf

UH Executive Policy E1.203, Policy on Sexual Harassment and Related Conduct
 web  http://www.svpa.hawaii.edu/svpa/ep/e1/e1203.pdf

UH Executive Policy E9.210, Workplace Non-violence Policy
 web  http://www.svpa.hawaii.edu/svpa/ep/e9/e9210.pdf

UH Professional Assembly (UHPA) contract Section IX.D,
 “Procedures for Dealing with Alleged Breach of Professional Ethics and/or Conflicts
 of Interest in Research or Scholarship”
 print  Evidence Room

UH System-wide Executive Policies on Academic Freedom
 web  http://www.svpa.hawaii.edu/svpa/ep/ep.html

**Standard III**

2003–2004 Student Help Bookbook
 print  Evidence Room

BORP (Board of Regents Policies) Section 9-14; Executive/Managerial Personnel Policies

A9.170 Performance Evaluation of Administrative, Professional and Technical (APT) Personnel
 web  http://www.svpa.hawaii.edu/svpa/apm/pers/a9170.pdf

A9.210 Classification and Compensation Plan for APT Personnel
 web  http://www.svpa.hawaii.edu/svpa/apm/pers/a9210.pdf

A9.260 Procedures for Maintenance of the Executive and Managerial Classification System
 web  http://www.svpa.hawaii.edu/svpa/apm/pers/a9260.pdf

A9.320 Workplace Non-Violence Campus Procedures
 web  http://www.svpa.hawaii.edu/svpa/apm/pers/a9730.pdf

A9.485 Filling of Vacant Position
 web  http://www.svpa.hawaii.edu/svpa/apm/pers/a9485.pdf

A9.540 Recruitment and Selection of Faculty and APT Personnel
 web  http://www.svpa.hawaii.edu/svpa/apm/pers/a9540.pdf

A9.560 Appointment of Lecturers and Cooperating Teachers/Counselors
 web  http://www.svpa.hawaii.edu/svpa/apm/pers/a9560.pdf
A9.620 Recruitment and Reassignment of Executive and Managerial Personnel
web http://www.svpa.hawaii.edu/svpa/apm/pers/a9620.pdf

Administrative Procedures Manual
web http://www.svpa.hawaii.edu/svpa/

Affirmative Action Plan
print Evidence Room

Annual Review process (2006)
web http://emedia.leeward.hawaii.edu/cs/planning/
print Evidence Room

CCCM #2600, Statement of Professional Ethics
web http://www.hawaii.edu/ccc/Docs/CCCM_PDF/2600-040198.pdf

Contract Renewal and Progress Report Timelines and Forms
web http://home.lcc.hawaii.edu/docs/faculty
print Evidence Room

Department of Human Resources Development – Class Specifications
web http://www.hawaii.gov/hrd/main/eccd/

Executive Policy E9.203 Evaluation of Board of Regent Appointees
web http://www.svpa.hawaii.edu/svpa/ep/e9/e9203.pdf

Executive Policy E9.205 Qualification Requirements for Academic Positions in the Executive/ Managerial Classification and Compensation Plan
web http://www.svpa.hawaii.edu/svpa/ep/e9/e9205.pdf

Executive Policy E9.210 – Workplace Non-Violence
web http://www.svpa.hawaii.edu/svpa/ep/e9/e9210.pdf

Guidelines for Tenure and Promotion University of Hawai‘i Community Colleges 2005-06
web http://home.lcc.hawaii.edu/docs/faculty

How to Write a Position Description Workbook

Leeward Community College Strategic Plan 2002-2010
web http://emedia.leeward.hawaii.edu/sp
print Evidence Room

Long Range Development Plan (LRDP)
print Director of Administrative Services Office
Institutional Integrity

Operational Expenditure Plans
web  http://emedia.leeward.hawaii.edu/cs/planning/reports/

Performance Appraisal System – Summary for Employees
web  http://www.state.hi.us/hrd/eab/pas/PAS_Summary.pdf

web  http://www.state.hi.us/hrd/eab/pas/pasman01.pdf

State of Hawai‘i Department of the Attorney General
Workplace Violence Prevention, Intervention, and Recovery
web  http://www.hawaii.edu/ohr/docs/violence.htm

State of Hawai‘i Workplace Non-Violence Policy and Procedures
web  http://hawaii.gov/ag/cpja/quicklinks/workplace_violence/

University of Hawai‘i Community Colleges Strategic Plan 2002-2010.
web  http://emedia.leeward.hawaii.edu/cs/planning/reports/

University of Hawai‘i System Strategic Plan 2002-2010
web  http://www.hawaii.edu/ovppp/stratplansys.html

Standard IV

Campus Council Charter and By-Laws
web  http://home.lcc.hawaii.edu/docs/govern/

Curriculum Revision and Review Policy
web  http://home.lcc.hawaii.edu/docs/policies
print  Evidence Room

June 2005 UHCC System Reorganization Functional Statement
web  http://www.hawaii.edu/vpaa/system_aa/accreditation/reorg.pdf

June 2005 BOR minutes
web  http://www.hawaii.edu/offices/bor/regular/minute/20050621.regular.pdf

Policy on Program Reviews, (rev. 2005)
web  http://home.lcc.hawaii.edu/docs/policies
print  Evidence Room

Policy on Unit/Area Program Reviews adopted in May, 2003
web  http://home.lcc.hawaii.edu/docs/policies/
print  Evidence Room
Program and Support Area Assessment 2004 and 2005 results
web http://documents.leeward.hawaii.edu:8080/docushare/dsweb/View/Collection-14

Reorganization Committee
web http://home.lcc.hawaii.edu/docs/reorg

Results of Program Assessments
web http://documents.leeward.hawaii.edu:8080/docushare/dsweb/View/Collection-14

UHCCP 1.102, Community College Council of Faculty Senate Chairs
and Role of faculty governance,
web http://www.hawaii.edu/offices/cc/docs/policies/UHCCP_1.102_CC_Council_Fac_Sen_Chairs.pdf

Shared Governance Policy of Leeward Community College
web http://home.lcc.hawaii.edu/docs/policies/

University of Hawai‘i Community Colleges Strategic Academic Planning (4.101)
web http://www.hawaii.edu/offices/cc/policies.html Select 4.101
pdf http://www.hawaii.edu/offices/cc/docs/policies/UHCCP_4.101_CC_Strategic_Academic_Planning.pdf

University of Hawai‘i Community Colleges Functional Roadmap
web http://www.hawaii.edu/vpaa/system_aa/accreditation/UHCC_Map_of_College_System_Functions_05_08_06.pdf

Vice President for Community Colleges (VPCC) Position Description
pdf http://www.hawaii.edu/ohr/bor/classpdf/cc100.pdf
List of Evidence
Evidence List

Standard I

2007–09 College Plan
web http://emedia.leeward.hawaii.edu/cs/planning/budget/
print following Evidence List, page 462 and Evidence Room

Annual Review process (2006)
web http://emedia.leeward.hawaii.edu/cs/planning/
print Evidence Room

Accreditation Progress Report, March 2005
web http://emedia.leeward.hawaii.edu/cs/planning/reports/
print Evidence Room

Assessment Analysis Report, February 2005
web http://emedia.leeward.hawaii.edu/cs/planning/reports/
print Evidence Room

Assessment Templates (2004, 2005)
web http://documents.leeward.hawaii.edu:8080/docushare/dsweb/View/Collection-14
print Evidence Room

Community College Survey of Student Engagement (CCSSE) Results Report, 2005

Curriculum Central
web http://emedia.leeward.hawaii.edu/central

High School Senior Exit Survey
web http://arch.k12.hi.us/school/seps/seps.html

Leeward CC 2005-2006 Catalog
web http://www.lcc.hawaii.edu/catalog
print Evidence Room

Leeward CC Fact Book
web http://emedia.leeward.hawaii.edu/cs/planning/IR
print Evidence Room

Leeward CC Institutional Self Study in Support of Reaffirmation of Accreditation, September 1, 2000
web http://emedia.leeward.hawaii.edu/cs/planning/reports/
print Evidence Room

Leeaward CC Interactive Module on SLO
web http://emedia.leeward.hawaii.edu/slo/
Evidence List: Standard I

*Leeward CC Strategic Plan, 2002-2010*
web http://emedia.leeward.hawaii.edu/sp
print Evidence Room

*Management and Planning Support (MAPS) documents*
web http://www.hawaii.edu/iro/maps.htm

*Office of Continuing Education and Workforce Development*
web http://www.lcc.hawaii.edu/ocewd/

*Office of Continuing Education and Workforce Development Mission*
web http://www.lcc.hawaii.edu/ocewd/Mission.htm

*Policy on Curriculum Revision and Review (2003)*
web http://home.lcc.hawaii.edu/docs/policies
print Evidence Room

*Policy on Program Reviews (2005)*
web http://home.lcc.hawaii.edu/docs/policies
print Evidence Room

*Policy on Unit/Area Program Reviews (May 8, 2003)*
web http://home.lcc.hawaii.edu/docs/policies
print Evidence Room

*Report on Program Reviews & Support Area Reviews, Sept. 2004*
print Evidence Room

*Results of the Assessment Committees’ efforts*
web http://documents.leeward.hawaii.edu:8080/docushare/dsweb/View/Collection-14
Select “Program SLO Assessments.”

*Revision of Mission Statement*
web http://emedia.leeward.hawaii.edu/sp/evidence.htm See “MS Revision Chronology.”

*SCT Banner system*
web http://myuhportal.hawaii.edu/

*Strategic Plan Assessment Reports for 2002-03, 2003-04, and 2004-05*
web http://emedia.leeward.hawaii.edu/sp/
print Evidence Room

*Strategic Project Action Plan Proposals, 2004*

*Support Areas’ Assessment Results (2004, 2005)*
web http://documents.leeward.hawaii.edu:8080/docushare/dsweb/View/Collection-14
print Evidence Room
**Standard II**

2004 and 2005 Assessment Templates
- **print** Evidence Room

Accreditation Implementation Committee Reports
- **web** [http://www.lcc.hawaii.edu/ac2006/](http://www.lcc.hawaii.edu/ac2006/)
  Scroll down to Accreditation Implementation Committees

- **web** [http://emedia.leeward.hawaii.edu/cs/planning/](http://emedia.leeward.hawaii.edu/cs/planning/)
- **print** Evidence Room

Articulated Courses (to meet UHM General Education requirements)
- **web** [http://www.manoa.hawaii.edu/ovcaa/academics/articulation/courses/leeward-cc.htm](http://www.manoa.hawaii.edu/ovcaa/academics/articulation/courses/leeward-cc.htm)

Association of College and Research Libraries (ACRL) Standards of Information Literacy
- **web** [http://www.lcc.hawaii.edu/lib/faculty/il10.htm](http://www.lcc.hawaii.edu/lib/faculty/il10.htm)

Automotive Service Excellence (ASE)
- **web** [http://www.ase.com/](http://www.ase.com/)

Board of Regents Policies 5-l.B.2-3, Elimination of Programs

CCCM #6004, (November 4, 1996) pertaining to “Academic Credentials: Degrees and Certificates”
- **print** Evidence Room

CCCM #6100 criteria for creation and modification of courses
- **print** Evidence Room

CCCM #7200 Faculty Evaluation

CCCM #11100, February 1, 1994: Guidelines for Borrowing Library Materials
- **web** [www.hawaii.edu/ccc/Docs/CCCM_PDF/11100-020194.pdf](http://www.hawaii.edu/ccc/Docs/CCCM_PDF/11100-020194.pdf)

Campus Center Facilities Use Plan
- **print** Evidence Room

Campus Safety & Security Policies and Procedures brochure
- **print** Evidence Room
College Plan 2007–2009
web http://emedia.leeward.hawaii.edu/cs/planning/budget/
print Evidence Room

Contract Renewal and Tenure and Promotion Guidelines
web http://home.lcc.hawaii.edu/docs/faculty

Courses offered entirely through the Internet (WebCT) and Teleweb
web http://emedia.leeward.hawaii.edu/de/

Course Outline Archive
web http://emedia.leeward.hawaii.edu/central/dspcourse.asp
Select desired course

Creative Services Policies
web http://emedia.leeward.hawaii.edu/cs/policies.html

Curriculum Central
web http://emedia.leeward.hawaii.edu/central

Educational Media Center
web http://emedia.leeward.hawaii.edu/emc/

Distance Education website
web http://emedia.leeward.hawaii.edu/de/

DocuShare site
web http://documents.leeward.hawaii.edu:8080/docushare/dsweb/HomePage

Drug-free Workplace Policy
web http://www.hawaii.edu/ohr/docs/drugfree.htm

Educational Media Center Streamed video orientations
web http://emedia.leeward.hawaii.edu/de/streaming/Streaming_Videos.htm

English Language Institute (ELI)
web http://home.lcc.hawaii.edu/eli

General Education Project, UH Systemwide General Education Academic Skill Standards
web http://www.hawaii.edu/ovppp/gened/gedwww.htm
print Evidence Room

Guidebook for Faculty and Staff
print Evidence Room

A Handbook on Outcomes Assessment for Two-year Colleges (by Edward Morante)
print Evidence Room
Information Technology Group
web http://emedia.leeward.hawaii.edu/itg

*Harvest* student magazine
web http://emedia.leeward.hawaii.edu/harvest
print Evidence Room

Hawai'i Library Consortium (HLC) Bylaws

JPS surveys results 2005
web http://documents.leeward.hawaii.edu:8080/docushare/dsweb/View/Collection-63/

Kāko'o 'Ike Office
web http://emedia.leeward.hawaii.edu/kiprogram/

*Ka Mana'o*, the student newspaper,
web http://emedia.leeward.hawaii.edu/kamanao
print Evidence Room

*Leeward CC 2005-2006 Catalog*
web http://www.lcc.hawaii.edu/catalog
print Evidence Room

*Leeward CC Fact Book*
web http://emedia.leeward.hawaii.edu/cs/planning/IR
print Evidence Room

*Leeward CC Strategic Plan*
web http://emedia.leeward.hawaii.edu/sp
print Evidence Room

Leeward CC Theatre
web http://lccTheatre.hawaii.edu

Leeward CC Website
web http://www.lcc.hawaii.edu

Learning Resources Center
web http://emedia.leeward.hawaii.edu/lrc

Learning Resource Center workshops
web http://emedia.leeward.hawaii.edu/lrc/sc.html

Leeward CC Library and Library Skills Exam module
web http://www.lcc.hawaii.edu/lib/
http://www.lcc.hawaii.edu/lib/libraryskills/index.htm
Management and Planning Support (MAPS) documents
web http://www.hawaii.edu/drd/maps.htm

Math Lab
web http://emedia.leeward.hawaii.edu/mathlab/

NATEF/ASE Certified Programs for Automotive Tech AAS degree
web http://www.natef.org/about/achieving_ase_cert.cfm

National Association of Communication Systems Engineers (NACSE)

National Restaurant Association
web http://www.nraef.org/faq/faq_exams.asp?flag=lcd&level1_id=6&level2_id=4

Office of Continuing Education and Workforce Development non-credit courses catalog
web http://www.lcc.hawaii.edu/ocewd/ Click on image of catalog

Office of Continuing Education and Workforce Development Course SLOs
web http://www.lcc.hawaii.edu/ocewd/ (Refer to the link on the website program pages.)

Online Writing Assistance Program (OWAP)
web http://emedia.leeward.hawaii.edu/lrc/online.html

Policy on Curriculum Revision and Review
web http://home.lcc.hawaii.edu/docs/policies
print Evidence Room

Policy on Program Reviews (rev. 5/05),
web http://home.lcc.hawaii.edu/docs/policies
print Evidence Room

Policy on Unit/Area Program Reviews (May 8, 2003)
web http://home.lcc.hawaii.edu/docs/policies
print Evidence Room

Program Review Assessment templates
web http://documents.leeward.hawaii.edu:8080/docushare/dsweb/View/Collection-14

Program Review Objectives, Structure and Implementation, Timeline/flowchart
web http://emedia.leeward.hawaii.edu/cs/planning/reports/

Program Review Results
web http://emedia.leeward.hawaii.edu/cs/progReview/
print Evidence Room
Progress Report to ACCJC, September 9, 2004
web  http://emedia.leeward.hawaii.edu/cs/planning/reports/
print  Evidence Room

Report on Program Reviews & Support Area Reviews, Sept. 2004
print  Evidence Room

Research Report on the Needs of Incoming Students Fall 2005, Rossi, 11/05
web  http://emedia.leeward.hawaii.edu/cs/planning/IR
print  Evidence Room

Results of Academic Support Program assessments for 2004-2005
web  http://documents.leeward.hawaii.edu:8080/docushare/dsweb/View/Collection-14
Select “Support Area/Unit” and the specific unit of interest.

Results of Program/Support Area Reviews (2004, 2005)
web  http://documents.leeward.hawaii.edu:8080/docushare/dsweb/View/Collection-14

Service Learning
web  http://emedia.leeward.hawaii.edu/servicelearning/

Student Conduct Code for the University of Hawai‘i System
web  http://www.hawaii.edu/student/conduct

Student Services’ 2004 Assessment Report and SLOs
web  http://emedia.leeward.hawaii.edu/cs/planning/reports/
print  Evidence Room

Student Services, including Financial Aid and Job Prep Services, reports on SLO assessments, 2005
web  http://documents.leeward.hawaii.edu:8080/docushare/dsweb/View/Collection-63/

Study Abroad Program
web  http://emedia.leeward.hawaii.edu/studyabroad/

UH Board of Regents System-wide Executive Policy E5.211 Ethical Expectations
web  http://www.svpa.hawaii.edu/svpa/ep/e5/e5211.pdf

UH Executive Policy E1.203, Policy on Sexual Harassment and Related Conduct
web  http://www.svpa.hawaii.edu/svpa/ep/e1/e1203.pdf

UH Executive Policy E5.209, Faculty and Staff Renewal
web  http://www.svpa.hawaii.edu/svpa/ep/e9/e9201.pdf
UH Executive Policy 5.211
  web  http://www.hawaii.edu/offices/cc/policies.html  Select Policy 5.211
  pdf  http://www.hawaii.edu/offices/cc/docs/policies/UHCCP_5.211_Statement_on_Professional_Ethics.pdf

UH Executive Policy E9.201, Faculty and Staff Renewal and Vitality Directive
  web  http://www.hawaii.edu/svpa/ep/e9/personnel.html  Select Policy E9.201
  pdf  http://www.hawaii.edu/svpa/ep/e9/e9201.pdf

UH Executive Policy E9.210, Workplace Non-violence Policy
  web  http://www.svpa.hawaii.edu/svpa/ep/e9/e9210.pdf

University of Hawai‘i Library Council Bylaws

UH Professional Assembly and the BOR 2003–2009 Agreement, Section IX; evaluation of Faculty
  web:  http://www.uhpa.org/uhpa-bor-contract/article-iv-faculty-professional-responsibilities-workload
  print  Evidence Room

UH Professional Assembly (UHPA) contract Section IX.D,
  “Procedures for Dealing with Alleged Breach of Professional Ethics and/or Conflicts of Interest in Research or Scholarship”
  web  http://www.uhpa.org/uhpa-bor-contract/article-iv-faculty-professional-responsibilities-workload
  print  Evidence Room

UH System-wide Executive Policies on Academic Freedom
  web  http://www.hawaii.edu/svpa/ar/arch2.pdf

WebCT, the UH system’s online course management software
  web  http://webct.hawaii.edu/webct/public/show_courses.pl
Standard III

2003–2004 Student Help Bookbook
print Evidence Room

360 Assessment document
web http://www.pers.hawaii.edu/hrin/360/demo2/360.asp (demo)
print Evidence Room

BORP (Board of Regents Policies) Section 9-14; Executive/Managerial Personnel Policies

A9.170 Performance Evaluation of Administrative, Professional and Technical (APT) Personnel
web http://www.svpa.hawaii.edu/svpa/apm/pers/a9170.pdf

A9.210 Classification and Compensation Plan for APT Personnel
web http://www.svpa.hawaii.edu/svpa/apm/pers/a9210.pdf

A9.260 Procedures for Maintenance of the Executive and Managerial Classification System
web http://www.svpa.hawaii.edu/svpa/apm/pers/a9260.pdf

A9.320 Workplace Non-Violence Campus Procedures
web http://www.svpa.hawaii.edu/svpa/apm/pers/a9730.pdf

A9.485 Filling of Vacant Position
web http://www.svpa.hawaii.edu/svpa/apm/pers/a9485.pdf

A9.540 Recruitment and Selection of Faculty and APT Personnel
web http://www.svpa.hawaii.edu/svpa/apm/pers/a9540.pdf

A9.560 Appointment of Lecturers and Cooperating Teachers/Counselors
web http://www.svpa.hawaii.edu/svpa/apm/pers/a9560.pdf

A9.620 Recruitment and Reassignment of Executive and Managerial Personnel
web http://www.svpa.hawaii.edu/svpa/apm/pers/a9620.pdf

Academic Development Plan (ADP) 1996-2002
web http://documents.leeward.hawaii.edu:8080/docushare/dsweb/View/Collection-102
print Evidence Room

Act 115 (See Session Laws of Hawai‘i 1998, as codified in chapter 304, Hawai‘i Revised Statutes.)

Accreditation Implementation Committee (AIC) on Planning of Technology, Information/ Learning Resources September 9, 2004 Progress Report to ACCJC, Appendix D
web http://emedia.leeward.hawaii.edu/cs/planning/reports/
Accreditation Midterm Report
web http://www.lcc.hawaii.edu/ac2006 Scroll down to “Reports”

Administrative Procedures Manual
web http://www.svpa.hawaii.edu/svpa/

Affirmative Action Plan
print Evidence Room

Annual Review process (2006)
web http://emedia.leeward.hawaii.edu/cs/planning/
print Evidence Room

Board of Regents Policies, Section 9-14, Executive/Managerial (E/M) Personnel Policies
web: http://www.hawaii.edu/offices/bor/policy/index.html Begins on page 83

Board of Regents Policies, Section 9-14, Part IV (Conditions of Service)
web http://www.hawaii.edu/offices/bor/policy/index.html Begins on page 93

Board of Regents Policies, Section 9-15 (Evaluation of Board of Regents Appointees), October 16, 1981
web http://www.hawaii.edu/offices/bor/policy/index.html Begins on page 102

CCCM #2600, Statement of Professional Ethics
web http://www.hawaii.edu/ccc/Docs/CCCM_PDF/2600-040198.pdf

CCCM #7200 (March 19, 1982) Faculty Evaluation Procedures

Committee on Learning Resources and Information Technology (CLRIT)
web http://emedia.leeward.hawaii.edu/clrit

Contract Renewal and Progress Report Timelines and Forms
web http://home.lcc.hawaii.edu/docs/faculty
print Evidence Room

Department of Human Resources Development – Class Specifications
web http://www.hawaii.gov/hrd/main/eccd/

DocuShare site
web http://documents.leeward.hawaii.edu:8080/docushare/dsweb/HomePage

Educational Development Plan (1987-1993)
web http://documents.leeward.hawaii.edu:8080/docushare/dsweb/View/Collection-1020
print Evidence Room

Educational Media Center
web http://emedia.leeward.hawaii.edu/emc
Educational Media Center Assessment
web http://emedia.leeward.hawaii.edu/clrit/3_year_plan/EMC_Plan.pdf

Faculty Minimum Qualification Guidelines (revised), May, 2001
web http://www.hawaii.edu/offices/bor/policy/index.html Select Chapter 9, Personnel

Executive Policy E9.203 Evaluation of Board of Regent Appointees
web http://www.svpa.hawaii.edu/svpa/ep/e9/e9203.pdf

Executive Policy E9.205 Qualification Requirements for Academic Positions in the
Executive/Managerial Classification and Compensation Plan
web http://www.svpa.hawaii.edu/svpa/ep/e9/e9205.pdf

Executive Policy E9.210 – Workplace Non-Violence
web http://www.svpa.hawaii.edu/svpa/ep/e9/e9210.pdf

Guidelines for Tenure and Promotion University of Hawai‘i Community Colleges 2005-06
web http://home.lcc.hawaii.edu/docs/faculty

How to Write a Position Description Workbook

Information Technology Group
web http://emedia.leeward.hawaii.edu/itg

Kāko‘o Iike Office
web http://emedia.leeward.hawaii.edu/kiprogram/

Leeward CC 2005-2006 Catalog
web http://www.lcc.hawaii.edu/catalog
print Evidence Room

Leeward CC Learning Resource Center
web http://emedia.leeward.hawaii.edu/lrc/

Leeward CC Learning Resource Center Assessment
web http://emedia.leeward.hawaii.edu/clrit/3_year_plan/LRC_plan.pdf/

Leeward CC Library
web http://www.lcc.hawaii.edu/lib/

Leeward CC Library Assessment
web http://emedia.leeward.hawaii.edu/clrit/3_year_plan/Library_Plan.pdf

Leeward CC Strategic Plan, 2002-2010
web http://emedia.leeward.hawaii.edu/sp
print Evidence Room
Long Range Development Plan
web http://documents.leeward.hawaii.edu:8080/docushare/dsweb/View/Collection-1020
Select "LCC Long Range Development Plan July 1988.pdf"
print Director of Administrative Services Office

Operational Expenditure Plan (OEP)
web http://emedia.leeward.hawaii.edu/cs/planning/reports/
print Evidence Room

Performance Appraisal System – Summary for Employees


Policy on Unit/Area Program Reviews (May 8, 2003)
web http://home.lcc.hawaii.edu/docs/policies
print Evidence Room

Policy on Program Reviews
web http://home.lcc.hawaii.edu/docs/policies

State of Hawai‘i Department of the Attorney General
Workplace Violence Prevention, Intervention, and Recovery
web http://www.hawaii.edu/ohr/docs/violence.htm

State of Hawai‘i Workplace Non-Violence Policy and Procedures
web http://hawaii.gov/ag/cpja/quicklinks/workplace_violence/

UH AP A9.300, Position descriptions for Civil Service employees of the University
web http://www.hawaii.edu/svpa/apm/pers/a9300.pdf

UH AP A9.540, Recruitment and Selection of Faculty and Administrative, Professional and Technical (APT) Personnel
web http://www.hawaii.edu/svpa/apm/pers/a9540.pdf

UH AP 9.210, Classification and Compensation Plan APT Personnel
web http://www.hawaii.edu/svpa/apm/pers/a9210.pdf

UHCC Contract Renewal Suggested Guidelines
web http://home.lcc.hawaii.edu/docs/faculty

UHCC May 1, 2001 memorandum entitled
“Revised Faculty Minimum Qualifications and Salary Placement Guidelines
print Evidence Room
University of Hawai'i Community Colleges Policies
web  http://www.hawaii.edu/offices/cc/policies.html

University of Hawai'i Community College Council of Faculty Senate Chairs
web  http://www.hawaii.edu/offices/cc/policies.html  Select UHCCP 1.102

University of Hawai'i Community Colleges Functional Roadmap
web  http://www.hawaii.edu/vpaa/system_aa/accreditation/UHCC_Map_of_College System_Functions_05_08_06.pdf

University of Hawai'i Community College Contract Renewal Suggested Guidelines (2005–06)
web  http://home.lcc.hawaii.edu/docs/faculty
print  Evidence Room

University of Hawai'i Community Colleges Strategic Plan 1997-2002.
print  Evidence Room

University of Hawai'i Community Colleges Strategic Plan 2002-2010.
web  http://emedia.leeward.hawaii.edu/cs/planning/reports/

University of Hawai'i System Strategic Plan, 1997-2007
print  Evidence Room

University of Hawai'i System Strategic Plan 2002-2010
web  http://www.hawaii.edu/ovppp/stratplansys.html

University of Hawai'i Strategic Plan for Information Technology 2002-2010

University of Hawai'i: Systemwide Administrative Procedures Manual
web  http://www.svpa.hawaii.edu/svpa/apm/sysap.html
**Standard IV**

360 Assessment document  
print  Evidence Room

Administrative Procedures Manual  
web  [http://www.svpa.hawaii.edu/svpa/apm/sysap.html](http://www.svpa.hawaii.edu/svpa/apm/sysap.html)

Board of Regents (BOR) website  
web  [http://www.hawaii.edu/offices/bor/](http://www.hawaii.edu/offices/bor/)

BOR Meeting Minutes Oct 2002  
web  [http://www.hawaii.edu/offices/bor/regular/minute/20021018.regular.html](http://www.hawaii.edu/offices/bor/regular/minute/20021018.regular.html)

BOR Meeting Minutes Nov 2002  
web  [http://www.hawaii.edu/offices/bor/regular/minute/20021122.regular.html](http://www.hawaii.edu/offices/bor/regular/minute/20021122.regular.html)

BOR Meeting Minutes Oct 2004  

BOR minutes, June 2005  

BOR “Orientation Manual.”  
web  [http://www.hawaii.edu/offices/bor/regular_minute/20040902.special.pdf](http://www.hawaii.edu/offices/bor/regular_minute/20040902.special.pdf)

BOR Policy Chapter 2, Evaluation of the President  

BOR Policy Chapters 4 and 5, Planning and Evaluation Policies  

BORP Section 9-14, Part IV, Conditions of Service  
web  [http://www.hawaii.edu/offices/bor/policy/index.htm](http://www.hawaii.edu/offices/bor/policy/index.htm)  Select Chapter 9, Personnel

Campus Council Charter and By-Laws  
web  [http://home.lcc.hawaii.edu/docs/govern/](http://home.lcc.hawaii.edu/docs/govern/)

Charters and By-Laws of Faculty Senate and Campus Council  
web  [http://home.lcc.hawaii.edu/docs/govern/](http://home.lcc.hawaii.edu/docs/govern/)
print  Evidence Room

Community College Standing Committee BOR CC Committee  
web  [http://www.hawaii.edu/offices/bor/cc/](http://www.hawaii.edu/offices/bor/cc/)

Constitutional Amendment UH Autonomy  
web  [http://www.capitol.hawaii.gov/hrscurrent/Vol05_Ch0261-0319/HRS0304/HRS_0304-0004.HTM](http://www.capitol.hawaii.gov/hrscurrent/Vol05_Ch0261-0319/HRS0304/HRS_0304-0004.HTM)
Curriculum Revision and Review Policy
web http://home.lcc.hawaii.edu/docs/policies
print Evidence Room

Faculty Senate Charter and By-Laws (October 15, 1999)
web http://emedia.leeward.hawaii.edu/senate/charter.html

Hawai‘i Budget Preparation Statutes
web http://www.capitol.hawaii.gov/hrscurrent/Vol01_Ch0001-0042F/HRS0037/

Hawaii Revised Statutes, Chapter 304-3 Membership on the BOR
web http://www.capitol.hawaii.gov/hrscurrent/Vol05_Ch0261-0319/HRS0304/HRS_0304-0003.htm

Leeward CC Assessment Documents
web http://documents.leeward.hawaii.edu:8080/docushare/dsweb/View/Collection-14

Leeward CC Mission Statement Revision
web http://emedia.leeward.hawaii.edu/sp/evidence.htm See MS Revision Chronology

Leeward CC Program Review
web http://emedia.leeward.hawaii.edu/cs/ProgReview/

Leeward CC Reorganization Proposal
web http://home.lcc.hawaii.edu/docs/reorg
print evidence Room

Leeward CC Strategic Plan, 2002-2010
web http://emedia.leeward.hawaii.edu/sp
print Evidence Room

Policy on Program Reviews, (rev. 2005)
web http://home.lcc.hawaii.edu/docs/policies
print Evidence Room

Policy on Unit/Area Program Reviews adopted in May, 2003
web http://home.lcc.hawaii.edu/docs/policies/
print Evidence Room

Program and Support Area Assessment 2004 and 2005 results
web http://documents.leeward.hawaii.edu:8080/docushare/dsweb/View/Collection-14

Results of Program Assessments
web http://documents.leeward.hawaii.edu:8080/docushare/dsweb/View/Collection-14
Shared Governance Policy of Leeward Community College
web http://home.lcc.hawaii.edu/docs/policies/

State's Sunshine Law
web http://www.hawaii.gov/oip/sunshinelaw.html

Stocktaking Presentations
web http://www.hawaii.edu/offices/app/aa/

University of Hawai‘i Community Colleges Functional Roadmap
web http://www.hawaii.edu/vpaa/system_aa/accreditation/UHCC_Map_of_College System_Functions_05_08_06.pdf

UHCC System Reorganization Functional Statement, June 2005
web http://www.hawaii.edu/vpaa/system_aa/accreditation/reorg.pdf

University of Hawai‘i Community Colleges Strategic Academic Planning (4.101)
web http://www.hawaii.edu/offices/cc/policies.html Select 4.101

University of Hawai‘i Community Colleges Policies
web http://www.hawaii.edu/offices/cc/policies.html

UHCCP 1.102, Community College Council of Faculty Senate Chairs
and Role of faculty governance,
web http://www.hawaii.edu/offices/cc/docs/policies/UHCCP_1.102_CC_Council_Fac_Sen_Chairs.pdf

UHCC Legislative Request Jan 2006

UH Biennium Budget Committee
web http://www.hawaii.edu/vpaa/vpaa_memo/042106_BienniumBudget.pdf

UHCC Council Chancellors Minutes
web http://www.hawaii.edu/vpaa/system_aa/cccc.html

UH President’s System Level Reorganization--Community Colleges, June 2005
web http://www.hawaii.edu/vpaa/posts/053105-signed-cc-reorg.pdf

University of Hawai‘i Community Colleges Strategic Plan 2002-2010

Vice President for Community Colleges (VPCC) Position Description
pdf http://www.hawaii.edu/ohr/bor/classpdf/cc100.pdf
The College Plan
2007–2009
COLLEGE PLAN: Biennium Budget Request - Operating Budget

After all Areas and Units generated Planning Lists based on Annual Reviews, a College Plan was compiled. The list was reviewed and revised by the Executive Planning Committee and forwarded to the Administration.

Items were grouped and arranged strategically within UH budget parameters, which included a budget ceiling placing a limit on the amount the College could request. The budget also needed to address specific initiatives: Increase Educational Capital of the State; Expand Workforce Development; Assist in Economic Diversification; Address Underserved Regions/Populations; Campus Infrastructure.

The Biennium Budget and CIP requests have been submitted to the UHCC System. The UHCC System will compile all CCs lists and submit the requests to the UH System Biennium Budget Advisory Committee, who will provide recommendations to the UH President in August. The formal budget request is scheduled to go to the Board of Regents in mid-September.

At any time during this process, the College may be asked to make adjustments to the requests. The State Legislature will review the budget during legislative session, January-May, 2007. The Legislature may or may not follow the priorities as defined by the College and System. When final allocations are made, the College will need to re-examine its priorities to adjust to the System and Legislative decisions.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Priority</th>
<th>Budget Item or Initiative</th>
<th>Funding Source</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Faculty Collective Bargaining</td>
<td>TFSF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Student Financial Aid Commitment</td>
<td>TFSF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Full Year Funding for New FY 2007 Positions</td>
<td>GF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Expansion of Educational Services to Waianae Center</td>
<td>GF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Expansion of Institutional Research and Assessment</td>
<td>GF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Support for Workforce Development/Job Placement</td>
<td>GF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Center for Accelerated Learning</td>
<td>GF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Instructional Program Support</td>
<td>GF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Website Development</td>
<td>GF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Utility Costs for Renovated Facilities</td>
<td>GF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Support for Native Hawaiian Programs</td>
<td>GF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Office of Grants and Contracts Management</td>
<td>GF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Administrative and Institutional Support</td>
<td>GF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Support for New Academic Equipment Initiatives</td>
<td>GF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Nursing Initiative</td>
<td>GF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Recruitment and Retention Officer</td>
<td>GF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Academic Support Services Positions</td>
<td>GF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Current Service Base Adjustment</td>
<td>GF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Academic Equipment Replacement</td>
<td>TFSF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Replacement Schedule for Computers</td>
<td>TFSF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>Faculty &amp; Staff Professional Development and Training</td>
<td>TFSF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>Campus Rehabilitation Project</td>
<td>TFSF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>Learning Commons</td>
<td>TFSF</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

TFSF=Tuition & Fees and Special Funds  
GF=General Funds
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Personnel</th>
<th>Unit</th>
<th>Unit Priority</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Campus Priority</th>
<th>Operating Budget</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>INST</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.0 FT Instructor, Hawaiian Studies</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>Instructional Program Support</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INST</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.0 FT Science APT (cross disciplinary)</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>Instructional Program Support</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INST</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.0 FT ELI APT position</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Full Year Funding for Positions rec'd in Supplemental Budget</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INST</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>24% increase in wages for student help</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>Instructional Program Support</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INST</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1.0 FT Instructor, Job Developer</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Job Placement Office (includes APT and clerical)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INST</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1.0 FT Instructor, Biology</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>Instructional Program Support</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INST</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1.0 FT Instructor, Biology</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>Instructional Program Support</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INST</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1.0 FT Instructor, Digital Media</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>Instructional Program Support</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INST</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1.0 FT Instructor, History</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>Instructional Program Support</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>StSrv</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2 FTE APT, Financial Aid Office</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Full Year Funding for Positions rec'd in Supplemental Budget</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>StSrv</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1 faculty, 1 APT, 1 clerical, Job Placement Office</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Job Placement Office</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AcaSup</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Disability Specialist</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>Academic Support Positions</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AcaSup</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>APT, Network Specialist &amp; Computer Repair</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>Academic Support Positions</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AdSrv</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>APT Position, O&amp;M</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>Administrative &amp; Institutional Support</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AdSrv</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Grants Administrator, Bus Office</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>Office of Grants &amp; Contract Management</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AdSrv</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>APT Position (conversion from OCET), Bus Office</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>Reallocation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NH</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Funding for Grant-Based NH programs</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>Support for Native Hawaiian Programs</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Admin</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Positions for LCC Waianae</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Expansion of Educational Services to LCCW</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Admin</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Website Content Manager</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>Website Development</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Admin</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Expansion of IR and Assessment</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Expansion of Institutional Research &amp; Assessment</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Admin</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Clerical positions for administration</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>Administrative &amp; Institutional Support</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Admin</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Recruitment and Retention Officer</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>Recruitment and Retention Office</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UH</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>Faculty Collective Bargaining</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Faculty Collective Bargaining</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UH</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>Full Year Funding for Positions obtained in Supplemental Budget</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Full Year Funding for New FY07 Positions</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Equipment and Supplies

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Unit</th>
<th>Priority</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>INST</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Classroom Equipment Replacement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INST</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Increase in Annual Divisional Supply Budgets</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INST</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Classroom Furniture Replacement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>StSrv</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Computer Replacement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AcaSup</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Replacement of Production Equipment, EMC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AdSrv</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Custodial/Maintenance/Postage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Admin</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Campus-wide Improvements (signage, landscaping)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Information Technology

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Unit</th>
<th>Priority</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>INST</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Replacement of faculty and staff computers on a regular basis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INST</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Adding unsupported instructional labs to replacement schedule</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INST</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>25 Smart Rooms</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INST</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Normal upgrading of specialized instructional software</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INST</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Division level peripherals (printers/scanners/etc.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AA</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>25 Smart Rooms</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AcaSup</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Campus IT Replacement Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AdSrv</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>New computers (2-HR, 1-BO, 1-O&amp;M)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Training and Travel

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Unit</th>
<th>Priority</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>INST</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Professional development for faculty and staff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AA</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Training and Stipends for Assessment Participants</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>StSrv</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Training and Travel Funds</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AdSrv</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>In-service staff training, HR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AdSrv</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Supervisor’s training, O&amp;M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NH</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Faculty Development</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Other

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Unit</th>
<th>Priority</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AA</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Assigned time for each AA SLO Chair</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UH</td>
<td></td>
<td>Student Financial Aid Commitment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Admin</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Remediation and Applied Science &amp; Technology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Admin</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Electrical costs for renovated facilities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Admin</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>One-stop Learning Service Center</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Repair and Maintenance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>INST</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>Increase overall campus R&amp;M budget</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>INST</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Classroom and office renovations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INST</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>New floor for stage in theatre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INST</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Re-roof &amp; paint AMT facility</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INST</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Shade House Expansion and Improvement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>StSrv</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Repair Leaks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AdSrv</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Storage space (DA Basement)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AdSrv</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>ASO office space, O&amp;M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AdSrv</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Renovate Admin Bldg work room; nurse, HR, Bus Off space</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### R&M Budget

- **R&M funding to be determined when UHCC System determines amount for each campus for FY07**
- **Administrative & Institutional Support**
  - **13** R&M funding priority for FY 2007
- **Upgrade of Operations & Maintenance Facility in CIP Budget**
  - **9** Upgrade of Operations & Maintenance Facility

### Capital Improvement Projects

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>INST</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>Classroom/faculty office building</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>INST</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>DA basement renovations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INST</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Cafeteria renovations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INST</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Observatory</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INST</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Planetarium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INST</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Marine Science Education Center</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AdSrv</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>O&amp;M facility upgrade/renovation/expansion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>StSrv</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Student Services One Stop Center</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NH</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Native Hawaiian Success Center</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Admin</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Waianae Expansion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Admin</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Library A/C upgrades</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Admin</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Second Access Road</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Admin</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Dormitory; Health and Wellness Center</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### CIP Budget

- **1** Social Science/Teacher Education Bldg number 1 priority for R&M funding FY 2007
- **6** Expansion of Observatory Park
- **6** Expansion of Observatory Park
- **9** Upgrade of Operations & Maintenance Facility
- **5** Student Services One Stop Center
- **7** Native Hawaiian Success Center
- **2** Waianae Education/University Center
- **3** Library Air Conditioning Upgrades
- **4** Second Access Road
- **5** College Village Project
DATA TO SUPPORT BUDGET REQUESTS

1. **Faculty Collective Bargaining**
   Mandated by UH agreement with UHPA.

2. **Student Financial Aid Commitment**
   Mandated by UH System responding to tuition increases.

3. **Full Year Funding for New FY 2007 Positions**
   Positions obtained in the Supplemental Budget were funded for a half year; system requires campuses to include request for full funding for these positions in Biennium Budget.

4. **Expansion of Educational Services to Waianae Center**
   LCCW is currently enrolling approximately 800+ registrations per year and producing 2,700 credit hours.
   Department of Education 2004-05 School Status and Improvement Report and 2004 MAPS data indicate potential for increasing going rates and student success.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>% Dropout</th>
<th>Going Rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Nanakuli HS</td>
<td>26.60%</td>
<td>18.40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wai’anae HS</td>
<td>29.20%</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

   The region has the highest percentage of adults who only have a high school diploma. In addition the region has the lowest percentage of those with a bachelor’s degree. See data taken from UH Second Decade Project.
   Ranking is level of urgency

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FACTOR</th>
<th>State Rank</th>
<th>State Avr</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Projected Hawai’i High School Graduates, 2006–2018</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.70%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Per Capita Personal Income 2000</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$13,802</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Workforce Participation, Age 16 &amp; older</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>57.80%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Population Age 18-64 with only a HS Diploma</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>47.10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Population Age 25-64 with at least a Bachelor’s</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10.10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UH 2 year Going Rates, Fall 2005</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UH 4 year Going Rates, Fall 2005</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.90%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

   Stocktaking presentation from the Puko’a Council indicated that “Lack of State support for Native Hawaiian access to higher education is directly related to over representation of Native Hawaiians in the worst social statistics.” This presentation goes on to state that Native Hawaiian suffer in the following ways:

   - 23% of the population
   - 47% of Known Offenders
   - 38% of Prison Inmates
   - 30% of the Homeless
   - 28% of all Welfare Recipients
   - Highest % of all races incarcerated
Waianae is challenged by poverty, unemployment, underemployment, geographic remoteness, going rates to college, and drop out rates from high school and other variables. Also, Waianae has the largest concentration of Native Hawaiians in the state. Over the years, the LCCW has offered an uneven set of course offerings in a staggered and unpredictable manner. There is no instructional budget line item for LCCW. This request seeks funding to provide sufficient academic, academic support, student support, and institutional support resources to LCCW in order to begin the transitioning process to a true educational center able to respond and address the higher education needs of the Waianae community and in particular the Native Hawaiian population base.

5 Expansion of Institutional Research and Assessment

All instructional Annual Reviews, Administration and NH Annual Reviews cited a need for additional data. Development of data-driven decisions is dependent upon the ability of the College to respond promptly and accurately to data requests.

Although Leeward CC is the 3rd largest campus in the system, it has only one staff member in its Institutional Research Office. The new focus from ACCJC on data production and data driven decision making makes this request more acute.

Each year Leeward CC engages in an Annual Review of all programs requiring significant data facilitation. The UHCC system now requires a system template of required data. Leeward CC is pursuing more grants that require data production and data tracking.

Our current staff member can not keep up nor is fully capable of addressing all of these needs in addition to individual faculty and division requests for data analysis. Additional support for the Institutional Research function would allow Leeward CC to stabilize a set of regularly published performance data that would allow better decision making as well as better communication with all constituencies.

6 Support for Workforce Development/Job Placement

Successful Job Placement at other colleges has proven to improve recruitment numbers and lower the attrition rate (Noel-Levitz). One initiative that has been proven effective in creating and reinforcing partnerships between colleges and community businesses is job placement.

The connections that are established with employers are essential in helping the college keep its curriculum current and are vital to workforce development initiatives. Job placement has also been shown to be an effective recruitment and retention strategy for colleges and universities.

Leeward CC does not have a state funded job placement office. Rather, the College has been relying on soft money to fund one of its core student services functions and the need to institutionalize the funding for this vital service is well past due. Currently, federal funds support one job developer and one counselor for over 1,000 vocational technical students.

Job placement functions must be properly supported to enable Leeward CC to remain competitive with private colleges and technical institutes that provide job-locating services. Job placement services will help match students to employers needs, make referrals when requests are received from employers, prepare students for the job search process, and aid their adjustment on the job. Feedback from employers has already been funneled to faculty in programs for curriculum review and revision purposes.

7 Center for Accelerated Learning

The Center for Accelerated Learning encompasses two initiatives: the Center for Applied Science and Technology (CAST) and Accelerated Learning Program (ALP).

The UH Second Decade Project identified regional needs in Hawaii for post secondary education and training. Eleven factors measuring growth, income, academic achievement, and workforce needs were taken into consideration.

Based on this study, four state regions were identified with very high needs. Three of the four regions, Ewa, Waianae, and North Shore are served by Leeward Community College.

This initiative is an efficient response to the challenges outlined in the Second Decade Project.
The Center for Applied Science and Technology (CAST) is community responsive customized training designed to meet the specific needs of specific companies in the College’s service area. Most entry level positions in manufacturing and design have a universal knowledge base in science, math and technology. On top of this, employers need a special set of skills that their company requires.

The basic foundation of knowledge will remain the same but CAST will design a specialized set of modules to fit the exact needs of a company. Currently Leeward CC sees the need for chemical technicians, agricultural technicians, engineering technicians, and other paraprofessional entry level technician jobs. All of these technical and manufacturing positions require a basic skill set in math and science. In addition, these areas will have special needs due to the goals and mission of a particular company.

The following State of Hawaii workforce data was supplied by EMSI (Economic Modeling Specialists, Inc.) and has been used by the UH Community College System to reflect a more accurate portrayal of the education and training opportunities in the State.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Occupation</th>
<th>Actual # of Jobs 2004</th>
<th>Projected # of Jobs 2012</th>
<th>Annual Jobs to Fill</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Process Technology Operators (chemical technician, refinery, plant and system, water and waste treatment operators)</td>
<td>6,792</td>
<td>7,526</td>
<td>2,074</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physical and Life Science Technicians, (Environmental, Forestry, Agricultural, Biological technicians)</td>
<td>2,574</td>
<td>2,880</td>
<td>721</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engineering Technicians (Electrical, aerospace, environmental, mechanical, civil, industrial technicians)</td>
<td>1,349</td>
<td>1,587</td>
<td>449</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It would be prohibitive to try to design a program for each of these occupational specialties. Leeward’s strategy will be to develop a two phase training approach.

Phase I will be a strong science and mathematics based core curriculum common to each of these technician programs. Phase II will be an industry and experiential based curriculum that will provide on-the-job training for students.

Phase II will be designed in partnership with industry and delivered with the assistance of industry partners serving as adjunct faculty. This approach will eliminate the need for costly facilities and permanent faculty housed at the Leeward campus. Phase II of the curriculum will also have the flexibility to deliver training either as a credit program leading to a degree/certificate or as a non-credit program.

In order for CAST to be successful, it will have to address the fact that most students entering the UH Community Colleges have academic challenges.

In the UHCC system, only 14% of entering students are ready for college level math and only 34% are prepared for writing at the college level. This means that any successful workforce development program not only must provide training in workforce skills, it must also address basic skills deficiencies.

CAST will include an Accelerated Learning Program (ALP) as an alternative approach to remedial/developmental learning. ALP’s curriculum will be broken down into a number of specific basic skill modules so that remedial/developmental learning can be tailored for a given workforce program and student. By using tools such as ACT’s Workkeys to analyze job skills and assess student learning, ALP can certify to employers that its students will have the basic skills needed for employment.
8 Instructional Program Support

Leeward’s revision of the Associate’s in Arts General Education Core Curriculum along the lines of that of the Manoa campus, required that all students must take one course that meets the HAP (Hawaiian Asian Pacific) focus requirement, as well as one class in the DL (Diversity Literature) category. Based upon these core curriculum changes, Leeward CC is anticipating that student demand for these classes will require one additional full-time position in each of those two disciplines. Literature classes are classified as “Writing Intensive” and hence have mandated caps of 20 which reduce their enrollment capacity. Hawaiian Studies classes typically have fill rates 87%-90% so there is not much unused capacity to absorb the projected increases in enrollment. Also note that the fill rates cited for Hawaiian Studies and other disciplines are for the end of the semester and hence classes typically start with 100% fill rates or more.

History classes have fill rates that average of 89%. Currently the high student demands on the history courses are filled 1/3 by lecturers and since the introduction of the 5/4 teaching load reduction, securing lecturers each semester has become increasingly difficult. This full-time position would help alleviate this staffing problem in History.

The recently BOR-approved DMED (Digital Media) program has only one full-time instructor and a half-time position and much of the special programs have been taught by a temporary full-time faculty member for the past four years. The funding for this position has been pieced together each year through temporary, one-time resources and as such is at risk on an annual basis. This request seeks to make permanent this position and funding. The program has grown five-fold from 11 to 55 majors in a relatively short period of time and continued growth is expected to continue.

Biology classes are required for nursing and allied health students and hence are in high demand by students. Average fill rates for these courses range between 92%-95%. More offerings in this discipline are needed as both a workforce issue and to meet increased student demand. The increase of course offering in the Biological Sciences will also require additional lab support in the form of a full-time Science APT.

Over the past 13 years, costs for student help has risen over 22% and rather than affecting services to students, the only way the difference has been made up has been to reduce student help hours and siphoning off division supply budgets; both of which puts increasing strain on the college’s services.

9 Website Development

Every academic division’s Annual Review cited an urgent need to redesign the College website.

Use of the website as a content-rich communication system is urgently required by current and potential students, as well as faculty and staff. The College’s website must provide clear and accurate information on the institution, its programs and services, not only as a recruitment tool, but also to improve institutional effectiveness.

Studies prove that websites are integral to recruitment:

A study of the Pew Internet & American Life Project, published in April 2006, indicates:

- 73% for all American adults use the Internet.
- 50% of Internet users said websites played a major role as they pursued more training for their careers.
- 42% Internet users said websites played a major role as they decided about a school or a college for themselves or their children.

2004 Pew survey noted that the internet is a common tool used to search for information on colleges:

- 57% of online teens access websites to get information about a college or university.
- 45% of online adults have done the same thing.

The U.S. Department of Education, National Center for Education Statistics indicates that 99% of public schools have internet access.
Hawai'i data includes:

52% of Internet users on Oahu have broadband connections, which was the highest percentage among 75 major metropolitan areas in a survey released by Scarborough Research in February 2005 (national average of 33 percent).

Website was the highest ranked choice in response

IR Survey of Summer 2004 students showed that more than half of the students used the Internet to obtain information about Leeward CC, far more than any other information source.

## Utility Costs for Renovated Facilities

As a result of nearly completed or planned facility renovation work, the Leeward campus will have a sizable increase in the total amount of square footage that will become climate controlled through the use of air conditioning mechanical systems. This budget request seeks general fund support in order to meet these fixed cost increases due to the increase in electrical consumption for the campus.

Two buildings will have the most significant impact related to this request...the Campus Center and the Drafting Technology facilities. The Campus Center is in the final stages of a multi-year renovation project which was funded by the state. The most significant change is that an additional 8,000 square feet on two floors will now be climate controlled. Previous electrical consumption funding estimates included 6,000 additional square feet and was part of the FY 2007 Legislative appropriation for utilities. This estimate, however, did not include the 2,000 square foot Student Lounge space. This request seeks additional funding for this oversight.

Secondly, design and construction work will soon begin on the Drafting Technology facility. The 5,525 square feet encompassing this space will undergo a complete renovation which will include office and technician space for the majority of the information technology maintenance and support personnel. This renovation is the College's number priority for FY 2007 repair and maintenance funding through the CIP process.

## Support for Native Hawaiian Programs

Leeward CC has the largest number of Native Hawaiian students of any UHCC campus (909 students in 2004-05). The College, largely through federally funded grants, has established several programs for Native Hawaiians.

As funding lapses from external programs, the College must work to institutionalize its Native Hawaiian support programs. This request aligns with Puko’a Council recommendations and Leeward's own Native Hawaiian Annual Review process.

It should be noted that while this particular funding request does not have an impact on existing facility needs, it is the intent of Leeward CC to pursue planning and design funds for a Native Hawaiian Success Center in the CIP budget process. The Native Hawaiian Success Center facility is consistent with the Puko’a Council recommendations. The size and scope of this facility is to be determined during the planning process.

## Office of Grants and Contracts Management

During the past five years, Leeward CC has seen the value of our grant and contract portfolio increase six-fold...from slightly under $1.0 m to $6.1m (all extramural award allocations including financial aid). This has been done with no additional staff support and has put tremendous pressure on the administrative support functions.

Many grants and contracts do not allow, or minimally allow, for direct administrative support and overhead. Thus, the return of the indirect cost recovery revenue back to the College is not nearly enough to support the effort involved. For instance, Title III monies dedicated for Native Hawaiian programs allows minimal administrative overhead yet is staff-intensive to track and monitor.

However, it is believed that through coordinated efforts, more thorough research, and grant proposal selectivity, the College will be able to more than offset the initial general fund investment that is made. These excess dollars may then be directed back to the academic or support unit.
13 Administrative and Institutional Support

Initiative includes clerical support and an increase in O&M operating budget

Clerical staffing is requested to support the administration of the campus consistent with the Leeward CC planned reorganization that will be presented to the UH Board of Regents during the coming year. Current staffing level has led to substantial workload pressures and a backlog of projects that have gone unattended.

All Annual Program Reviews conducted by the campus this past semester noted maintenance funding needs of the campus as a critical budgetary priority.

Without additional funding, the institution will continue to see a decline in adequate facility preventive maintenance. The result will eventually be far more costly repairs as the list of deferred maintenance projects will increase significantly.

Examples of key performance measurements used in determining our operation and maintenance effectiveness and to identify funding needs include:

One program measure that the campus uses to assess the effectiveness of our maintenance operations is the identification and repair of roof, drainpipe, and lanai water leaks. Data is collected monthly on all validated leaks, when the leak is scheduled for repair, and then assessing the actual work performed. During the 2005 reporting period, 67 leaks were validated and work was completed on 55 projects…a completion rate of 82%. The goal of repairing all remaining leaks was prohibited primarily due to lack of resources.

Another program measure used is the timely processing and completion of projects completed through the campus work order process. The campus goal of completing all work orders within a 3-day time period fell short during the last reporting period as 85% of work orders were completed. Again, the lack of resources was primarily to blame.

Finally, on the effectiveness of the janitorial services, the campus uses the Association of Physical Plant Administrators (APPA) guidelines in evaluating the cleanliness and sanitation of the facilities. Based upon the latest assessment, the Leeward CC facilities fall between the levels 3 and 4 in terms of cleanliness…far below the goal of level 2 at which all facilities should be maintained. Due to the age of the campus facilities, it is more labor intensive to prep and clean these facilities.

14 Support for New Academic Equipment Initiatives

- Wireless Network
- Smart Classrooms
- Digital Media Production
- Furniture Renewal

Wireless Network

There are now 3,511 students enrolled in 135 technology-enhanced courses where access to a networked computer is an intrinsic part of the class. The College also supports 18 computer lab/classrooms containing 368 computers for student use with an acquisition cost of $441,000.

There are also operational costs such as maintenance, repair, peripherals, and software. Another issue is that computer labs cannot be used as general classrooms and thus every new computer lab takes a classroom out of the inventory. At this point, the demand for computer labs has outstretched LCC’s ability to provide them.

A campus-wide enterprise level wireless network, as requested by various divisions within the Annual Review SWOT analysis, would allow anyone with a UH user ID to log onto the UH network. Ubiquitous access would reduce setup time for wireless labs which now cuts into the instructional hour. It would also allow students to use their own computers on campus and in computer labs, reducing the number of computers required in a lab, reducing demand for conventional computer labs, greater flexibility in course scheduling, and increased student IT access.
Smart classrooms also provide efficiencies. It was found that a significant use of computer labs was for the projection of computer data and images and did not require student computers. Thus classes could be scheduled in labs when student computer use was needed and in more economical smart classrooms for demonstrations resulting in more efficient use of expensive resources. Requests for additional classrooms to accommodate student demand was cited in Language Arts and Math & Science Annual Reviews.

**Smart Classrooms**

In the College Planning List, derived from Annual Reviews, both Instructional divisions and the AA Program SLO committees requested 25 smart classrooms. Each cited the opportunity to enhance learning through the use of technology. Language Arts, also indicated the critical need to include current technologies such as computer presentations in speech classes.

Additionally, the AA Degree Program Planning list narrative stated, “One thing learned from assessment is that the process is much more effective and efficient by using online resources. The written communication SLO group currently piloted an online technology assessment process. The plan is to extend this online assessment process to include other AA SLO groups because of the feedback from faculty, report generation capability, and the overall organization and efficiency of the process. As an increased number of students and faculty become involved in this online assessment process, more people will require access to technology.

**Digital Media Production**

The A.S. degree in Digital Media Production was officially approved by the Board of Regents at their March 2006 meeting. This program prepares students for careers in computer animation, digital video, web design, and media authoring. The program has grown five-fold from 11 to 55 majors in a relatively short period of time and continued growth is expected to continue.

Start-up equipment funding for this program has been reliant upon one-time funding pulled together from a variety of sources…this request seeks to make permanent a budget allocation line item in order to maintain program and equipment technology currency. Because the skills taught in Digital Media have a ready market in the business world, and because student training is more realistic and successful with technologically current tools, the College requires funding support in this area.

**Furniture Renewal**

One of the strongest impressions on students comes from the basic learning environment of the college - the classroom. LCC has 127 classrooms. The typical LCC classroom is showing its age of 35 plus years. It has a mixture of furniture of varying ages, some dating back to the original CIP appropriation, some worn and broken, some unsafe.

The classroom overall is an uninviting learning environment that reflects years of neglect due to tight budgets and other more pressing budget priorities. Annual Program Reviews have cited the need to address the classroom furniture renewal issue as a high campus budgetary priority. Furthermore, due to the age of the existing furniture, maintenance employees at the campus have a difficult time piecing together or replacing furniture simply due to lack of parts which no longer exist or are no longer supplied by vendors.

15 Nursing Initiative

Leeward Student Demand for a Nursing Program: along with the population growth, there is a burgeoning demand for a Nursing Program by high school graduates in the region. In 2004, the Department of Education’s Senior Exit Survey revealed that nearly 44% of the graduating high school seniors interested in a career in nursing or dental hygiene were from Leeward Community College service region of Oahu.

Growing Need for Long Term Care: central Oahu is experiencing growth in the number of hospitals, clinics, health centers, care home and homecare facilities. Presently, the region represents the largest concentration of residential care home facilities servicing the long term care needs of the state. There is a compelling need for a career laddered nursing program that can produce nurse aides, adult residential care home operators, adult day care workers, etc., to meet the growing long term care needs of the state. Growth projections for various nursing related occupations for the state are as follows:
As the Department of Labor data suggest, there will be a need not only for more Registered Nurses within the state for acute care hospital based nursing, but an equally large and compelling need for a wide range of nursing related workers to meet the growing need for community and home based health care. There is a corresponding need to develop such a program in close partnership with the health care providers in the region.

Addressing Socio-Economic Disparities on Leeward Oahu: Leeward Oahu possesses the largest population of Native Hawaiians within the state. It also possesses the most populated rural and least economically developed regions that are medically underserved and rooted in a cycle of poverty. There is a need to develop a Nursing Program on the Leeward Coast that is career laddered and culturally sensitive and which is taught by nursing practitioners from the region, and flexible enough to meet the needs of these populations. Although the Waianae Health Academy has done a credible job in meeting some of these educational needs in health care, through a partnership with Kapiʻolani Community College, it has not risen to the scale required and has been primarily funded through extramural funding – making it vulnerable to soft funding. There is a compelling need for a stable and larger scaled program that can meet the Nurse Education needs at the Leeward Campus and surrounding rural areas.

Financial Requirements: To begin to meet these needs, it is proposed that Leeward Community College initially partner with Kapiʻolani Community College’s program during the first two years. After that initial two years, the goal will be for Leeward Community College to obtain its own accredited program that provides a Registered Nurse Associate degree, licensed practical nursing certificate, nurse’s aide certificate, and other home/community based nursing related certificates. The initial phase of the program will concentrate on establishing the lower rungs of the Nursing career ladder (LPN, Nursing Aide, ARCH workers, etc.).

### Recruitment and Retention Officer

As indicated in the chart below, Leeward CC’s Freshman Persistence rate drops precipitously after the second semester. Currently, the college does not have any coordinated approach to initiatives and programs aimed at retention.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Major</th>
<th>2nd (spr)</th>
<th>3rd (fall)</th>
<th>4th (spr)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Liberal Arts</td>
<td>70%</td>
<td>53%</td>
<td>46%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accounting</td>
<td>70%</td>
<td>56%</td>
<td>41%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Automotive</td>
<td>67%</td>
<td>49%</td>
<td>38%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business Tech</td>
<td>83%</td>
<td>57%</td>
<td>37%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Digital Media</td>
<td>77%</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>46%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Food Service</td>
<td>65%</td>
<td>51%</td>
<td>43%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ICS</td>
<td>67%</td>
<td>54%</td>
<td>33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Management</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sub Abuse Counsel</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TV Pro</td>
<td>67%</td>
<td>52%</td>
<td>48%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>70%</strong></td>
<td><strong>53%</strong></td>
<td><strong>45%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

source: Banner extraction, Leeward CC IR Office
In addition to the critical need in retention, the need for increased recruitment surfaced in the College’s Annual Reviews. Each division indicated a need for increased recruitment, with the Career and Technical Education (CTE) programs expressing the strongest need. Competition in educational marketing is at an all time high. Private colleges and universities, such as Hawai‘i Pacific University, spend approximately 15% of tuition income on marketing. Leeward CC allocates less than 1% of tuition income to marketing efforts.

The need to build and implement an effective recruitment campaign is critical to the success of the College. As indicated the UH Strategic Plan, “Higher education operates in an increasingly competitive marketplace. Success in this environment requires “branding” the unique and special strengths of the University of Hawaii system and successfully communicating this brand throughout its universe” (UH Strategic Plan, 2002–2010, Planning Imperatives).

17 **Academic Support Services Positions**

Kako‘o Ike (KI) was established four years ago when centers for learning and physical disabilities were combined as a unit under the Learning Resource Center. KI currently employs two disabilities specialists, one general funded and one funded through Perkins funding. Since its creation, visits from students requiring accommodations or services have more than doubled.

Even with two specialists, KI is taxed to provide comprehensive services to these students. An even greater challenge is providing this same level of services to the students of the Leeward CC Waianae Center campus. The Perkins grant funding has been cut by 50% for FY 2007. Beginning in FY 2008, the Perkins grant will no longer fund the second disabilities position.

The services which the KI unit provides are federally mandated under the Americans with Disabilities Act. If these services are not continued, Leeward CC will face serious liability issues. This request will insure that federally mandated KI services will continue at the present level after federal funding lapses.

Within the UH Information Technology infrastructure, individual campuses are responsible for the campus computer network. The network is the single most important IT infrastructure item on campus and is as essential as utilities. Without connectivity, business and instructional operations shut down. Currently, the LCC network is maintained by one technician

During the tenure of this technician, the campus has become fully networked and the number of computers has more than doubled. Use of the network and access to LCC services on line has also become a 24/7 necessity - an impossible task for one person

18 **Current Service Base Adjustment**

addresses inflation

19 **Academic Equipment Replacement**

The equipment covered by this request directly supports instruction. This request does not include information technology items (e.g. computers) and furniture as these are requested in separate requests.

Within the six academic divisions and four academic service support units, LCC has an inventory of $3,115,501 of academic equipment.

During the past decade, LCC has not had sufficient budget to implement an equipment replacement and maintenance program. The result has been a steady aging of the equipment inventory.

For example, in Math & Science, which houses disciplines very dependent of equipment, equipment is on the average 19 years old. The average replacement age for the equipment should be 13 years. Thus on the average, Math & Science equipment should have been replaced 6 years ago. Much of the older equipment is obsolete and prone to breakdown which has a strong negative impact on the effectiveness of Math & Science instruction.
20 **Replacement Schedule for Computers**

Of LCC’s 297 FTE, 273 positions have been identified as “information workers.” In addition, LCC supports 18 computer lab/classrooms containing 368 computers for student use. Providing access to information technology resources is critical to student success as much of what students do today involves computers.

Current IT budget does not include a regular replacement cycle for all faculty, staff and lab computers. Further, it does not address the total cost of ownership (software, upgrades, maintenance, and repair) as stipulated in the UH Strategic Plan nor does it allow for upgrades of the existing network such as the increasing needs for wireless connectivity.

The need to upgrade computers, along with keeping current with software, was cited in every Annual Review, resulting in 6 of the 8 items on the College Plan’s IT category referencing computer replacement. The need for upgraded software was cited in Accounting Program Assessment as critical for teaching.

21 **Faculty & Staff Professional Development and Training**

All areas and units in the Annual Review process indicated a critical need for training and professional development activities for faculty and staff.

22 **Campus Rehabilitation Project**

Infrastructure needs at Leeward Community College have been in serious decline for several years. Due to a lack of resources and flexibility in the budget, the facilities and supporting grounds, landscaping, and signage needs are in desperate need of attention.

The physical environment of the campus establishes a visual statement about the quality and viability of the institution. A study by the University of Texas Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development indicates that physical environments in universities affect motivation, behavior and performance. The same study determined that the natural settings (e.g. grounds, campus artwork, gathering areas and commons) play an important role in educational outcomes. Leeward CC’s campus, which is over 35 years old, does not reflect positive environmental aesthetics.

In addition, the campus signage needs are readily apparent to anyone who has attempted to navigate the campus roadways and/or pedestrian pathways. This also has an impact on campus accessibility needs in communicating the most convenient access points for students and visitors to campus who require special accommodations.

When people lose their way they get frustrated, disoriented and form a negative opinion of the institution.

Effective signage plays a critical role in creating a consistent, orderly, high quality campus environment conducive to a collegiate atmosphere. Additionally, studies have found that students who are comfortable in their surroundings and finding their way around campus facilities are more likely to continue their progression in higher education. This is especially true for first-generation college students.

National research regarding student retention, persistence, and the quality of the student experience affirms the role that out of class experiences have on the success of college students. Ernest Boyer (1987) concluded that “the effectiveness of the undergraduate experience relates to the quality of campus life and is directly linked to the time students spend on campus and the quality of their involvement in activities.” In the 2004 Community College Survey of Student Engagement report, “Engagement by Design,” colleges are encouraged to redesign the educational experience outside the classroom to engage students and promote extended time on campus. These students will not only have a higher retention rate, but are more likely to achieve educational goals.

Currently, the physical environment at Leeward CC does not invite or “engage” a student to spend more time on campus.

This request is specifically targeted at providing a recurring line item in the campus operating budget to support infrastructure improvements. This includes supply and equipment funding necessary to improve campus signage and way finding, landscaping design and improvements, expansion of campus art work projects, campus beautification initiatives, and training and professional development funds specifically targeted at improved grounds maintenance.
23 Learning Commons

Academic Services at LCC provides direct services to students as part of its mission. The Learning Resource Center provides tutoring in writing as well as specific subjects. In addition, it provides access to computers through a computer lab co-located in the center. The Library provides access to information resources through its print and electronic collections, reference services, and information literacy training. In addition, the Library provides access to computing through a laptop computer check-out service and wireless network. The Information Technology Group offers access to computers through two open labs located on campus. All units provide places for study by students.

Problems identified in the Annual Reviews of these units include insufficient resources to maintain computer labs, insufficient human resources to maintain hours of operation through an extended day, lack of space and/or inappropriate configuration of space, and old, broken, and shabby furniture. A larger college problem is a lack of space specifically designed to meet the learning needs of our current students. Numerous studies have shown that students today tend to learn through collaborative engagement and holistic project-oriented learning tasks. LCC is primarily a commuter campus and most of LCC's students tend to leave campus after classes. Studies show that there is a strong correlation between the amount of time students spend on campus and their success.

This request for funding is to establish a Learning Commons at LCC. Funds would be used to provide furniture, computers, and infrastructure in a portion of the Library Building. Funding for appropriate renovation of the facility is to be requested in a separate Repair and Maintenance request. The College would then co-locate a wireless laptop computer service, tutoring services, reference services, and selected student services in the remodeled facility.

The goal would be to provide a seamless, "one-stop" learning environment for students that would provide areas for collaboration and student projects. The idea of a learning or information commons is a widespread and successful concept pioneered by such varied institutions as Dartmouth, University of Massachusetts, Monterey Peninsula College, and Cal State-Hayward.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Campus Priority</th>
<th>UH Goal/Obj</th>
<th>CC Goal/Obj</th>
<th>UH Req Cat</th>
<th>ID</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>FUND GF</th>
<th>FY 2008</th>
<th>FY 2009</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Full Year Funding for New FY 2007 Positions</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>321</td>
<td></td>
<td>GF</td>
<td>167,579</td>
<td>167,579</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>3-2</td>
<td>A-4</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>321</td>
<td>Expansion of Educational Services to Waianae Center expanded academic, student, and institutional support services</td>
<td>GF</td>
<td>298,744</td>
<td>701,108</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>1-1</td>
<td>A-5</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>323</td>
<td>Expansion of Institutional Research and Assessment strengthen planning, policy, assessment &amp; research efforts</td>
<td>GF</td>
<td>212,372</td>
<td>253,028</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>2-2</td>
<td>C-1</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>324</td>
<td>Support for Workforce Development/Job Placement institutionalize job placement services for students</td>
<td>GF</td>
<td>150,784</td>
<td>150,784</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>1-1</td>
<td>A-5</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>321</td>
<td>Center for Accelerated Learning remediation efforts, teaching innovation, applied science &amp; tech</td>
<td>GF</td>
<td>322,708</td>
<td>252,708</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>1-1</td>
<td>A-5</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>321</td>
<td>Instructional Program Support faculty, APT, &amp; student assistant funding</td>
<td>GF</td>
<td>109,116</td>
<td>392,196</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>2-3</td>
<td>E-1</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>323</td>
<td>Website Development new campus website support and development</td>
<td>GF</td>
<td>70,204</td>
<td>70,204</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>4-2</td>
<td>E-6</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>325</td>
<td>Utility Costs for Renovated Facilities electrical costs associated with renovated facilities</td>
<td>GF</td>
<td>5,000</td>
<td>18,813</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>3-2</td>
<td>A-4</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>321</td>
<td>Support for Native Hawaiian Programs fund Pukoa Council recommendations</td>
<td>GF</td>
<td>293,808</td>
<td>293,808</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>2-2</td>
<td>C-1</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>325</td>
<td>Office of Grants and Contracts Management expansion/support of grant and contract funding opportunities</td>
<td>GF</td>
<td>90,632</td>
<td>90,632</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>4-1</td>
<td>E-6</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>325</td>
<td>Administrative and Institutional Support infrastructure support…clerical and operations &amp; maintenance</td>
<td>GF</td>
<td>230,472</td>
<td>230,472</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>2-3</td>
<td>E-1</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>323</td>
<td>Support for New Academic Equipment Initiatives smart classrooms, wireless campus, digital media, furniture renewal</td>
<td>GF</td>
<td>570,000</td>
<td>270,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>2-2</td>
<td>C-1</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>321</td>
<td>Nursing Initiative creation of nursing program to meet statewide nursing shortage</td>
<td>GF</td>
<td>241,184</td>
<td>607,016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>1-1</td>
<td>A-2</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>325</td>
<td>Recruitment and Retention Officer enhance student recruitment/retention through comprehensive marketing/promotion efforts</td>
<td>GF</td>
<td>60,376</td>
<td>60,376</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>1-1</td>
<td>A-3</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>323</td>
<td>Academic Support Services Positions&lt;br&gt;disability accommodation &amp; networking specialists positions</td>
<td>GF</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>101,248</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Current Service Base Adjustment&lt;br&gt;inflation adjustment</td>
<td>GF</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>138,927</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Subtotal - General Fund</td>
<td>34.00</td>
<td>3,063,154</td>
<td>52.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tuition and Fees Special Fund (TFSF):</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>4-1</td>
<td>D-1</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>301</td>
<td>Faculty Collective Bargaining</td>
<td>TFSF</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>292,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>1-1</td>
<td>A-2</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>304</td>
<td>Student Financial Aid Commitment</td>
<td>TFSF</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>9,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>2-3</td>
<td>E-3</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>321</td>
<td>Academic Equipment Replacement&lt;br&gt;replacement schedule for academic/classroom equipment</td>
<td>TFSF</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>100,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>2-3</td>
<td>E-3</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>323</td>
<td>Replacement Schedule for Computers&lt;br&gt;replacement computer schedule for labs and offices</td>
<td>TFSF</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>100,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>4-1</td>
<td>D-4</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>321</td>
<td>Faculty &amp; Staff Professional Development and Training&lt;br&gt;professional development opportunities for faculty/staff</td>
<td>TFSF</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>50,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>1-1</td>
<td>A-2</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>325</td>
<td>Campus Rehabilitation Project&lt;br&gt;infrastructure support for campus-wide improvements</td>
<td>TFSF</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>50,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>1-1</td>
<td>A-5</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>323</td>
<td>Learning Commons&lt;br&gt;one-stop learning service center (Library, LRC, IT)</td>
<td>TFSF</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Subtotal - Tuition and Fees Special Fund</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>601,000</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Total Budget Request</td>
<td>34.00</td>
<td>3,664,154</td>
<td>52.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Internal Reallocations:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2-2</td>
<td>C-1</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>321</td>
<td>Creation of 1.0 faculty fte position in Culinary Arts from faculty lecturer/overload budget</td>
<td>GF</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>36,000</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3-2</td>
<td>A-4</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>321</td>
<td>Creation of 1.0 faculty fte position in Hawaiian Studies from faculty position in Social Sciences</td>
<td>GF</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>31,194</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-1</td>
<td>A-2</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>324</td>
<td>Creation of Financial Aid counselor position from other current expenses</td>
<td>GF</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>42,020</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2-2</td>
<td>C-1</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>321</td>
<td>Creation of 1.0 APT fte for Shade House manager to support Math/Science ethnobotany and horticulture programs from other current expenses</td>
<td>GF</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>31,845</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Total Internal Reallocations</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>141,059</td>
<td>4.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 Request Categories:<br><br>A: Increase Educational Capital of the State<br>B: Expand Workforce Development<br>C: Assist in Economic Diversification<br>D: Address Underserved Regions/Populations<br>E: Campus Infrastructure

2 Funds: GF: General Fund; TFSF: Tuition & Fees SF; CCSF: Community Colleges SF; CONF: Conference Center RF; STDNT: Student Activities RF; OTH: Other Funds
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Priority</th>
<th>Project Title</th>
<th>Phase</th>
<th>MOF</th>
<th>Prior Appropriation</th>
<th>MOF</th>
<th>FY 2007-08</th>
<th>FY 2008-09</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Social Science/Teacher Education Building</td>
<td>Land</td>
<td>C</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Plans</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>367,000</td>
<td>C</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Design</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>944,000</td>
<td>C</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Construction</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>13,500,000</td>
<td>C</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Equipment</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>2,500,000</td>
<td>C</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>1,311,000</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>16,000,000</strong></td>
<td><strong>0</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Library Air Conditioning Upgrades</td>
<td>Land</td>
<td>C</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Plans</td>
<td>C</td>
<td></td>
<td>C</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Design</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>C</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Construction</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>900,000</td>
<td>C</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Equipment</td>
<td>C</td>
<td></td>
<td>C</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>901,000</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>0</strong></td>
<td><strong>0</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Waianae Education/University Center</td>
<td>Land</td>
<td>C</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Plans</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>50,000</td>
<td>C</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Design</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>100,000</td>
<td>C</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Construction</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>1,000,000</td>
<td>C</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Equipment</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>100,000</td>
<td>C</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>0</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>3,250,000</strong></td>
<td><strong>0</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Project Description</td>
<td>Land</td>
<td>C / C</td>
<td>C / C</td>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Second Access Road</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Planning funds to begin second access road development; placeholder</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>for possible state/federal DOT funding; introduced as part of HB 2917 - 2006</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Legislative session</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Plans</td>
<td>C</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>500,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Design</td>
<td>C</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Construction</td>
<td>C</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Equipment</td>
<td>C</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>500,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>College Village Complex</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Planning funds for public/private partnership; centerpiece of complex would</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>be a student dormitory</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Plans</td>
<td>C</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>100,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Design</td>
<td>C</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Construction</td>
<td>C</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Equipment</td>
<td>C</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>100,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Student Services One-Stop Center</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Planning and design funds for new 20,000 square foot student services facility</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Plans</td>
<td>C</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>250,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Design</td>
<td>C</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>550,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Construction</td>
<td>C</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Equipment</td>
<td>C</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>800,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Expansion of Observatory Park Complex</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Funding partnership between state and grant funds to build observatory</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Building and provide necessary infrastructure</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>MOF A: infrastructure costs roadway, parking, utilities, ADA accessibility</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Plans</td>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>50,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Design</td>
<td>C</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>250,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Design</td>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>100,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Construction</td>
<td>C</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3,000,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Construction</td>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1,000,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Equipment</td>
<td>C</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Equipment</td>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>100,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>50,000</td>
<td></td>
<td>450,000</td>
<td>4,100,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Native Hawaiian Success Center</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td>Land</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>C</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>planning and design funds for 10,000 square foot academic &amp; cultural facility;</td>
<td>Plans</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>C</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>introduced as part of HB 2844 - 2006 legislative session and part of Puko’a Council recommendations</td>
<td>Design</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>C</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Construction</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>C</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Equipment</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>C</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>350,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Upgrade of Operations and Maintenance Facility</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>planning, design, and construction funds for major facility repairs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Land</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>C</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Plans</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>C</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Design</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>C</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Construction</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>C</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Equipment</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>C</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>300,000</td>
<td>2,750,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Campus Total - MOF A - State General Obligation Bonds</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Land</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Plans</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Design</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Construction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Equipment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Campus Total - MOF N - Federal Funds</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Land</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Plans</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Design</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Construction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Equipment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Campus Grand Total - All Funds</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Land</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Plans</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Design</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Construction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Equipment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>