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STATEMENT ON PREPARATION OF THE MIDTERM REPORT

Background
The Accrediting Commission for the Community and Junior Colleges (ACCJC) reaffirmed the accreditation of Leeward Community College (Leeward CC) on January 31, 2007, with one requirement, that the College submit a Midterm Report by October 15, 2009.

Preparation of the Midterm Report
The preparation of the Leeward CC 2009 Midterm Report was headed by the College’s Accreditation Liaison Officer (ALO), under the guidance of the Chancellor.

Upon receipt of the Visiting Team’s Evaluation Report in January 2007, Chancellor Peter Quigley sent a message to the entire campus community outlining the five major recommendations. A preliminary chart of all self-identified issues was compiled indicating how the College was going to approach these items with tentative deadlines and responsible parties listed. This document was placed online on February 8, 2007. (http://documents.leeward.hawaii.edu:8080/docushare/dsweb/View/Collection-1783)

In March 2007 Chancellor Peter Quigley accepted a position at the UH Manoa campus and Manuel Cabral was appointed Interim Chancellor. Cabral took over the process, reviewing the Team Report and meeting with ALO and Strategic Plan coordinator. In May 2007, he charged them with the following:

1. Meet with the people indicated for each recommendation and set up a reporting structure and methods of gathering evidence as they work towards completion. Please note any challenges you see to our meeting the required actions and report them to me.

2. During Fall 2007, gather information and complete the Planning Agenda Status Report Forms for items on the attached list. The administrative team will review your reports during Spring 2008, giving us enough time to make any necessary adjustments during the AY 2008-09 in preparation for the Fall 2009 Midterm Report.

A Reporting Grid was generated for responses to recommendations and planning agendas. During AY 2007-08, appropriate parties were asked for updates, which included what was currently in place, what was accomplished, what evidence there was of accomplishments, and most importantly, what was needed for improvement.

Throughout Fall 2008, updates were posted online to encourage dialogue and campus review at http://emedia.leeward.hawaii.edu/poa/status/status.asp.

In Spring 2009, Barbara Hotta was appointed ALO. Chancellor Cabral established an Accreditation Advisory Group comprised of five members. The Accreditation Advisory Group consulted with individual faculty, staff and administrators who provided information and updates on the progress of all recommendations and the related college-identified concerns. Additionally, a small committee was formed to work on a Substantive Change Proposal.
## Timeline of Activities for Midterm Report Preparation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Event</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>January 2007</td>
<td>Visiting team submitted Evaluation Report</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>February 8, 2007</td>
<td>Report placed on-line</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>March 2007</td>
<td>Chancellor Peter Quigley accepted a position at UH Manoa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>March 2007</td>
<td>Manuel Cabral appointed Interim Chancellor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May 2007</td>
<td>ALO, Robert Asato and Strategic Plan Coordinator, Lani Uyeno tasked with setting up a reporting structure and methods of evaluation for the Planning Agenda Status Reports</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AY 2007 – 2008</td>
<td>Appropriate parties asked for updates to Planning Agenda Status Reports</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall 2008</td>
<td>Updates posted online to encourage dialogue and campus review</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spring 2009</td>
<td>Barbara Hotta appointed ALO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spring 2009</td>
<td>Chancellor Cabral established an Accreditation Advisory Group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May 2009</td>
<td>Draft of <em>Midterm Report</em> presented to Campus Council and Faculty Senate for feedback</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>June 2009</td>
<td>Vice President for Community Colleges John Morton identifies submission requirements for <em>Midterm Report</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>September 24, 2009</td>
<td>Report due to UH President and Vice-President for Community Colleges</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>October 1, 2009</td>
<td>Report submitted for Board of Regents review</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>October 15, 2009</td>
<td>Board of Regents meeting; Final approval of <em>Midterm Report</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>October 16, 2009</td>
<td><em>Midterm Report</em> due to ACCJC</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The Accreditation Advisory Group held weekly meetings, reviewing the information added to the Reporting Grid. The Accreditation Advisory Group members included:

1. Chancellor
2. Vice Chancellor of Academic Affairs
3. Director of Planning, Policy and Assessment
4. Accreditation Liaison Officer
5. Director of Marketing and Communications

Contributors to the report included:

1. Vice Chancellor of Administrative Services
2. Interim Dean of Academic Services
3. Interim Dean of Arts and Sciences
4. Interim Dean of Student Services
5. Dean of Career and Technical Education
6. Coordinator Educational Media Center
7. Distance Education Coordinator
8. Institutional Effectiveness Officer
9. Faculty Senate Chair
10. Campus Council Chair
11. Assessment Chair
12. Division Chairs and Discipline Coordinators
13. College Computing Lab Manager
14. Student Government Advisor
15. Student Representative

The Midterm Report was compiled by the ALO in April 2009. The final draft was posted online for campus wide review on May 7, 2009.

Review and Approval
The review and approval of the Midterm Report included the following actions:

1. In May 2009, electronic copies of the Midterm Report Draft were sent to all members of the major campus governance groups, Faculty Senate and Campus Council.
2. Feedback and comments from this review were incorporated during summer 2009.
3. Faculty Senate approved the final Midterm Report on September 2, 2009
5. After campus approval, the Midterm Report was transmitted to the UH Vice President for Community Colleges, and the UH Board of Regents.
RESPONSES TO RECOMMENDATIONS OF THE 2006 VISITING TEAM

As a result of the October 2006 visit, the team made five recommendations:

Recommendation #1: Improving Institutional Effectiveness

The team recommends that the college maintain the newly approved Leeward Community College Assessment, Program Review and Planning Process, standardize the terminology used in the process, and evaluate the effectiveness of the process after several cycles of full implementation. The evaluation should also include an assessment of the effectiveness of resource allocations in achieving their desired outcome. (Standard IB.2, IB.6, Standard IIID.1c, IIID.2g, IIID.3, and Standard IVA.2, IVA.2a, IVA.3)

Recommendation #2: Institutional Programs

The team recommends that the college, having completed student learning outcomes for all its courses and for most of the programs offered by the college, complete student learning outcomes for the remaining programs (some certificate programs and the academic support programs), and initiate or continue the process of assessing the outcomes and applying the results of that assessment to the continuous improvement of the instruction and services provided to its students. (IIA.1a, IIA.1c, IIA.2a, IIB.4, IIC.2)

Recommendation #3:

The team recommends that the college implement a program for developing student leadership participation in the campus decision-making processes. (II.B.3.b, III.C.1.c, IV.A.2, IV.A.2.a, IV.A.3)

Recommendation #4

The team recommends that the college develop and implement a plan for ensuring that campus facilities are accessible to students, staff, and community members with disabilities. (IIIB.1.b)

Recommendation #5

The team recommends that the college fully implement the Leeward Administrative Reorganization which was approved by the Board of Regents in October of 2006 and, after several years of full operation, evaluate its effectiveness in addressing the college’s problems with administrative instability. (Standard IV.B.2)
Recommendation 1: Improving Institutional Effectiveness

The team recommends that the college maintain the newly approved Leeward Community College Assessment, Program Review and Planning Process, standardize the terminology used in the process, and evaluate the effectiveness of the process after several cycles of full implementation. The evaluation should also include an assessment of the effectiveness of resource allocations in achieving their desired outcome. (Standard IB.2, IB.6, Standard IIID.1c, IIID.2g, IIID.3, and Standard IVA.2, IVA.2a, IVA.3)

College Response/Action Taken on the Recommendation

Maintaining Assessment, Program Review and Planning Process

The Team’s recommendation references the College’s “Assessment, Program Review and Planning Process.” To clarify, the College uses the phrase, Annual Program Review, as the name of the overall process that integrates assessment, program review, planning, and resource allocation.

The Annual Program Review process provides the College with a comprehensive planning process that is inclusive, data-based, and collegial. The Annual Program Review focuses on the analysis of data provided by the program and course assessment of student learning, support area Student Learning Outcomes (SLOs), and institutional effectiveness, and serves as the foundation for budget and resource allocation.

The Annual Program Review process was implemented on a college-wide basis in spring 2006. The completion of the first cycle of the Annual Program Review served as the major building block of the 2007-2009 Biennium Budget Proposal.

These were newly approved processes at the time of the ACCJC Team Visit. Since that time, the College has maintained those processes. Annual Program Reviews were completed in three academic years, 2007, 2008 and 2009.

In 2007, the College completed both an annual review and an update because the timeline for our Annual Program Review process was modified to coincide with UHCC reporting requirements. Perkins Core Indicators (for Career Technical Education programs) were integrated with the UHCC Annual Report of Program Data, and the reporting deadline was changed to December 2007.

Annual Program Reviews (2008-2009) are in process. Division and support area planning lists have been prioritized and will be reviewed by Standing Committees and the Executive Planning Council (EPC) in fall 09. The Annual Program Review (2008-2009) timeline has been slightly extended to accommodate the following actions: Modifications were approved to assign EPC responsibilities to the Campus Council (CC) and to reduce the number of standing committees (details on page 10); and processes were implemented to use program review data during non-biennium years for operational budgets. Due to this timeline extension, the term EPC will continue to be used throughout this document, and in fall 09 the CC will assume EPC responsibilities.
The chart above shows the progression of the *Annual Program Review* timeline, with each year providing increased periods of time for analysis and generation of budget proposals. The traditional supplemental budget request process was suspended for 2010-2011 due to Hawaii’s worsening economic conditions and pending State-wide budget reductions. Strategies to address the State of Hawaii budget deficit are on-going and the magnitude of the budget reduction targets to the College, as well as to the entire University of Hawaii system, are not known. The College, in collaboration with the other UH community colleges, is developing several budget reduction scenarios, which, when finalized, will be vetted with the Leeward Community College campus community. This is anticipated to occur during the Summer/Fall 2009 timeframe. The College’s strategic plan and annual program review documents will be used to guide and assist the campus in any budget reduction or funding prioritization process.

The overall Annual Program Review process supports analysis at several levels:

SLO assessments (course, program, and support area) are analyzed as part of each assessment activity. These analyses involve dialogue about what the data mean, what changes will be implemented, how these changes affect the College, and what funding the changes require. Details of our progress in assessment are discussed under Recommendation #2 on page 13.
1. Academic Divisions compile and analyze results from the following areas in their Division Annual Program Reviews: SLO assessments; institutional research data; issues involving student learning and achievement, curriculum, faculty and staff, support area collaboration initiatives, and external factors; overall analysis of the divisions’ strengths, weaknesses, opportunities, and threats (SWOT); and a summary of the division’s tactical plans that have been implemented to address the College’s Strategic Plan. Ongoing dialogue and focused discussions occur among the members of each division as annual reviews are completed. The result is a division planning list with items supported by data and an estimated funding request. Details of Division Annual Program Reviews and planning lists are stored on DocuShare: http://documents.leeward.hawaii.edu:8080/docushare/dsweb/View/Collection-93

2. Division chairs, appropriate Deans, a representative from the AA degree program, and the Vice Chancellor of Academic Affairs develop a prioritized Instructional Plan, based on the analysis of items on each division’s prioritized planning list and their relevance to the Strategic Plan and the overall needs of the divisions and the College. These discussions result in an Instructional Plan with items supported by data and an estimated funding request.

3. During the 08-09 supplemental budget year, the Vice Chancellor of Academic Affairs initiated a process to connect data from program reviews and prioritized planning lists to operational budgets for Instructional Divisions, Student Services, and Academic Services. Also, Division Chairs developed spending plans, based on division prioritized planning lists, for 2008 summer school revenues. These efforts expand our planning process to include additional levels of resource allocation and increase the College’s focus on data driven decision-making.

4. This annual review process and analysis of results also occurs within two other academic areas, Leeward CC at Wai‘anae and the Office of Continuing Education and Workforce Development (OCEWD). Even with the complexity and uniqueness of these areas, their prioritized planning lists will be merged into the Instructional Plan during the 2009-2010 Annual Program Review process.

5. Support areas (Academic Services, Administrative Services, and Student Services) follow the same annual program review process, but these area reviews and prioritized planning lists are not finalized until after the prioritized Instructional Plan has been completed. This schedule provides time for support areas to address needs, identified in other reviews, which require support area collaboration/interaction. The discussions in each support area result in a prioritized plan with items supported by data and an estimated funding request.

6. Prioritized plans (Instructional, Student Services, Academic Services, and Administrative Services) are sent to Standing Committees and the Executive Planning Council for review and response (based on an institutional perspective). Recommendations from the latter groups are submitted to the Chancellor. The number of standing committees has been reduced from five to two; details are discussed on page 10.

7. All plans are merged into an institutional plan that serves as the basis for budget requests and resource allocation. (http://documents.leeward.hawaii.edu:8080/docushare/dsweb/View/Collection-2724/Document-25540)
Standardizing Terminology

Since spring 2006, the College has been assessing and modifying the Annual Program Review process, as needed, to improve its efficiency and effectiveness. As the College completes the 2008-2009 cycle, the Director of Planning, Policy and Assessment (DPPA) is in the process of standardizing the terminology used in the process. The glossary is a work in progress; a draft was posted on DocuShare in summer 2009 (http://documents.leeward.hawaii.edu:8080/docushare/dsweb/View/Collection-2654).

Faculty and staff will be asked to provide comments regarding the clarity and completeness of the glossary.

The following section describes modifications to the process that have been completed since spring 2006.

In fall 2006, after the ACCJC Team Visit, the administration reviewed the first cycle of the assessment, program review and planning process (now known as the Annual Program Review process). Discussions with Division Chairs and Support Area heads indicated that a few changes needed to be made for increased efficiency in completing the reviews. Additionally, administrators wanted to modify a few of the questions to bring assessment results to the forefront in the review form. Campus leaders also discussed the differences between an “Annual Review” and a “Program Review.” As our process evolved, along with the UHCC System’s Program Review requirements, it became evident that our Annual Review process fulfilled all requirements of a Program Review.

The Chancellor decided to implement these modifications based on feedback from the campus and complete at least one more cycle before attempting to standardize the terminology. It was also critical to have the Office of Planning, Policy and Assessment established to handle all revisions and modifications.

Changes were made to the template questions for the 2007 review. The changes placed an even greater emphasis on assessment and provided specific prompts to evoke more analytical responses. The form itself was changed to a word processing document in response to campus feedback on the original PDF format.

In July 2007, the College appointed a Director of Planning, Policy and Assessment as an appointed faculty position. Under her guidance, timelines, terminology, and overview of all the processes are being coordinated and improved.

Revisions of the Policy on Program Review and the Annual Program Review process are ongoing. In addition to the modifications discussed above, these changes have been or are in the process of being adopted:

1. The Program Review and Annual Review processes have been merged into the Annual Program Review (APR) process. (Spring 2007)

2. The following template revisions were completed for the fall 08 APR process:

   a. The Dean of Academic Services, Dean of Student Services, Institutional Effectiveness Officer, and Director of Planning, Policy and Assessment (DPPA) revised the support area template to encourage discussion and analysis of current APR initiatives in relation to previous college and area initiatives (summer 08).
b. The DPPA, Leeward CC at Wai‘anae coordinator, and Office of Continuing Education and Workforce Development (OCEWD) coordinator revised the APR templates to better reflect the needs, reporting responsibilities, and data requirements of these academic areas (summer 08).

c. The DPPA and Division Chairs made minor revisions to several questions on the division APR template to incorporate suggestions from planning agendas identified during the College’s 2006 Self Study process (fall 08).

All of the template revisions will be re-assessed, if needed, prior to the fall 09 APR process.

3. During the 08-09 APR process, a new section—Tactical Implementation of the Strategic Plan—was added to all of the APR templates. This section shows direct connections between our planning process and our Strategic Plan and helps track activities that are being implemented to address college strategies and strategic outcomes.

4. Two APR modification proposals were submitted to the Campus Council (CC) on February 9, 2009:

   Proposal #1 Assign the responsibilities of the Executive Planning Council (EPC) to the CC – approved by the CC 4/20/09.

   Proposal #2 Modify the number of standing committees required in the APR process – approved by the CC 02/09/09.

   (Proposals in Appendix A)

Rationale for the proposed modifications is included in the proposals, and additional information provided in the next section—Evaluating the Process, page 10. Informational updates about APR modifications and the glossary will be shared with the campus during the Convocation in fall 2009. The assessment portion of this process has clearly defined terminology, published online at [http://emedia.leeward.hawaii.edu/slo/](http://emedia.leeward.hawaii.edu/slo/)

In April 2007, the UHCC System initiated discussion of an update to the UHCC Strategic Plan and requested all campuses to begin the process of updating individual campus’ Strategic Plans to align with the System. This unified approach established a focus on critical issues affecting the colleges and the State; provided a framework for the integration of assessment, planning, and budgeting processes for the colleges and the System; and included outcomes with benchmarks and targeted goals to measure our progress. This has had significant impact on our APR process since all our processes are integrated with our Strategic Plan. As a result of this alignment, System directives for the 2009-2015 biennium budgeting process were developed to target specific Strategic Plan initiatives that affect the entire System. The College, having completed its APR process before receiving these directives, reviewed and, in some cases, reprioritized the College’s priorities and budget requests to align with the parameters of the System directives. This framework for the integration of assessment, planning, and budgeting processes was not something new for Leeward CC. Our APR process is based on the same principles.
Evaluating the Process

This year marks the third full cycle of the revised planning process. Up until this point, the process has been evaluated through feedback from campus users to improve efficiency in completing the forms and by modification to the prompt questions. This assessment has been based on interviews with the users and administrators.

At the time of our Institutional Self Study Report (2006), the College planned to have an Executive Planning Council (EPC) to provide oversight to the process. In our Self Study, we stated:

…the EPC will be responsible for the overall assessment/review of the planning process (p.89); evaluate the annual process to assess the quality and usefulness of the planning process and the data collected (p. 107); and review results of the planning process to insure that quality data has emerged from assessment processes, that changes were instituted, that budget items were put forward as a result, and that information & modifications are provided to campus (p. 108).

After receiving feedback from campus users and members of the EPC, the DPPA compared the purpose, function, and membership of the EPC and the Campus Council, an existing governing body, and determined that there was much duplication between the responsibilities of these two groups. A proposed modification, assigning the responsibilities of the EPC to the CC, was approved by the CC with the stipulation that the current EPC would complete the 08-09 APR process, and that the CC revised constitution and bylaws, which incorporate this change and expand representation to include a majority of campus constituencies, would become effective in fall 09.

Now that the CC will take on the responsibilities of the EPC as of fall 09, a subcommittee of the CC will be formed to design and implement a comprehensive evaluation process to assess APR effectiveness during AY 09-10.

In addition to this evaluation process, during spring 09, as part of the college’s Strategic Plan, targeted campus leadership (Campus Council, Faculty Senate, Unit Heads, and Administrators) were asked to complete the “Community College Inventory: Focus on Student Persistence, Learning and Attainment.” This survey will be used as a tool for institutional review, reflection, and discussion of the college’s efforts to develop and sustain an institutional environment that promotes transparency, and a culture of evidence that links institutional assessment, planning, resource acquisition, and resource allocation. In addition to providing valuable data for several performance measures in our SP, the survey questions that are directly related to our assessment and planning process will be used as another form of feedback to evaluate our APR process and help the College identify its strengths and weaknesses for the purposes of improvement. Survey data will be reported to the campus in fall 2009.

Assessment of the Effectiveness of Resource Allocations

All budget requests must align with strategic outcomes in the Strategic Plan, and performance measures, with benchmarks and targeted goals, will measure our progress and the effectiveness of our resource allocations.

Due to the nature of the UH system budget timeline and the State legislative process, there is a significant delay between budget request and allocation of funds. An item requested in the 07-09 biennium may be funded in FY09 and implemented in FY10. Assessing the impact of the item would then require at least one cycle of assessment, placing the assessment in FY11.
A significant factor in the assessment of the Annual Program Review process will be determining if resource allocations achieved their desired outcomes. Although the College has not yet formalized this evaluation process, various budgeted resource allocations that resulted from planning lists have been tracked to determine resultant changes.

An example is the 2007-09 Biennium Budget request for expansion of services to the satellite campus, Leeward CC at Wai‘anae. Twelve new positions were received.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FTE</th>
<th>Position</th>
<th>Date of Hire</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Director</td>
<td>09/01/07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>APT Staff</td>
<td>07/01/08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Nursing</td>
<td>05/19/08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Education, English</td>
<td>08/01/08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Office Asst</td>
<td>08/25/08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Math</td>
<td>01/01/09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Science, Digital Media</td>
<td>01/01/09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Hawaiian Studies, Business</td>
<td>Anticipated 08/01/09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Janitor</td>
<td>Not filled yet</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The increase in staffing may have contributed to significant improvements at Leeward CC at Wai‘anae.

Leeward CC at Wai‘anae continues to grow. The resources allocated to the campus, especially the positions in the last biennium, have encouraged and sustained that growth. The number of enrollments in Fall 2008 increased by about 18%. The Spring 2009 enrollments and headcounts were 58% and 42% higher than the 2008. The number of sections offered in AY2009 increased by about 23% over the previous AY. The percentage increases of students of Native Hawaiian ancestry paralleled the overall increases. The measures for performance in courses were similar to those in previous years. The campus is accomplishing its mission to provide greater access for those of Native Hawaiian ancestry. They usually constitute the majority in Leeward CC at Wai‘anae classes, ranging from about 60% to 75%. At the main Leeward CC campus, they usually make up about 20% - 30% of the student population.

The increase in support staff and their efforts have also contributed to developing student engagement—a key ingredient for student success. For the first time last year, the CCSSE (Community College Survey of Student Engagement) was administered to Leeward CC at Wai‘anae students. CCSSE uses five benchmarks to indicate how well students are being engaged: The Leeward CC at Wai‘anae benchmark scores were all above the CCSSE average (50). But more significantly, the Leeward CC at Wai‘anae scores were higher in all five benchmarks than the scores of the entire UHCC consortium. Their benchmark values placed them in the following percentiles:

100th percentile of all CCSSE institutions in Support for Learners
90th percentile for Student Effort and Academic Challenge
70th percentile for Active and Collaborative Learning
60th percentile for Student/Faculty Interaction

The UHCC Consortium’s highest score—in Support for Learners—was 16% lower than Leeward CC at Wai‘anae’s score, putting the Consortium in the 60th percentile.
Assessment of the Progress Made in Addressing the Recommendation

The College has maintained the Annual Program Review Process and will have standardized the terminology by the end of summer 09. Responding to changes from the System, such as the new approach to Strategic Plan and the modified UHCC System Program Review reporting structure, has delayed a thorough and systematic evaluation of our process.

With the spring 09 decision to have the Campus Council tasked with the formal evaluation of the process, the College is poised to put the final piece of the puzzle in place.

The College has embraced the Annual Program Review Process, with continual improvements in each cycle’s implementation. Annual program review has definitely become part of the campus routine. Every division and support area understands the importance of participating in the APR process and makes an effort to focus attention on assessment data to provide a basis for planning and budget and resource allocations. There is still much room for improvement as the College engages in institutional dialogue about assessment results and the identification of appropriate data sources, becomes more analytical in interpreting results and using data to inform all requests, and formalizes a tracking mechanism to determine if resource allocations have achieved their desired outcomes.

Plan of Actions to Be Completed Before the Next Self-Study and Evaluation Visit

The APRs of OCEWD and Leeward CC at Wai‘anae will be incorporated into the Instructional Plan. The International Program will prepare an APR beginning in fall 09. Currently, data and analysis of this program submitted as part of the Language Arts APR. Our Institutional Effectiveness Officer and International Program Coordinator have met to discuss data needs for the program and will identify a set of data elements for the International Program for fall 09.

The DPPA will clarify where the remaining areas/units, such as Marketing, Theatre, Hawaiian Programs, and OPPA should be included in the APR process (09-10).

Since the CC will take on the responsibilities of the EPC as of fall 09, and the CC has representation from a majority of the campus constituencies, a subcommittee of the CC will be formed to design and implement a comprehensive evaluation process with defined performance measures to assess the effectiveness of the APR process and the effectiveness of resource allocations (AY 09-10).
Recommendation 2: Institutional Programs

The team recommends that the college, having completed student learning outcomes for all its courses and for most of the programs offered by the college, complete student learning outcomes for the remaining programs (some certificate programs and the academic support programs), and initiate or continue the process of assessing the outcomes and applying the results of that assessment to the continuous improvement of the instruction and services provided to its students. (IIA.1a, IIA.1c, IIA.2a, IIB.4, IIC.2)

College Response/Action Taken on the Recommendation

Complete Student Learning Outcomes for Remaining Programs

SLOs have been developed for all degree programs and the Substance Abuse Counseling certificate, and are published in the Catalog. Many of our other certificates are subsumed into degree programs and share some of the program SLOs. The College has discussed whether SLOs for all of its certificates or just the Certificates of Achievement (which are BOR approved and are at least 24 credits) should be listed in the Catalog. After attending a WASC retreat in January 2009 and receiving clarifications from ACCJC, the College now understands that SLOs should be published for each certificate regardless of the number of credits required. The College is in the process of identifying SLOs for each certificate, and these SLOs will be published in the 2010-2011 Catalog.

SLOs have been developed for the following degrees and certificates:

- AA Degree (Critical Thinking; Technology & Information Literacy; Oral Communication; Quantitative Reasoning; Written Communication)
- AS Degree Accounting
- AS Degree Business Technology
- AS Degree Digital Media
- AS Degree Television Production
- AS Degree Info & Computer Science
- AAS Degree Automotive Technology
- AAS Degree Culinary Arts
- AAS Degree Supervisory Management
- Substance Abuse Counseling Certificate

Certificates that will be developing SLOs during AYs 09-11:

- All Certificates of Achievement
- All Certificates of Completion
- All Certificates of Competence
- All Academic Subject Certificates

Support Areas (Academic Services, Student Services, and Administrative Services) have also made good progress on establishing SLOs. Details are provided in the next section on page 15. OCEWD has developed SLOs for all of their courses and programs.
Initiate or Continue Assessment

Program/Course Assessment

Program assessments have been ongoing since 2004, and course assessments are being completed according to the college’s 6-year timeline (http://documents.leeward.hawaii.edu:8080/docushare/dsweb/View/Collection-14). In summer 2008, the College sponsored a Student Learning Outcomes (SLO) Design and Assessment Workshop led by Julie Slark of Rancho Santiago Community College District.

A pilot assessment project was initiated in August 2008 and an Assessment Team, with division and support area representatives, was formed to support the effort. To date, one or two revised SLOs and plans for their assessment (for 65 courses, 18 support area units, and 4 OCEWD courses) have been submitted through the Assessment Team and are available in Laulima at:

https://laulima.hawaii.edu/portal
Username: laulimaguest@yahoo.com Password: leeward

The team has worked with the Educational Media Center Coordinator to create an SLO site which provides an overview of assessment activities since summer 2008 (http://emedia.leeward.hawaii.edu/slo/Default.htm).

As a result of the reporting process and the SLO Assessment Form created by the Assessment Team, assessments completed during 08-09 are aligned to Institutional Learning Outcomes (ILO) and to General Education Core Learning Outcomes, results are analyzed, changes are proposed and implemented, and results of changes will be analyzed during fall 09. This alignment was also completed by support areas (Academic Services, Student Services, and Administrative Services). This process illustrates that every unit/division of the College has an effect on students’ learning experiences.

In January 2009, the DPPA, the Accreditation Liaison Officer (ALO), and a group of faculty attended the WASC Retreat on Student Learning. Faculty attended from the General Education areas (writing, oral communication, quantitative reasoning, and technology and information literacy), the assessment team, and the CTE programs. The goals were to expand the work that was being done by the Assessment Team and create an implementation plan to develop general education assessment via the course assessments that are in process or are being developed, and also to work on our Curriculum Grid, perhaps simplifying what is currently in place. As a result, the DPPA worked with faculty on a Program Assessment Plan draft (Appendix B) to be used by all degree and certificate programs to accomplish the following goals:

• modify program assessment processes and timelines;
• integrate course and program assessment reporting processes;
• map relationships between course, program, and institutional outcome assessments;
• indicate Gen Ed component of each program;
• illustrate how programs assess whether graduates achieve program outcomes and ILO;
• demonstrate how on-going course assessment leads to on-going program assessment.

As courses are mapped to program outcomes, faculty will indicate the expected level of student performance in each course, as it relates to the program outcome: Introductory (I) – student is introduced to the outcome; Practicing (P) – student is expected to practice the outcome during the semester; and Mastery (M) – student is expected to demonstrate mastery of the outcome.
During the development of the Program Assessment Plan, feedback was requested from the Assessment Team, WASC Retreat faculty group, Information and Computer Science (ICS) program faculty, Business Division faculty, and the Faculty Senate. In May, before the end of the duty period, an email was sent to all faculty to identify those who were interested in receiving Program Assessment Plan updates during the summer.

The original Program Assessment Plan draft was written with an AS/AAS program focus because of the clear alignments that already exist between these course and program outcomes. In fact, because of this alignment, the existing course and program assessment processes resulted in a duplication of efforts in reporting results of course and program assessments. This duplication will be eliminated with the Program Assessment Plan process. Two AS programs (ICS and Accounting) piloted the Program Assessment Plan during summer 2009 to align courses with program outcomes and ILO, schedule program courses for ongoing assessment on the next timeline (2010-2014), and provide feedback on the process. The Program Assessment Plan process will be introduced to all CTE programs in fall 2009.

With the existing AA program assessment process, course assessments did not always speak to program assessments, and the College did not have a formalized process for identifying appropriate artifacts for AA cross-curricular program (Gen Ed) assessments. The AA Degree Program Assessment Plan was drafted during summer 09, and will be piloted during fall 09 to coincide with the development of the College's next 5-year course assessment timeline (2010-2014). Due to the complexity of the AA degree program and the fact that the AA degree program is cross-disciplinary, Program Assessment Plans will be created by disciplines. Course assessments will be aligned with program (Gen Ed) outcomes and ILO. These relationships among courses and disciplines will identify cross-curricular alignment with Gen Ed outcomes and identify courses that may provide appropriate artifacts for AA cross-curricular program assessment via Gen Ed SLO committees. Before the beginning of fall 09, the AA Degree Program Assessment Plan draft was emailed to faculty who requested to receive Program Assessment Plan updates.

Institutional Learning Outcomes (ILO) were approved by the Faculty Senate on April 29, 2009, but they have been used as part of the Pilot Project on SLO Assessment since fall 2008. A diagram illustrating the relationship between the ILO and the College Mission is provided in Appendix C.

**Support Area and OCEWD Assessment**

While the College continues the process of program/course assessments, support areas (Student Services, Academic Services, and Administrative Services) and OCEWD have also been participating in assessment. As part of the College’s Pilot Project SLO Assessments and Annual Program Review processes, 18 support area units have identified and are beginning to assess SLOs. In these College processes, assessment results are analyzed, changes are proposed and implemented, and results of changes are used to improve services provided to students.

**Student Services**

Broad-based SLOs and methods for their assessment were developed for use by each Student Services unit. Assessment methods include: use of SARS (Scheduling, Appointments, and Reporting System), CCSSE surveys, graduate/leaver surveys, unit student satisfaction surveys, the achievement of instructional SLOs, tracking UAP students, and data from a comprehensive FYE (First Year Experience) program.
Student Services collectively developed a new division mission statement, five broad-based SLO’s, and methods for their assessment. The units have a better understanding of the Annual Program Review process and are using it to identify areas that need to be measured for their effectiveness.

Documentation for Student Services progress is stored online:
- http://emedia.leeward.hawaii.edu/cs/ProgReview/data/StSrv_Prog Review2006.doc
- http://documents.leeward.hawaii.edu:8080/docushare/dsweb/View/Collection-2585

**Academic Services and OCEWD**

System-wide Academic Support SLOs were developed for Tutoring and Library services units as part of the data required for the UHCC Academic Support Services Program Review in December 2008 and are used in the College's support area APR process.

The Office of Continuing Education and Workforce Development (OCEWD) mission statement is aligned with the College mission and institutional learning outcomes. SLOs developed for OCEWD courses and programs can be found at: http://www.ocewd.org

Assessment in OCEWD offerings (programs and courses) is dependent on whether the offering is placed in the workforce development or the personal/community development category. All offerings, at a minimum, have indirect assessment in the form of instructor and participant evaluation forms. All workforce development and selected personal/community development offerings additionally have direct internal or external assessments in the form of standardized tests. Some offerings employ an additional indirect assessment in the form of knowledge surveys.

In fall 09, OCEWD will be assigned a DocuShare site to store documentation about how assessment results are analyzed, changes are proposed and implemented, and results of changes are used to improve services provided to students. OCEWD has representation on the Assessment Team to participate in campus review of credit and non-credit SLOs and to allow for cross-campus dialogue on assessment processes and reporting results.

**Assessment of the Progress Made in Addressing the Recommendation**

The College has accomplished a great deal in terms of assessment. All courses and degree programs have SLOs; all certificates will have SLOs published in the 2010-2011 Catalog; 18 units in support areas have identified and are assessing SLOs; and approximately 50% of courses have ongoing assessment. Assessment is being maintained and is becoming part of the normal routine. The Assessment Team provides assistance in developing SLOs and designing assessment tools; the SLO Assessment Form clarifies the steps of the assessment reporting process (data analysis, changes identified and implemented, and analysis of results to improve student learning); and the Program Assessment Plan will provide the overall framework for program assessments.

But there is still much room for improvement. As the Assessment Team begins the second year of the pilot project, coordination of timelines and discussion of processes between the Assessment Team and the Curriculum Committee is needed. These separate but related processes and timelines have caused some confusion for faculty submitting course SLO modifications to the Curriculum Committee and SLO assessments to the Assessment Team. Course modifications often take more than one year to be approved through the normal course modification process, and this has delayed the SLO assessment process. Division Chairs, ALO, DPPA, Curriculum Committee Chair, Assessment Team Chair, and Dean of Arts and Sciences have met (summer 09) to begin discussion on the coordination of these processes.
The College’s *Curriculum Revision and Review Policy* (approved 3/18/03) does not currently mention SLO assessment ([http://home.lcc.hawaii.edu/docs/policies/](http://home.lcc.hawaii.edu/docs/policies/)). After the Assessment Team and Curriculum Committee processes are coordinated (fall 09), and it has been determined whether SLO assessment should be included in the *Curriculum Revision and Review Policy* or in a separate policy, the *Curriculum Revision and Review Policy* will be updated as needed (spring 2010).

Curriculum Central has been modified to include a student notification statement on assessment of student work as part of the standardized information included on each course syllabus (fall 09).

As the Program Assessment Plan is drafted for the AA program, overarching statements must be developed for each of the Gen Ed outcome areas. This process has begun in some of the Gen Ed SLO committees and will continue in fall 09.

In the Program Assessment Plan, ILO and PLO are assessed with each course assessment. The assessment of those courses that are aligned with several PLO provides a comprehensive or capstone view of student learning and achievement.

Courses mapped to PLO according to the expected level of student performance (Introductory (I), Practicing (P), or Mastery (M)) will be used to identify appropriate artifacts for AS and AAS program assessment and AA cross-curricular program (Gen Ed) assessment and to determine whether graduates achieve/master program SLOs.

The implementation of the assessment plan with the AA degree academic disciplines will be a large undertaking and will begin in fall 09.

The curriculum grid has been on hold because of Gen Ed SLO modifications. With the Program Assessment Plan, a map for each AA, AS and AAS program will be generated. Additional maps will be prepared for certificates that are not subsumed into degree program maps. If the College continues to use the current online AA (Gen Ed) curriculum grid, modifications will be needed to address overarching Gen Ed statements and ILOs from the Program Assessment Plans.

**Plan of Actions to Be Completed Before Next Self-Study**

The DPPA will be responsible for the following actions:

1. SLOs for all certificates will be published in the 2010-2011 Catalog.
2. The Program Assessment Plan process was developed and will be rolled out in stages:
   a. AS/AAS programs piloted Program Assessment Plan (summer 09)
   b. Plan will be rolled out to all AS/AAS programs (fall 09)
   c. Plan was drafted for the AA degree program (summer 09)
   d. Overarching Gen Ed statements will be developed (early fall 09)
   e. AA Program Assessment Plan will be piloted (fall 09).
3. Discussions will be coordinated between Assessment Team and Curriculum Committee (fall 09).
4. Course assessment timeline (2010 – 2014) will be developed (fall 09).
5. DocuShare site will be assigned to OCEWD to document assessment results and improve services provided to students (fall 09).
6. *Curriculum Revision and Review Policy* will be reviewed and updated as needed (spring 10).
Recommendation 3:
The team recommends that the college implement a program for developing student leadership participation in the campus decision-making processes. (II.B.3.b, III.C.1.c, IV.A.2, IV.A.2.a, IV.A.3)

College’s Response/Action Taken on the Recommendation

Student Services approached this recommendation through re-describing staffing positions. In 2006, a counseling position was divided into one-half counseling and one-half student government/student activities. This did not provide enough time or resources to address the problems with student leadership.

In Academic Year 2007-2008, the position was changed to two counselors, one with the responsibility to work with student government and counseling and one with student activities and counseling. This approach did not adequately address the issue.

In Academic Year 2008-2009 a counseling position was re-described as half time student government and half time student activities. Both activities fall under Student Government as the main unit, from which all other student committees and boards branch. (http://documents.leeward.hawaii.edu:8080/docushare/dsweb/View/Collection-2587)

This Student Government position was filled on an interim basis. The official position will begin on May 4, 2009. During March 2009, the interim SG/SA Coordinator worked with College Marketing on an intensive campaign to make students aware of up-coming Student government elections. Posters, email, on-campus digital signage and online sites like Facebook were included in the messaging system.

Elections were held on April 6, 7 and 8 through an online system designed by the College IT staff. Nearly 3% of the entire student population participated in the elections; one of the College's highest percentages of involvement.

As of spring 2009, Student Government members serve on the Facilities Committee, the Academic Grievance Committee, the University of Hawai'i Student Caucus, the Board of Student Communications, the Sustainability Committee, and the Campus Council.

Assessment of the Progress Made in Addressing the Recommendation

It has taken a few years to discern the right fit for counselors working with student government. The college believes the new fulltime position will make a difference. Building a Student Government that is self sufficient and effective generally takes about 6 months for students to acclimate to their leadership roles. The College is in the initial stages of building stable student leadership. The new SG/SA position brings a vision to build strong leadership and a committed foundation with a new student government that was initiated in May 2009.
Plan of Actions to Be Completed Before Next Self-Study

The immediate goal is to build students up as leaders and to set an example so that when students leave or graduate there will be a strong foundation for new members to enter Student Government. Another goal is to have active students everywhere on campus. Students will know the role of Student Government is to support them and their needs and that they will follow through and try to find solutions to those needs.

Examples of planned activities include:

• A retreat to build the foundation with the SG members, focusing on team building and developing their mission and goals for the year (June 6, 2009)

• Summer meetings once a week to discuss initiatives and goals. Additional time for training will include: diversity, communication, leadership, conflict management, safe zone, etc.

• Each senator will sit on at least one campus committee
**Recommendation 4**

*The team recommends that the college develop and implement a plan for ensuring that campus facilities are accessible to students, staff, and community members with disabilities.*

**College Response/Actions Taken on the Recommendation**

In the Fall 1997, all University of Hawaii campuses were required to undertake an ADA self-evaluation for disability access. The process was coordinated by the State Disability and Communication Access Board (DCAB). In April 1998, the University of Hawaii Community Colleges (UHCC) facilities planning office completed the Disability Access Transition Plan for all community college campuses. The disability access transition plan includes an access survey related to such basic elements as entryways, restrooms, elevators, and parking and identified specific projects that were completed during the 1990-1998 time period as well as a future project listing. 


Using this Disability Access Transition Plan as a foundation, the Vice Chancellor for Administrative Services convened a working group in Spring 08 to develop comprehensive disability access plan for campus. Membership consisted of representation from VCAS, Student Services and Operations & Maintenance.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Building</th>
<th>Scope of Work</th>
<th>Project #</th>
<th>Completion</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Library, Campus Center, LA, GT, BS, PS, FA, AM</td>
<td>Architectural Barrier Removal: renovation of 15 campus restrooms in order to comply with ADA guidelines and standards.</td>
<td>CC-04-4256</td>
<td>Summer, 2007</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Campus Center, PS, LA</td>
<td>Restroom Renovations, Phase I: complete renovation of 8 campus restrooms.</td>
<td>SW-08-4271</td>
<td>Notice to Proceed December 2008; Project is in progress</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theatre, Library, Administration, Campus Center</td>
<td>Retrofit Building Entrance Doors For Accessibility Compliance: renovation of 9 high-use entry doorways for ADA compliance.</td>
<td>SW-08-4272</td>
<td>Notice to Proceed January 2009; Project is in progress</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AM, Campus Center, Theatre, Library</td>
<td>Elevator Upgrades: upgrade and restoration of all 4 campus elevators to include ADA compliance to maximum extent and where technically feasible.</td>
<td>CC-07-4268</td>
<td>Notice to Proceed May 2009; Project is in progress</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Campus Wide Locations</td>
<td>Campus Signage/Wayfinding Project: installation of 3 campus informational and wayfinding signs</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Project is in progress; scheduled for completion December 2009</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Additionally, a map indicating the evacuation point for mobility impaired was added to the College Emergency Procedure manual in June 2007.

Assessment of the Progress Made in Addressing the Recommendation

The O&M facilities team and the VCAS have completed a review and update of the April 1998 UHCC Disability Access Transition Plan. The update includes all access-related projects that have been completed or in-progress. Future projects that have received funding have also been identified. It should be noted that completion of other access-related projects is dependent upon capital improvement program (CIP) and/or repair and maintenance (R&M) funding from the State Legislature.

Plan of Actions to Be Completed Before the Next Self-Study and Evaluation Visit

Future improvements will include an annual update of the Disability Access Transition Plan, coordinated by the VCAS in consultation with the O&M facilities team and the Leeward CC Space Management and Facilities Planning Committee.
**Recommendation 5**

_The team recommends that the college fully implement the Leeward Administrative Reorganization which was approved by the Board of Regents in October of 2006 and, after several years of full operation, evaluate its effectiveness in addressing the college’s problems with administrative instability._

_(Standard IV.B.2)_

**College Response/Action Taken on the Recommendation**

**Fully implement approved Reorganization**

The following actions that were identified in the 2006 BOR approved Reorganization were completed on October 26, 2006:

- Title change: Director of Administrative Services to Vice Chancellor for Administrative Services
- Re-describe and re-title Asst Dean of Instruction to Dean of Arts & Sciences
- Re-describe Asst Dean of Instruction as Dean of CTE
- Re-describe Asst Dean for Academic Support as Dean of Academic Services
- Change in reporting structure: VCAA/CAO and VCAS report directly to Chancellor
- Change in reporting structure: Dean of Student Services from Chancellor to VCAA
- Change in reporting structure: Director of OCEWD from Chancellor to VCAA
- Change in reporting structure: Institutional Analyst from Chancellor to DPPA
- Establishment of Office of Planning, Policy & Assessment (OPPA)
- New Position: Director of Planning, Policy & Assessment (DPPA)
- Establishment of Support Staff for new OPPA
- Name change Functional Area from General Education to Arts & Sciences
- Establish new Functional Area: Career & Technical Education
- Name change, Functional Area: Academic Support to Academic Services
- Name change, Functional Area: Office of Continuing Education and Training to Office of Continuing Education and Workforce Development

Diagrams of the previous organizational charts and the 2006 BOR approved reorganization are in Appendix D.

**Evaluate reorganization’s effectiveness in addressing administrative instability**

The reorganization has resulted in better-defined roles with Deans having line supervision over and responsibility for their respective divisions and units. The role is clarified and expanded to deal with instructional/service planning, program assessment, problem resolution, and staffing selections/transactions (e.g., promotions). This differs greatly from the previous staff/administrative dean who assisted only without any supervisory capacity.

The length of tenure each of the current administrators will measure the effectiveness of the reorganization in addressing administrative instability. Nationally, the turnover rate for college presidents is 6-8 years.

**Assessment of the Progress Made in Addressing the Recommendation**

Four and a half months after the BOR approved the administrative reorganization, Chancellor Quigley accepted a position at the UH Manoa campus. Between March 2007 and May 2008, Manny Cabral served as interim Chancellor. On June 1, 2008, Cabral’s appointment as permanent Chancellor was approved by the BOR. As UH VP for Community Colleges noted, Cabral is the first Leeward CC Chancellor to “come up through the ranks,” with a proven commitment to the College, having worked here since 1980 as a math professor and with 19 years as Division Chair.
In December 2008, the Office of Continuing Education and Workforce Development (OCEWD) was placed as an academic unit under the Dean of CTE. This enabled the College to use the Executive/Managerial position from OCEWD for the Director of Planning, Policy & Assessment. The Faculty Senate and Campus Council reviewed and approved this change, in addition to the BOR.

Currently, the top three administrative positions, chancellor and both vice-chancellors are filled with permanent appointments. The fourth permanent administrator, the CTE Dean, recently retired (May 09), leaving the remaining positions filled with interim appointments. In April 2009, the College began recruitment for permanent appointments for two of the interim positions.

Even with the changes due to the reorganization and the recent retirement, the College is hopeful that the current administration will display greater stability over time than previous administrative teams, noting that six of the eight administrative positions are currently filled with former Leeward faculty. As indicated in the chart below, interim appointments have displayed greater “staying power,” with a minimum of two years.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Position</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Length of Admin. Tenure</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Chancellor</td>
<td>M Cabral</td>
<td>interim, 03/07-05/08 permanent since 06/08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vice Chancellor, Academic Affairs</td>
<td>M Pecsok</td>
<td>interim asst dean, 01/99-06/00 asst dean, 06/00-9/06 interim VC, 10/06-04/207 permanent VC, since 04/07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vice Chancellor, Administrative Srv.</td>
<td>M Lane</td>
<td>permanent since 12/05 title changed from Director to VC in 2007</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dean, Arts &amp; Sciences</td>
<td>J Goodman</td>
<td>interim position since 07/05 permanent beginning 08/09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dean, CTE</td>
<td>vacant</td>
<td>(previous dean retired in 05/09)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dean, Student Services</td>
<td>S Hoshino</td>
<td>in acting/interim position since 07/07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dean, Academic Services</td>
<td>D Kunimune</td>
<td>interim position since 08/09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Director, Planning, Policy &amp; Assessment</td>
<td>K Hill</td>
<td>interim position since 07/07 position changed from interim faculty position to EM in 2009</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Plan of Actions to Be Completed Before Next Self-Study**

Recruitment for Dean of Arts and Sciences and Dean of Career and Technical Education positions began with advertisement and announcement of position openings in April 2009. Both positions are scheduled to be filled in September 2009.

As these positions are filled on a permanent basis, the remaining positions that are currently filled by interim appointments, Dean of Academic Services, Dean of Student Services, and Director of Planning, Policy & Assessment, will be recruited.

http://documents.leeward.hawaii.edu:8080/docushare/dsweb/Get/Document-24862/Work%20At%20UH-Dean%20of%20CTE.doc


The effect of the reorganization on administrative instability will be evaluated in terms of length of stay in administrative positions and overall effectiveness of administration in achieving strategic goals. The effectiveness can be measured through benchmarks and performance measures updated yearly through the Strategic Plan.
AGENDA ITEM 1

*The College will establish and follow guidelines and regular review of the College’s mission to ensure emphasis on achievement of student learning. Review will be based on inclusive dialogue.* (1.A.2, I.A.3.)

**Progress:** A policy for the review of the College’s mission has been drafted by the DPPA. The policy includes specifics on scheduling, inclusive dialogue and approval process. The Administration reviewed the draft with Faculty Senate and Campus Council in Spring 09.

Feedback from Faculty Senate and Campus Council will be incorporated into the Mission Policy. Policy will then be approved by the Chancellor and implemented in Fall 09.


**Timeline:** Fall 2009

**Responsible Parties:** DPPA

AGENDA ITEM 2

*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.* (I.B.1.)

**Progress:** As part of the SLO assessment process, all faculty who teach a course should be involved in the dialogue about and assessment of SLOs for that course, and the College’s *Annual Program Review* focuses on the analysis of data provided by program and course assessments of student learning as a foundation for budget and resource allocations.

The Leeward CC Staff Development Coordinator chaired the planning committee for the first two Annual Best Practices in Assessment Conferences (April 11, 2008 and March 23-24, 2009). The 2009 Conference provided opportunities for dialogue at more than 40 concurrent sessions, 15 workshops, and round-table discussions on various assessment topics. The Assessment Team’s presentation, *Everything You Wanted to Know about SLO Assessment… But Were Afraid to Ask* (April 2009), provided another opportunity for faculty and staff to learn about and discuss campus assessment activities and processes.

As explained in Recommendation #1, a subcommittee of the Campus Council will be appointed to design and implement a comprehensive evaluation process with defined performance measures to assess the effectiveness of the APR process and the effectiveness of resource allocations (AY 09-10).

**Timeline:** On-going

**Responsible Parties:** DPPA, Program Coordinators, Discipline Coordinators, Division Chairs, Assessment Team coordinators, Subcommittee of the Campus Council
AGENDA ITEM 3

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.1.)

**Progress:** Policy on Program Reviews (2005) exists. The Program Review and Annual Review processes have been merged into the Annual Program Review (APR) process (spring 2007), and revisions of the Policy on Program Reviews are ongoing with expected completion Spring 2010. The DPPA is in the process of standardizing the terminology used in the process, and the glossary was posted on DocuShare (summer 09).

As explained in Recommendation #1, a comprehensive evaluation process to assess the effectiveness of resource allocation will be developed and implemented by a subcommittee of the Campus Council in AY 09-10. The Institutional Plan, created every two years to align with biennium budget requests, documents the history of each prioritized item. An update is created for supplemental budget years. These documents are available in DocuShare (http://documents.leeward.hawaii.edu:8080/docushare/dsweb/View/Collection-2724/Document-25540).

**Timeline:** On-going

**Responsible Parties:** DPPA and subcommittee of the Campus Council

AGENDA ITEM 4

Develop a mechanism to ensure communication of quality assurance between the institution and its students, faculty, staff and public constituencies. (I.B.5)

**Progress:** The College has annually included data on graduation and persistence rates in its Catalog and fall, spring and summer Schedule of Courses.

The College has established the Office of Planning, Policy, and Assessment and hired a DPPA and Institutional Effectiveness Officer with the intent of addressing this planning agenda.

The OPPA website, http://emedia.leeward.hawaii.edu/oppa/, posts information on quality assurance issues including Annual Program Reviews, Annual Reports of Program Data (that are submitted to the BOR via the OVPCC and provide an analysis of the health of each program based on demand, effectiveness, and efficiency), and the Strategic Plan. Achieving the Dream data is available online at http://www.lcc.hawaii.edu/atd/

**Timeline:** On-going

**Responsible Parties:** Institutional Effectiveness Officer
AGENDA ITEM 5

*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. (II.A.1.a.)*

**Progress:** The UHCC system continues to use DOL data, transfer data for student transfers within the system, National Student Clearinghouse for student transfers outside of the system, and the Graduate & Leavers survey. COGNOS (a business intelligence software to assist the College with data reporting) implementation is ongoing, but tracking is not included at this time. In summer 09, members of the system-wide IR Cadre discussed ways to improve the Graduate & Leavers survey process to improve the student response rates and will be acting on some of the suggestions in fall 09.

**Timeline:** On-going

**Responsible Parties:** Institutional Effectiveness Officer

AGENDA ITEM 6

*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.b.)*

**Progress:** Each course lists delivery methods and modes of instruction in the core outline on Curriculum Central. An additional question regarding the appropriateness of modes of instruction was added to the Division Annual Program Review template (08-09 review cycle). Dialogue is ongoing as discipline faculty address these issues as part of the division review process.

**Timeline:** On-going

**Responsible Parties:** Division chairs, program coordinators, and discipline coordinators

AGENDA ITEM 7

*The Policy on Course Revision and Review will be revised to incorporate course SLO assessment. Course assessment policies and procedures will be documented in this Policy. (II.A.2.a., II.A.2.e.)*

**Progress:** As the Assessment Team begins the second year of the pilot project in fall 09, coordination of processes between the Assessment Team and the Curriculum Committee will be discussed and clarified (fall 09). Division Chairs, ALO, DPPA, Curriculum Committee Chair, Assessment Team Chair, and Dean of Arts and Sciences met (summer 09) to begin discussion on the coordination of these processes. It will be determined whether SLO assessment should be included in the Curriculum Revision and Review Policy or in a separate policy, and the Curriculum Revision and Review Policy will be updated as needed (spring 2010). Currently, SLO assessment procedures, timelines, forms, and resources may be found at [http://emedia.leeward.hawaii.edu/slo/Default.htm](http://emedia.leeward.hawaii.edu/slo/Default.htm)

The revisions will be developed in conjunction with the Faculty Senate Curriculum Committee.

**Timeline:** Fall 09-Spring 2010

**Responsible Parties:** DPPA
AGENDA ITEM 8
The responsibilities of the Assessment Team will be permanently assigned to an administrative office in order to ensure that policies continue to be followed. (II.A.2.b.)

Progress: The purpose and function of the Assessment Team has been modified (fall 08). The Assessment Team is responsible for campus-wide SLO assessment and includes a representative from the OPPA, OCEWD, and each division and support area. Responsibilities of the Assessment Team are assigned to the OPPA.

Timeline: Completed

Responsible Parties: DPPA

AGENDA ITEM 9
The College will also enforce or revise the policy of annual Career and Technical advisory board meetings. (II.A.2.b.)

Progress: While all career and technical programs have a means of meeting with their respective boards and do so on a regular basis, an official updated policy needs to be on file. The recently vacated position of the Dean of Career and Technical Education (DCTE) will be filled by September, 2009. At that time, the new Dean will be tasked with formalizing the policy on Advisory Board meetings and developing a mechanism for posting annual minutes in Docushare.

Timeline: December 2009

Responsible Parties DCTE

AGENDA ITEM 10
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.c.)

Progress: A question was added to the division Annual Program Review (2008-2009) template to address the assessment and analysis of course sequencing, time to completion, and synthesis, in addition to the analysis of breadth, depth, rigor, etc. of the Program. This requirement will be added to the revised Policy on Program Reviews.

The revisions will be developed in conjunction with the Faculty Senate Program Review Committee.

Timeline: Policy revision is ongoing; expected completion Spring 2010

Responsible Parties: DPPA
AGENDA ITEM 11

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.d.)

Progress: A learning style assessment is available as a handout in both the Learning Resource Center (LRC) and Kakoʻo ‘Ike (KI) office. It has also been distributed at tutor workshops. The handout was sent to all counselors with a cover memo regarding availability and suggested uses for the assessment. The handout is also included on a list of LRC handouts on the LRC website: http://emedia.leeward.hawaii.edu/lrc/handouts.html

Timeline: Completed

Responsible Parties: LRC staff

AGENDA ITEM 12

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. (II.A.2.f.)

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. (II.A.2.e.)

Progress: Duties of the EPC will be assumed by the Campus Council as of fall 09, and in recommendation #1, the College explains that a subcommittee of the Campus Council will be appointed to design and implement a comprehensive evaluation process with defined performance measures to assess the effectiveness of the APR process and the effectiveness of resource allocations (AY 09-10).

The purpose and function of the Assessment Team have been modified (fall 08). At the time of the 2006 Self Study, an Assessment Team was responsible for overseeing the entire review process for the College including everything from assisting with the development of SLOs to designing plans for the budget allocation process. Currently, the Assessment Team is responsible for campus-wide SLO assessment. Due to this modification of the Assessment Team function, the Campus Council will be responsible for this agenda item and may choose to consult with the Assessment Team as needed.

As part of the Annual Program Review process, assessment results are analyzed, changes are planned and implemented, and budget requests (based on data) are prioritized. The quality of the data provided and the analysis of results have improved with each review cycle and should continue to improve with the help of the OPPA. The Annual Program Review process is documented and available to the campus in DocuShare: http://documents.leeward.hawaii.edu:8080/docushare/dsweb/View/Collection-93

Timeline: AY 09-10

Responsible Parties: Campus Council
AGENDA ITEM 13

The College will clarify the role of the Director of Planning, Policy, and Assessment, including the DPPA’s 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.f.)

Progress: The Office of Planning, Policy, and Assessment was created in 2007, and an Interim Director of Planning, Policy, and Assessment and an Institutional Effectiveness Officer were hired. For the past two years, the experiences of the people fulfilling the duties and responsibilities of both positions have helped clarify the DPPA’s role as well as the role of the Office of Planning, Policy, and Assessment (OPPA). The College’s Annual Program Review process with data-driven decision making, its reporting requirements, strategic planning process, and other policies and procedures provide a framework for the OPPA.

Interpretations of results of course and program assessments and effects of improvements made are available as part of SLO Assessment Forms.

Assessments completed prior to fall 08 are available in DocuShare: http://documents.leeward.hawaii.edu:8080/docushare/dsweb/View/Collection-14
Assessments completed since fall 08 are available in Laulima at: https://laulima.hawaii.edu/portal
Username: laulimaguest@yahoo.com Password: leeward

Course and program assessment summaries and interpretations are included in division Annual Program Reviews in the Curriculum section: “Summarize and interpret course and program assessments completed in the Division, and apply results to the continuous improvement of instruction and services provided to students. From analysis of your assessment results, do you plan or have you made any adjustments to your learning outcomes, methodologies, course or program structure, curriculum, etc?” Annual Program Reviews are available in DocuShare: http://documents.leeward.hawaii.edu:8080/docushare/dsweb/View/Collection-93

Timeline: On-going

Responsible Parties: DPPA, Vice Chancellor of Academic Affairs, and Chancellor

AGENDA ITEM 14

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.b.)

Progress: SLOs are listed on all course outlines, and at this time approximately 50% of our courses have on-going assessment. In fall 09, as the Program Assessment Plan is rolled out to the Campus, discipline and program faculty will schedule assessments for the next 5-year timetable. As the percentage of courses with on-going assessment increases, the College will look at course SLO assessment data to determine how to link assessment achievement percentage with awarding of credit.

Timeline: On-going

Responsible Parties: Program Coordinators, Discipline Coordinators, Division Chairs, CTE Dean, A&S Dean, Institutional Effectiveness Officer, and DPPA
AGENDA ITEM 15

The College will design a grid similar to the Curriculum Grid for the AA competencies in each Division to ensure all competencies are taught. (II.A.2.i., II.A.3.a)

The Curriculum Grid will be extended to include all courses that satisfy the AA General Education core. (II.A.2.i.)

Progress: The Leeward CC AA degree was revised in 2006 to align with the UH Manoa General Education Core and Graduation requirements. Due to this revision, general education core courses are approved by the General Education Standing Committee of the Faculty Senate and the Curriculum Committee. In fall 2009, the Faculty Senate will determine whether a grid similar to the Curriculum Grid for AA competencies taught in each Division is still needed.

The curriculum grid concept has been extended to include all courses as part of the Program Assessment Plan. In recommendation #2, the college explains that AA Program Assessment Plans will be created by disciplines, and each plan will include a curriculum grid/map to identify Gen Ed core courses and indicate how these courses align with AA program (Gen Ed core) outcomes and institutional learning outcomes.

Timeline: On-going

Responsible Parties: Faculty Senate, AA Discipline Coordinators and DPPA

AGENDA ITEM 16

The College will develop a plan to assess the extent to which graduates achieve program SLOs. (II.A.2.i.)

Progress: As explained in Recommendation #2, a Program Assessment Plan will be used by all degree/certificate programs. The Program Assessment Plan will illustrate how assessment of specific mapped courses provides assessment results for aligned program and ILO outcomes; provides a comprehensive (capstone view) assessment of student learning; is used to identify appropriate artifacts for program, certificate, and AA cross-curricular program (Gen Ed) assessments; and is used to determine whether graduates achieve program SLOs.

Timeline: On-going

Responsible Parties: DPPA, CTE Dean, A & S Dean, VCAA, Program Coordinators, Discipline Coordinators, and General Education SLO committees.
AGENDA ITEM 17

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.3.b)

Progress: The College has an ILO and an AA program (Gen Ed) outcome regarding computer literacy:

Written, Oral Communication and Use of Technology (WOCT) ILO: Our graduates are able to use written and oral communication and technology to discover, develop, and communicate creative and critical ideas, and to respond effectively to the spoken, written, and visual ideas of others in multiple environments.

Technology and Information Literacy Gen Ed outcome (draft): Students will make informed choices about information retrieval and technology to become productive citizens of an information world.

As explained in Recommendation #2, a Program Assessment Plan will be used by all degree/certificate programs. The Program Assessment Plan will illustrate how assessment of each mapped course provides assessment results for aligned program and ILO outcomes; may provide a comprehensive (capstone view) assessment of student learning; may be used to identify appropriate artifacts for program, certificate, and AA cross-curricular program (Gen Ed) assessments; and will indicate which courses and programs provide opportunities for students to achieve computer literacy SLOs.

Timeline: On-going

Responsible Parties: Program coordinators, discipline coordinators, Gen Ed SLO committee, DPPA, CTE Dean, A & S Dean, and VCAA.

AGENDA ITEM 18

The College will continue to follow its process and schedule for its program and course SLOs assessments. (II.A.3.b)

Progress: Program assessments have been ongoing since 2004, and course assessments are being completed according to the college’s 6-year timeline. A pilot assessment project was initiated in August 2008 and an Assessment Team, with division and support area representatives, was formed to support the effort. During 08-09, one or two revised SLOs and plans for their assessment (for 65 courses and 18 units from academic support areas) have been submitted through the Assessment Team. To date, approximately 50% of our courses have ongoing SLO assessment.

In recommendation #2, the college explains that a Program Assessment Plan will be used by all degree/certificate programs to integrate course and program assessment, and to develop the next 5-year assessment timeline (2010-2014)

Timeline: On-going

Responsible Parties: DPPA, CTE Dean, A & S Dean, VCAA, Program Coordinators, Discipline Coordinators, Gen Ed SLO committee, Faculty Senate General Education Standing Committee, and Assessment Team
AGENDA ITEM 19

*The College will develop a mechanism to track external licensure, certification, and/or employment after graduation. (II.A.5.)*

**Progress:** The primary mechanism for tracking student employment across all CTE programs after graduation is Department of Labor data. Data is gathered annually in individual CTE Program Reviews and for all CTE programs in aggregate to measure the degree to which CTE programs meet Perkins standards. Individual programs may track specialized certification of students. In summer 09, members of the system-wide IR Cadre discussed ways to improve the Graduate & Leavers survey process to improve the student response rates; the Institutional Effectiveness Officer will make recommendations to the administration to implement some of the suggestions in fall 09.

**Timeline:** On-going

**Responsible Parties:** Institutional Effectiveness Officer and CTE Dean

AGENDA ITEM 20

*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.6.c, II.B.2.d)*

**Progress:** Responsibility for the College website has been assigned to the Marketing Officer, who began working with the UHCC system web developer in January 2009 on the redesign and new organizational structure of the website.

**Timeline:** December 2009

**Responsible Parties:** Marketing Officer

AGENDA ITEM 21

*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.b)*

**Progress:** The Student Conduct Code was distributed at Orientation beginning in May 2009. The policy was also added to the new Student Planner that was distributed free to Leeward students. The Student Planner will be published and distributed in Fall 09. The Planner will include the Student Conduct Code and will be distributed to all Leeward students in conjunction with student ID cards. This distribution system will enable the College to reach nearly the entire student population.

**Timeline:** Completed

**Responsible Parties:** DOSS, Marketing
AGENDA ITEM 22

The College will ensure that the catalog is produced and made available in a timely manner. (II.B.2.a)

Progress: The College is establishing a Policy Analyst position whose task will be to oversee content creation for the catalog and schedule of courses. The position was advertised summer 2009. Additionally, the Graphic Artist position, which had been vacant for three and a half years, was filled in July 2008. The staffing of this position alleviated previous workload issues, enabling the catalog revision process to start one month ahead of schedule in Spring 09.

Timeline: July 2009

Responsible Parties: Marketing Officer/OPPA

AGENDA ITEM 23

Academic Divisions and Student Service Division will collaborate to address concerns raised in the Annual Review process regarding counseling and advising. (II.B.3.c.)

Progress: A Perkins grant allowed a counselor to be assigned to Culinary Arts and Automotive Technology from 2001 to 2007. The campus committed to continue this position with the end of that funding. Student Services has met with the Business Division faculty to discuss concerns raised in past Annual Review processes. The current Perkins grant calls for development of stronger relationships between CTE and Student Services. The grant will allow exploration of models for improving dialogue and coordination between the Business Division and Student Services.

Counselor liaisons have been assigned to the divisions that seem to be especially concerned with maintaining communication about changes in their programs.

The Perkins grant report at the end of the 2007-2008 academic year included a division-based model for student advising.

As of Spring 2009, more counselors have been assigned to specific programs, including BT, Automotive and Culinary, AAT, and Leeward CC at Wai‘anae.

Timeline: Completed and on-going

Responsible Parties: Dean of Student Services and Academic Division Chairs
AGENDA ITEM 24

The College will continue to work with its sister campuses in evaluating COMPASS and will make changes for improvement. (II.B.3.e.)

Progress: The College is represented at two system-wide committees which monitor COMPASS use and make changes for improvement. One is the COMPASS Coordinators Committee. The coordinators from the seven campuses meet at least once a semester and discuss issues concerning the testing process, operational procedures, test content, and the use of test results in placement at or across the various campuses.

The second committee is the COMPASS Advisory Committee, which meets to discuss various policy issues: e.g., retesting policies, charging for testing, aligning placement cut-offs and recommendations.

Leeward is very active on both committees. Proceedings for the Coordinator meetings are posted at http://www.hawaii.edu/vpaa/system_aa/test_coordinators.html

The Institutional Effectiveness Officer will work closely with English and math faculty to insure that their concerns are included in these system-wide discussions.

Timeline: On-going

Responsible Parties: Institutional Effectiveness Officer

AGENDA ITEM 25

The Library will develop an institutional information literacy vision statement in collaboration with the administration. (II.C.1.b.)

Progress: Revision of title and SLOs for the general education core area “Technology and Information Literacy” was based on Association of College and Research Libraries standards, and aligns with the University of Hawaii Information Literacy Statement and the Leeward CC Library Vision and Mission Statements. The new title and SLOs were approved by Faculty Senate on 2/28/07.

Timeline: Completed

Responsible party: DPPA

AGENDA ITEM 26

Academic Support Units, as part of their Annual Review, will continue to assess staffing needs to support student learning. (II.C.1.c, II.C.1.d)

Progress: Each Academic Support unit determines their personnel needs based on the usage data regarding the services they provide, campus and unit plans, and input obtained from the Instructional Division’s Annual Program Reviews.

As part of the Annual Program Review process, all of the Academic Services unit heads prioritize the needs requests that will be included in the Academic Services Planning Lists. This planning list can be viewed at: http://documents.leeward.hawaii.edu:8080/docushare/dsweb/Get/Document-24701/Academic%20Support%20Overall%20Support%20Area%20Priorities.pdf

Timeline: The next Annual Program Review will be completed during the fall 2009 semester.

Responsible Party: Academic Services unit heads and the Dean of Academic Services.
AGENDA ITEM 27

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.

II.C.1.e.

Progress: In 2006 the College did not have a contract with RFB&D (Reading for the Blind and Dyslexic). Students requiring recorded text as an accommodation requested assistance as part of the normal procedure. The publisher usually sent an electronic format of the text, or if this format was not available, KI scanned the books in-house and prepared a digital file for students to use in conjunction with assistive technology software.

In spring 2007, KI provided students with digital files for 9 textbooks. During the fall 2007 semester, the program processed 11 books.

The number of recorded text requests continued to increase and in spring 2009 KI renewed the RFBD subscription with institutional membership and invested in three proprietary CD players that are necessary to access material on RFBD CDs.

Timeline: Assessment is on-going

Responsible party: KI coordinator

AGENDA ITEM 28

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.

III.A.1.c

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.

III.A.1.c

The College will revise and standardize lecturer evaluation guidelines and include references to effectiveness in producing student learning outcomes.

III.A.1.c

Progress: Dialogue is continuing, both at the College (Faculty Senate) and system level. VPCC has discussed the issue with Community College Council of Faculty Senate Chairs.

Per current Faculty Classification Plan (11/2007), described under Primary Responsibilities: “Where appropriate, they design measurable or observable learning outcomes and assess and provide evidence of student learning. Above all they work to improve student achievement and success.”

Still under discussion is the extent to which effectiveness in producing learning outcomes (Standard III.A.1.c) shall be weighted in the total evaluation of individual faculty members given the shared responsibility for the teaching and learning process described in the Faculty Classification Plan.

The inclusion in lecturer evaluation guidelines is still pending.

Timeline: On-going

Responsible party: VCAA and Faculty Senate
AGENDA ITEM 29

The College will ensure that materials related to important topics such as workplace violence, sexual harassment, disabilities, and GLBTI are posted on the College website so that they are accessible to those who are unable to attend workshops on these topics. (III.A.4.a.)

Progress: The system is in the process of developing an online faculty handbook which will have links to all policies and procedures in the UH system including the areas of diversity and equity.

The Director of Marketing has created a new organizational structure for the College website that provides appropriate placement for these materials which will be easily accessible to all employees. The new website has a dedicated “micro-site” for faculty and staff resources.

After the new website is launched, faculty and staff will be asked for feedback on organizational structure, accessibility and navigation.

Timeline: The Director of Marketing is currently working with the web programmer and the College IT staff to prepare for the launch of the new site, scheduled to take place during the fall 09, with completion set for December 2009.

Responsible party: Director of Marketing

AGENDA ITEM 30

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 (APR) based on these assessments. (III.A.5.a) The Center will also develop indicators of success for professional development activities relating to achievement of student learning outcomes. (III.A.5.b)

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. (III.A.5.a)

Progress: The Innovation Center (ICTL) offered several workshops on SLO design and assessment. The office also coordinated system-wide Annual Best Practices in Assessment Conference (April 11, 2008 and March 23-24, 2009). In the 2009 conference, more than 40 concurrent sessions and 15 workshops and round-table discussions were held on assessment.

Workshop evaluations currently include questions on participants’ assessment of their ability to apply what they learned and the degree of effectiveness of presentations and/or activities related to improving SLOs.

The ICTL now has an approved SLO. Select professional development program are evaluated using a specially designed form that asks for lists of teaching strategies that can help students reach the SLO. These programs include: Hawaii National Great Teachers Seminar, Teaching Squares, Mid-Semester Assessment, Travel Grant, and Conference Dollars program.

Timeline: Completed

Responsible Parties: Staff Development Coordinator
AGENDA ITEM 31

The College’s Administration will address the need for an additional access road to campus. (III.B.1.b.)

Progress: The Second Access Road Project is included as part of the campus’ Long Range Development Plan (LRDP). This specific project was identified in the initial 1966 Master Plan for the College and was recommended to be completed prior to 1971 when the campus became fully operational. Two environmental assessment reports have been completed, one in 1974 by the Department of Accounting and General Services (DAGS), and one in November 2007 by the State Department of Transportation (DOT). The November 2007 Environmental Assessment included a Finding of No Significant Impact for the roadway project and estimated the cost of the project at $17 million. As of April 2009, no funding has been appropriated to complete this project. This biggest challenge facing completion of this roadway is related to jurisdictional issues. Several governmental agencies are impacted by this project, including the State DOT, the City and County, the UH system, the Department of Defense, and the State Department of Education.

In Spring 2009, the City and County has drafted plans to complete nearly half of the roadway project. This is being undertaken in order to gain access to the rail system’s maintenance operations center which will be located directly Ewa of the campus. Once this Ala Ike roadway extension is completed, the College will need to continue working with the various governmental agencies that have jurisdictional interest in this project to secure funding for the completion of the roadway.


Timeline: This project is on-going and is a coordinated effort between the University of Hawaii and the City and County of Honolulu.

Responsible Parties: VCAS
AGENDA ITEM 32

The College will ensure that processes for acquiring, maintaining, and upgrading or replacing technology are consistently applied, without exception. (III.C.1.c)

The Divisions/Units will develop a plan for replacement of faculty/staff computers on a regular basis. (III.C.1.c)

Progress: A regular replacement plan for computers from the College Computing Labs (CCL) has been implemented. This is the 5th year of the CCL replacement cycle.

Information Technology Group (ITG) provided annual computer inventory reports for all instructional and non-instructional units to assist in computer replacement decisions by Division Chair or Unit Coordinator.

In spring 2008 the assessment of minimum hardware requirements, data in inventory system, and survey of faculty/students that use computer classrooms and labs resulted in two findings: 1) CCL classrooms/labs meet hardware requirements; 2) The 3-year replacement cycle should be extended to a 4-year cycle.

Improvements resulting from assessment were: a) Tech Funds were better utilized; b) up-to-date hardware are standard in CCL facilities. Results can be viewed at http://emedia.leeward.hawaii.edu/itg/docs/.

All Divisions submitted replacement requests; out of 47 requests, 47 new computer systems were purchased and placed.

A comparison of the computers in the classrooms and the minimum hardware requirements verifies that requirements are being met. Data regarding the last series of upgrades and replacements of faculty and staff equipment can be viewed at: http://documents.leeward.hawaii.edu:8080/docushare/dsweb/View/Collection-1087

Timeline: On-going on an annual basis

Responsible Parties: IT Coordinator, Computer Lab Manager, Division Chairs

AGENDA ITEM 33

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. (III. D.1.b.)

Progress: The College works with the UHCC and UH system in several ways. System wide meetings of all Chief Academic Officers, Vice Chancellors/Directors of Administrative Services, and Deans of Student Services occur regularly throughout the year. The Council of Chancellors meets monthly, with the first half of the day set aside for CC Chancellors, joined by the four-year campus Chancellors and the UH President for the second half.

The College is also well represented on several system-wide committees, such as COMPASS Coordinators, the IR Cadre, UHCC Strategic Planning, and Marketing.

These meetings provide consistent and efficient opportunities for communication, interaction and collaboration.

Timeline: On-going

Responsible parties: Chancellor and Vice Chancellors
AGENDA ITEM 34

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. (III.D.1.d.)

Progress: With the last Annual Report on Program Data, we have standardized sources of assessment data, with common data elements identified and defined across the system. In 2008, a system-wide committee (Instructional Program Review Council—IPRC) began developing a set of benchmarks and benchmark values that were used by all the CCs to determine program health. This was a first attempt at defining benchmarks and setting values. The effort is ongoing. Initially, these benchmarks were developed for CTE programs. This coming year, we will also be developing benchmarks for Liberal Arts and Developmental Ed programs.

The same committee will be making recommendations concerning the comprehensive program review, which must be performed by all the CCs in the system periodically. We will be especially concerned in this coming year with modifying the requirements of the UHCC policy that specifies the data to be included in the comprehensive reviews.

The process for distributing the data has also been set so that the data is collected and tabulated centrally (by the OVPCC) and then sent out to each campus in the same format. Work is also being done to use the newly acquired Cognos reporting tools to store and “publish” this information via the web rather than sending out Excel spreadsheets and Word documents which contain the information.

The other common source of achievement data that has become part of our assessment plans is Achieving the Dream. We now have data on four cohorts of students, beginning Fall 2004 and continuing through Fall 2007. For each cohort (we will have another cohort in 2008 and plan to be collecting data on them through 2013), we have data on math and English placement, enrollment in developmental and gatekeeper courses, performance in those courses, and graduation and transfer.

Because the Achieving the Dream (AtD) initiative is nationally organized, the data elements are common to all participating colleges (and all the UHCCs are participating) and are commonly defined. All of this data eventually turns up in the Leeward CC Annual Program Review process, which is the way Leeward CC integrates its planning and budgeting for instructional programs as well as support areas. What we don’t have is a system-wide, agreed upon mechanism and process for tracking student enrollment and performance longitudinally.

The IPRC notes/minutes can be found at http://www.hawaii.edu/vpaa/system_aa/iprc.html/

The Achieving the Dream planning documents for LCC are not yet available on the web. However, some of the data from AtD was posted in Excel format at www.leeward.hawaii.edu/AtD The data was used by the Developmental Ed committee in its early stages of planning.

Timeline: On-going

Responsible Parties: Division chairs, program coordinators and Institutional Effectiveness Officer
AGENDA ITEM 35

The Administrative Team will document and share information so that campus members can see the effect of planning and policy-making. (IV.A.1) 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.1)

Progress: The College has established the Office of Planning, Policy, and Assessment and hired a DPPA and Institutional Effectiveness Officer. A comprehensive website is being developed that will enable the OPPA to post information and data connected to the planning process and resource allocation.

As explained in Recommendation #1, a subcommittee of the Campus Council will be appointed to design and implement a comprehensive evaluation process to assess APR effectiveness during AY 09-10. This evaluation will include assessing effectiveness of resource allocation, with clearly defined performance measures.

Timeline: AY 09-10

Responsible parties: DPPA, Faculty Senate, and Campus Council

AGENDA ITEM 36

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. (IV. A.5.)

Progress: The Community College Inventory Survey is linked to the UHCC Strategic Planning process through benchmarks that measure institutional practices at the System level. The College implemented the survey in April 2009 as a tool for institutional review, reflection, and discussion at the campus level.

The Faculty Senate developed and implemented a survey in April 2009 to evaluate the Faculty Senate. Survey results are being compiled and analyzed.

The Campus Council held discussions of evaluation, along with the proposed changes to its structure and responsibilities, during Spring 2009. At its April 20, 2009 meeting, the Campus Council voted to change its bylaws and membership and assume responsibilities of the Executive Planning Council (see page 10 and Appendix A). Now that the role of the Council is confirmed, a subcommittee will be formed in Fall 2009 to create and execute an evaluation mechanism.

Timeline: AY 2010

Responsible parties: Faculty Senate Executive Committee; Campus Council Executive Committee, and DPAA
AGENDA ITEM 37

The following represents those planning agenda items dealing with the Board of Regents and the UHCC System:

The College and the OVPCC will work with the BOR to
- establish regular review of BOR policies and procedures. (IV.B.1.e.)
- develop an appropriate program for BOR development and new member orientation. (IV.B.1.f.)
- develop and implement a clearly defined process for evaluation and assessment of BOR performance. (IV.B.1.g.)
- assist the BOR in becoming more involved and informed with the accreditation process. (IV.B.1.i.)

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. (IV.B.3.a.)
- develop methods for evaluating the UHCC System Office. (IV.B.3.b.)
- review and revise the Chancellor position description to reflect the dual reporting to the President and VPCC. (IV.B.3.e.)
- review and revise written policies and procedures to reflect the 2005 Reorganization (IV.B.3.f.)
- continue to develop, make public, and regularly review structures, policies, and procedures for improvement. (IV.B.3.g)
- 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.c.)

Progress: Leeward CC deals with the Board of Regents and the UHCC System in a variety of ways. One of the most common is the submission of Program Reviews for their approval. In this way both bodies are aware of what the campus is doing—especially in the realm of student learning outcomes. However it was perhaps overzealous of the campus in their last Self Study to propose planning agendas that suggest changes to BOR or UHCC/OVPCC policies and procedures.

The College cannot require the System to document the involved, multi-level process; however, information will be shared with the campus as the CC system budget is created. Budget information will be shared with the campus via the shared governance organizations.

Timeline: On-going

Responsible parties: Chancellor, VCAA and VCAS

The UHCC System provided the following information on specific planning agenda items:

Establish regular review of BOR policies and procedures. (IV.B.1.e.)

The Vice President for Community Colleges is working with the Vice President for Academic Planning and Policy and the BOR to develop and establish regular review of BOR policies and procedures.

Develop an appropriate program for BOR development and new member orientation. (IV.B.1.f.)

The BOR has developed an orientation process for new Board of Regent members. The most recent orientation took place on June 29, 2009 and included information about the community colleges, the accreditation process, and the Board's role in accreditation. The Vice President for Community Colleges is engaged in new Board member orientation.
Develop and implement a clearly defined process for evaluation and assessment of BOR performance. (IV.B.1.g.)

The Board has begun development of a process for evaluation and assessment of BOR performance. The results of a question sent to each Regent in May 2008 to evaluate the Board’s effectiveness was discussed at the August 22, 2008 Board meeting. BOR Minutes Aug 22 2008

Assist the BOR in becoming more involved and informed with the accreditation process. (IV.B.1.i.)

The BOR has developed an orientation program for new Board member which includes information about the accreditation process and the Board’s role in accreditation.

Develop methods for evaluating the UHCC System Office. (IV.B.3.b.)

Since the self studies were completed in 2006, Hawaii’s community colleges have joined Achieving the Dream: Community Colleges Count. UHCC sought participation in this major national initiative because of its focus on issues that are directly related to the institutional expectations expressed in the ACCJC Standards for Accreditation. In addition to the core Achieving the Dream initiatives, Hawaii participates in the State Policy component of the initiative which provides access to tools and “best practices”. The Community College Inventory: Focus on Student Persistence, Learning, and Attainment, distributed as part of the Achieving the Dream orientation materials provides descriptions of characteristics of colleges that are strongly focused on student success. Related to each characteristic is a set of indicators that more fully describe observable institutional practices. The UHCC system views these indicators as so significant that several have been incorporated into the UHCC System Strategic Outcomes and Performance Measures and will be regularly evaluated.

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.c.)

In response to Hawaii’s economic slowdown and decline in State revenues, in fall 2008 the governor requested that all departments identify budget reductions for FY 2010 and FY 2011. The Vice President for Community Colleges, working with the Chancellors and Associate Vice Presidents, identified budget priorities and developed written policies to manage the reductions. The priorities identified Native Hawaiian student success, remedial/developmental education, and workforce shortage areas (including Science Technology Engineering and Math). The agreed upon priorities specifically precluded reductions in areas identified as important strategic outcomes in the UHCC Strategic Plan.

Review and revise the Chancellor position description to reflect the dual reporting to the President and VPCC. (IV.B.3.e.)

No action taken

Review and revise written policies and procedures to reflect the 2005 Reorganization (IV.B.3.f.)

OVPCC is working with the UH system (including the Board) to review and revise written polices and procedures to reflect the 2005 Reorganization. Review includes not only title changes but functional changes as well.
Continue to develop, make public, and regularly review structures, policies, and procedures for improvement. (IV.B.3.g)

The University of Hawaii System has invested in IBM Cognos Business Intelligence software that will be used to develop enterprise-wide management applications. The first Cognos report at UH, released in spring 2009, is a table on selected characteristics of credit students found in the UH System Management and Planning Support (MAPS) Enrollment Report. Scheduled for release later in 2009 is the University of Hawaii’ System Strategic Outcomes & Performance Measures (Dashboard), This application provides an “at a glance” summary of 10 critical measures which are based on the University of Hawaii System Strategic Plan. The dashboard, together with drill throughs to detail graphs, provides a dynamic assessment of the University’s progress toward its goal.

OVPCC technical staff, working with the IR Cadre, are developing reports for UHCC specific initiatives and projects to include, but not limited to the UHCC Strategic Plan, Program Review, and Achieving the Dream (AtD). The reports will be web-based and open to the public.
AGENDA ITEM 38

The College will implement the second phase of the Annual [Program] Review process. (IV.B.2.d.)

Progress: To broaden participation in the planning and resource allocation process and to increase the scope of the College’s shared governance, Phase 2 of the Planning Process proposed the addition of Standing Committees and an Executive Planning Council to review the findings of instructional and support areas’ Annual [Program] Reviews. These groups would involve a wider cross section of the campus and provide an institutional overview to resource allocation.

Phase 2 Standing Committees were formed in Spring 2007.

Campus Council voted unanimously on February 9, 2009 to discontinue all standing committees of the APR process except for Information Technology (IT) and the Space Management and Facilities Planning Committees. A second proposal to modify the APR process by assigning the responsibilities of the EPC to the Campus Council was presented to the Campus Council on February 9, 2009. A subcommittee of the Campus Council was appointed to compare the existing Campus Council charter and bylaws with revisions that would be required if this proposal is adopted. The subcommittee met on March 2, 2009. Discussion on the proposal continued at the March 16, 2009 Campus Council meeting and the revised was approved by the CC on April 20, 2009.

http://docushare.leeward.hawaii.edu:8080/docushare/dsweb/View/Collection-1790

Timeline: On-going

Responsible parties: Chancellor
AGENDA ITEM 39

The planning agenda items from all four standards that deal with the assessment, evaluation and monitoring of the Program Review and Annual Review Processes are grouped together as “Planning Agenda Item 39.” The progress, analysis and future plans for these items are addressed in the response to Team Recommendation #1, pages 5-12.

The Program Review and Annual Review processes will be assessed, monitored and evaluated:

• to determine the extent to which these processes are successful in implementing and achieving the College’s goals of improving student learning and institutional improvement. (I.A.1.)
• to ensure that the mission is central to all decision-making. (I.A.4.)
• to determine appropriate goals and objectives and make changes as needed. (I.B.2)
• for their effectiveness in
  - improving student learning and institutional processes. (I.B.1.)
  - improving programs and services and making changes for improvement. (I.B.7)
  - supporting student learning needs through Student Services. (II.B.1.)
  - enhancing student understanding of diversity. (II.B.3.d.)
  - contributing to the achievement of student learning outcomes in Student Services. (II.B.4.)
  - determining improvements needed in learning support services. (II.C.2.)
  - identifying and meeting staffing needs. (III.A.6.)
  - providing sufficient physical resources to support student learning programs and services. (III.B.1.a.)
  - developing long-range capital plans and making changes for improvement. (III.B.2.a.)
  - assessing physical resource needs and making changes for improvement. (III.B.2.b.)
  - identifying & responding to the campus' information technology needs and training and technology planning. (III.C.1.a., III.C.1.b, III.C.1.c., III.C.2)
  - providing sufficient financial resources to support student learning programs and services. (III.D.2.a.)
  - allocating funds to support student learning programs and services. (III.D.2.b)
• to determine their effect in supporting the achievement of its stated goals and making changes as needed. (I.B.3)
• for overall effectiveness of the Program and Annual Review processes (I.B.6)
• to determine to what extent assessment was used to make decisions. (II.A.1.c)
• to assess the degree to which data is being housed in a manner that makes decision making transparent. (II.A.1.c)
• to evaluate the effect of the Policy on Program Reviews on improvement of student learning. (II.A.2.b.)
• to determine the extent to which these processes are successful in implementing changes in Academic Support Units to improve student learning. (II.C.1.a.)
• to ensure that they appropriately address staffing needs. (III.A.2.)
• to ensure that assessment and evidence drive financial and institutional planning. (III.D.1.a)

Following these assessments, changes for improvement will be made as needed.

For Progress and Timelines: see response to Team Recommendation #1, pages 5–12.
Update on Substantive Change Proposal

The college received notification about the action taken by the ACCJC Committee on Substantive Change at its April 17th, 2009 meeting for the Leeward Community College Substantive Change Proposal for the addition of two Associate of Arts, three Associate of Science, one Associate of Applied Science Degrees and twenty four Certificates offered 50% or more through a mode of distance or electronic delivery. The Committee acted to approve the Proposal.

APPENDICES

Appendix A
Approval of Modifications to Annual Program Review Process
Proposal to Modify the Annual Program Review Process

Appendix B
Program Assessment Plan

Appendix C
Relationship between Institutional Learning Outcomes and College Mission

Appendix D
College Organizational Structure, 2005
College Organizational Structure, 2006
College Organizational Structure, 2008

Appendix E
Crosswalk of Self-identified Issues from Self Study, 2006
 Modifications to Annual Program Review Process

Date: July 31, 2009

To: Manuel Cabral
Chancellor

From: Michael Pecok
Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs and Chief Academic Officer

Subject: Annual Program Review Modifications

It is recommended that the following modifications to the Annual Program Review process, approved by the Campus Council, be adopted immediately:

Proposal #1: Assign the responsibilities of the Executive Planning Council to the Campus Council. (Approved 4/20/09)

Proposal #2: Modify the number of standing committees required in the Annual Program Review process. Maintain two committees: Information Technology (IT) and Space Management & Facilities Planning (Space). Discontinue three standing committees: Equipment, Staffing, and External Factors & Environmental Scanning (EFES). (Approved 02/09/09)

Approved: Disapproved:

[Signature]
Manuel Cabral, Chancellor

AUG 5, 2009
Modifications to Annual Program Review Process

Annual Program Review
Proposed Modifications
2/3/09

Proposals:

1) Modify the Annual Program Review (APR) process by assigning the responsibilities of the Executive Planning Council (EPC) to the Campus Council.

Rational: The EPC currently consists of the Faculty Senate and Campus Council Executive Committees, DPPA, Dean of Arts & Sciences, Dean of Career & Technical Education, Dean of Academic Support, Dean of Student Services, VC of Academic Affairs, VC of Administrative Services, a representative for Native Hawaiian programs, a Staff Representative, the Chair of the Assessment Team, and the President of Student Government/representative. As stated in the “Phase Two Planning Standing Committee Guidebook”<http://emedia.leeward.hawaii.edu/cs/planning/documents/StandingCommGuidebook.pdf>, the EPC will serve as a recommending body to the Chancellor for finalizing planning and budgetary matters, including but not limited to program reviews, area plans, budget restructuring and reprioritization of the college's operational plan. The EPC reviews the major area Planning Lists generated from the APR process and reviews the recommendations of the appropriate Standing Committees. The EPC makes recommendations on overall prioritization, based on institutional parameters (e.g. Leeward CC Strategic Plan, UH system directives, budget ceilings, etc).

According to the “Leeward Institutional Self Study Report (2006)”<http://www.lcc.hawaii.edu/userfiles/file/accreditation/leewardcc_selfstudy2006.pdf>, the EPC will be responsible for the overall assessment/review of the planning process (p.89); determine to what extent assessment was used to make decisions (p. 96); assess whether data is being housed in a manner that makes decision making transparent (p. 96); evaluate the annual process to assess the quality and usefulness of the planning process and the data collected (p. 107); and review results of the planning process to insure that quality data has emerged from assessment processes, that changes were instituted, that budget items were put forward as a result, and that information & modifications are provided to campus (p. 108).

The purpose and functions of the Campus Council (see attached Campus Council Charter & By-laws Revised September 28, 2000) provide many of the same functions as the EPC. In addition to this duplication of purpose and function, the Campus Council, an existing governing body, includes some of the same members as the EPC.

Deans and Division Chairs are intimately involved with the APR process and the data that substantiate planning/budgeting requests. Therefore, these two groups would be invaluable in discussions regarding prioritizations and implementation plans. If this proposal is adopted, it would be necessary to review/modify the CC membership.
2) Modify the number of standing committees currently included in the APR process. Maintain two of the standing committees Information Technology (IT) and Space Management & Facilities Planning (Space); discontinue three of the standing committees (Equipment, Staffing, and External Factors & Environmental Scanning (EFES)).

**Rationale:** The standing committees were designed to provide broad participation in the planning and resource allocation process and to respond to the findings of the APRs in major planning areas. Two of the committees have specific requirements for membership due to the purpose and functions of their committees (IT and Space). In addition to the review of requests generated though the APR process, these two committees serve as ongoing advisory committees that involve day-to-day IT and Space utilization operations and policies. Therefore, these two standing committees should be continued.

On the other hand, the Equipment and Staffing committees should be discontinued because the main focus of these committees was to respond to the findings of the Annual Program Reviews. These responsibilities are redundant because the planning process provides for reprioritization at several levels as the planning/budget requests move up from Divisions and Support Areas to the College Plan.

Also, the EFES Standing Committee should be discontinued. The EFES committee was formed for “researching and communicating information gleaned from environmental scans for use in planning.” At the time, the Office of Planning, Policy & Assessment did not exist. The need for the EFES committee was due to the lack of pertinent data for use in the annual review process. The EFES committee met on 11/10/08 to discuss its initial charge and recommended that the intended responsibilities of the EFES Standing Committee be handled through the data and information provided by the Office of Planning, Policy & Assessment. (See attached EFES committee report.)
AA Program Assessment Plan Process Draft
8/19/09

The Program Assessment Plan (PAP) has been created to demonstrate the alignment of a program with its courses, illustrate how on-going course SLO assessment leads to on-going program assessment, and provide the framework for the assessment timeline. Since the AA degree is cross-disciplinary, individual Program Assessment Plans will be created by each discipline. This PAP aligns course and program student learning outcome (SLO) assessment processes and timelines, maps relationships between courses, program learning outcomes (PLOs), and institutional learning outcomes (ILOs), indicates the General Education (Gen Ed) component of each program and the connections between disciplines, and illustrates how programs assess whether graduates achieve course, program, and institutional learning outcomes. Program outcomes for the AA degree program are overarching Gen Ed outcome statements for critical thinking, oral communication, quantitative reasoning, technology and information literacy, and written communication.

- As part of the student learning outcome (SLO) assessment process, faculty (full-time and part-time) who teach a course at any location should be involved in the dialogue about and assessment of SLOs for that course.
- Course assessments should be scheduled throughout the timetable so that disciplines are continually involved in assessment. The timetable illustrates when assessments will be reported.
- Course and program assessments are reported on the SLO Assessment Form and submitted to the Assessment Team via their Assessment Team coordinator.
- All discipline courses that were not previously assessed must be scheduled to begin SLO assessment by spring 2011 to ensure that all courses have on-going SLO assessment before the 2012 Self Study.
- Gen Ed core courses are highlighted in the maps to illustrate the Gen Ed component of each program.
- ILOs and PLOs are assessed with each course assessment. The assessment of those courses that are aligned with several PLOs provides a comprehensive or capstone view of student learning and achievement.
- Courses mapped to PLOs according to students’ expected performance level (Introductory (I), Practicing (P), or Mastery (M) may be used to determine whether graduates achieve (“master”) program SLO. Relationships among courses and disciplines will identify cross-curricular alignment with Gen Ed outcomes and identify courses that may provide appropriate artifacts for AA cross-curricular program assessment via Gen Ed SLO committees.
- Maps of PLO to individual course SLO will be attached to this document. Example of page 8.

PAP references in our Midterm Recommendations and Planning Agendas:
- Initiate or continue the process of assessing the outcomes and applying the results of that assessment to the continuous improvement of the instruction and services provided to its students.
- The College will use the data from SLO assessment to consider how student achievement of course SLOs relates to the awarding of credit.
- The Curriculum Grid will be extended to include all courses that satisfy the AA General Education core.
- The College will develop a plan to assess the extent to which graduates achieve program SLOs.
- The College will continue to follow its process and schedule for its program and course SLOs assessments.
Institutional Learning Outcomes (ILO)

- **Critical Thinking and Problem Solving (CTPS)**
  Our graduates are able to examine, integrate, and evaluate the quality and appropriateness of ideas and information sources to solve problems and make decisions in real world situations.

- **Written, Oral Communication and Use of Technology (WOCT)**
  Our graduates are able to use written and oral communication and technology to discover, develop, and communicate creative and critical ideas, and to respond effectively to the spoken, written, and visual ideas of others in multiple environments.

- **Values, Citizenship, and Community (VCC)**
  Our graduates, having diverse beliefs and cultures, are able to interact responsibly and ethically through their respect for others using collaboration and leadership. Our graduates are able to engage in and take responsibility for their learning to broaden perspectives, deepen understanding, and develop aesthetic appreciation and workforce skills.

Program Learning Outcomes (PLOs)  
*Program outcomes for the AA degree program are overarching Gen Ed core outcome statements. These statements, still in draft form, will be identical on each AA program discipline PAP and will be filled in for disciplines.*

1. Program Learning Outcome 1: **Critical Thinking**
2. Program Learning Outcome 2: **Oral Communication**
3. Program Learning Outcome 3: **Quantitative Reasoning**
4. Program Learning Outcome 4: **Technology and Information Literacy**
5. Program Learning Outcome 5: **Written Communication**
7. Program Learning Outcome 7.
Map of ILOs to PLOs  *This map will be the same on each AA program discipline PAP.*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ILO</th>
<th>Critical Thinking and Problem Solving</th>
<th>Written, Oral Communication and Use of Technology</th>
<th>Values, Citizenship, and Community</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Program Learning Outcome 1.</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Program Learning Outcome 2.</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Program Learning Outcome 3.</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Program Learning Outcome 4.</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Program Learning Outcome 5.</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Program Learning Outcome 6.</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Program Learning Outcome 7.</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Map of PLO to Discipline Courses  Faculty will list discipline courses here and indicate how each course aligns with the PLOs. Use the following codes to indicate students’ expected level of performance in each discipline course: Introductory (I) - student is introduced to the outcome; Practicing (P) - student is expected to practice outcome during the semester; and Mastery (M) - student is expected to demonstrate mastery of the outcome.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>XXX 101</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>M</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XXX 102</td>
<td>I</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>P</td>
<td>M</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XXX 130</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>I,P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P,M</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XXX 145</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>M</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

To show the Gen Ed component of each program, highlight the discipline and non-discipline approved Gen Ed Core courses. See Catalog for listing of Gen Ed Core (i.e. Catalog 2009-2010 pages 26-27).
Program Assessment Plan

Course Assessment Timetable 2010-2014 (5 yrs)

The timetable has been changed from 6 yrs. to 5 yrs., because UHCC Policy #5.202 Review of Established Programs requires that 20% of our courses be reviewed each year. Fall 2009 has been included to allow for on-going assessment between the two timetables. Schedule all discipline courses on the timetable. Allow 3 semesters for the assessment cycle (Phase 1A, Phase 1B, and Phase 2). Courses that were not previously assessed must begin SLO assessment no later than spring 2011 to ensure that all courses have on-going SLO assessment before the 2012 Self Study.

On the Discipline Course Assessment Timetable, indicate all three phases of assessment. **Phase 1A** is the pre-assessment phase when the Assessment Team will review and provide assistance with the proposed course SLOs and proposed assessment tool. **Phase 1B** is the semester the initial assessment is conducted and assessment results reported to the Assessment Team. Modifications to core outline (including SLOs) are submitted to the Curriculum Committee via Curriculum Central. **Phase 2** is the semester a second assessment is conducted and assessment results reported to the Assessment Team.

Discipline Course Timetable  *Faculty will list discipline courses here and indicate when SLOs will be assessed and courses reviewed.*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>XXX 101</td>
<td>1A</td>
<td>1B</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XXX 102</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1A</td>
<td>1B</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XXX 130</td>
<td>1A</td>
<td>1B</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XXX 145</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1A</td>
<td>1B</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Discipline Course Assessment Reporting Dates (5 yrs, 2010-2014)

Submit SLO Assessment Forms to Assessment Team according to the following chart:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Assessment Scheduled</th>
<th>Phase 1A</th>
<th>Phase 1B</th>
<th>Phase 2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Curriculum Central has been modified to include this statement as part of the standardized information included on each course syllabus for fall 09.

*With the goal of continuing to improve the quality of educational services offered to students, Leeward CC conducts assessments of student achievement of course, program, and institutional learning outcomes. Student work is used anonymously as the basis of these assessments, and the work you do in this course may be used in these assessment efforts.*
ACC 202 Student Learning Outcomes (SLOs)  SAMPLE COURSE MAP shows how each course SLO aligns with the PLOs. This course map will be created with Phase 1A when the course is scheduled to be assessed. Use the following codes to indicate students’ expected level of performance of each PLO: Introductory (I) - student is introduced to the outcome; Practicing (P) - student is expected to practice outcome during the semester; and Mastery (M) - student is expected to demonstrate mastery of the outcome.

1. Analyze, record, and report equity and long-term liability transactions related to corporations from both an issuer and investor perspective using GAAP.
3. Analyze financial statements using horizontal analysis, vertical analysis, and financial statement ratio techniques.
4. Describe the concepts of managerial accounting and explain how they are applied to various business models.
5. Analyze, record, and report the activities of a manufacturing company using process cost, job order cost, and standard cost accounting systems.

Map of PLO to Course SLO

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ACC 202</th>
<th>PLO 1</th>
<th>PLO 2</th>
<th>PLO 3</th>
<th>PLO 4</th>
<th>PLO 5</th>
<th>PLO 6</th>
<th>PLO 7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SLO 1</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>I</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>I</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SLO 2</td>
<td>I</td>
<td></td>
<td>P</td>
<td></td>
<td>I</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SLO 3</td>
<td></td>
<td>I</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>P</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SLO 4</td>
<td>P</td>
<td></td>
<td>P</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>M</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SLO 5</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>M</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>M</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
CTE Program Assessment Plan Process Draft  
8/19/09

The Program Assessment Plan (PAP) has been created to demonstrate the alignment of a program with its courses, illustrate how on-going course SLO assessment leads to on-going program assessment, and provide the framework for the assessment timeline. This PAP aligns course and program student learning outcome (SLO) assessment processes and timelines, maps relationships between courses, program learning outcomes (PLOs), and institutional learning outcomes (ILOs), indicates the General Education (Gen Ed) component of each program and the connections between disciplines, and illustrates how programs assess whether graduates achieve course, program, and institutional learning outcomes.

- As part of the SLO assessment process, faculty (full-time and part-time) who teach a course at any location should be involved in the dialogue about and assessment of SLOs for that course.
- Course SLO assessments should be scheduled throughout the timetable so that programs are continually involved in assessment. The timetable illustrates when SLO assessments will be reported.
- Course and program SLO assessments are reported on the SLO Assessment Form and submitted to the Assessment Team via their Assessment Team coordinator.
- All program courses that were not previously assessed must be scheduled to begin SLO assessment by spring 2011 to ensure that all courses have on-going SLO assessment before the 2012 Self Study.
- Gen Ed core courses are highlighted in the maps to illustrate the Gen Ed component of each program.
- ILOs and PLOs are assessed with each course SLO assessment. The assessment of those courses that are aligned with several PLOs provides a comprehensive or capstone view of student learning and achievement.
- Courses mapped to PLOs according to students’ expected performance level (Introductory (I), Practicing (P), or Mastery (M) may be used to determine whether graduates achieve (“master”) program SLOs.
- Maps of PLOs to individual course SLOs will be attached to this document. Example of page 8.

PAP references in our Midterm Recommendations and Planning Agendas:
- Initiate or continue the process of assessing the outcomes and applying the results of that assessment to the continuous improvement of the instruction and services provided to its students.
- The College will use the data from SLO assessment to consider how student achievement of course SLOs relates to the awarding of credit.
- The Curriculum Grid will be extended to include all courses that satisfy the AA General Education core.
- The College will develop a plan to assess the extent to which graduates achieve program SLOs.
- The College will continue to follow its process and schedule for its program and course SLO assessments.
Institutional Learning Outcomes (ILOs)

- **Critical Thinking and Problem Solving (CTPS)**
  Our graduates are able to examine, integrate, and evaluate the quality and appropriateness of ideas and information sources to solve problems and make decisions in real world situations.

- **Written, Oral Communication and Use of Technology (WOCT)**
  Our graduates are able to use written and oral communication and technology to discover, develop, and creative communicate and critical ideas, and to respond effectively to the spoken, written, and visual ideas of others in multiple environments.

- **Values, Citizenship, and Community (VCC)**
  Our graduates, having diverse beliefs and cultures, are able to interact responsibly and ethically through their respect for others using collaboration and leadership. Our graduates are able to engage in and take responsibility for their learning to broaden perspectives, deepen understanding, and develop aesthetic appreciation and workforce skills.

Program Learning Outcomes (PLOs)

*Faculty will list PLOs here. PLOs should be written in appropriate format, be overarching, indicate what the students will be able to “DO” after completing the program, start with a verb, and be measurable.*

1. Program Learning Outcome 1.
2. Program Learning Outcome 2.
3. Program Learning Outcome 3.
5. Program Learning Outcome 5.
7. Program Learning Outcome 7.
**Map of ILOs to PLOs**  *Faculty will determine how PLOs align with ILOs.*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ILO</th>
<th>Critical Thinking and Problem Solving</th>
<th>Written, Oral Communication and Use of Technology</th>
<th>Values, Citizenship, and Community</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Program Learning Outcome 1.</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Program Learning Outcome 2.</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Program Learning Outcome 3.</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Program Learning Outcome 4.</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Program Learning Outcome 5.</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Program Learning Outcome 6.</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Program Learning Outcome 7.</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Map of PLOs to Discipline Courses  Faculty will list discipline courses here and indicate how each course aligns with the PLOs. Use the following codes to indicate students’ expected level of performance in each discipline course: Introductory (I) - student is introduced to the outcome; Practicing (P) - student is expected to practice outcome during the semester; and Mastery (M) - student is expected to demonstrate mastery of the outcome.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>XXX 101</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>I</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>P</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XXX 102</td>
<td>I</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>P</td>
<td></td>
<td>P</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XXX 130</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>I,P</td>
<td></td>
<td>P</td>
<td></td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P,M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XXX 145</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>M</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

To show the Gen Ed component of each program, highlight the discipline and non-discipline approved Gen Ed Core courses. See Catalog for listing of Gen Ed Core (i.e. Catalog 2009-2010 pages 26-27).
Map of PLOs to Non-Discipline Courses*  

Faculty will list non-discipline courses required for the program here and indicate how each course aligns with the PLOs. Use the following codes to indicate students’ expected level of performance in each non-discipline course: Introductory (I) - student is introduced to the outcome; Practicing (P) - student is expected to practice outcome during the semester; and Mastery (M) - student is expected to demonstrate mastery of the outcome.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ZZZ 101</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>M</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AAA 122</td>
<td></td>
<td>P</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YYY 201</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>M</td>
<td></td>
<td>M</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Support from non-discipline courses is needed to address some PLOs. Through cross-disciplinary discussions, assessments may be designed that could be used for both courses (i.e. ACC 201 and SP 151).
Program Assessment Plan

Program Course Assessment Timetable 2010-2014 (5 yrs)

The timetable has been changed from 6 yrs. to 5 yrs., because UHCC Policy #5.202 Review of Established Programs requires that 20% of our courses be reviewed each year. Fall 2009 has been included to allow for on-going assessment between the two timetables. Schedule all program courses on the timetable. Allow 3 semesters for the assessment cycle (Phase 1A, Phase 1B, and Phase 2). Courses that were not previously assessed must begin SLO assessment no later than spring 2011 to ensure that all courses have on-going SLO assessment before the 2012 Self Study.

On the Program Course Assessment Timetable, indicate all three phases of assessment. Phase 1A is the pre-assessment phase when the Assessment Team will review and provide assistance with the proposed course SLOs and proposed assessment tool. Phase 1B is the semester the initial assessment is conducted and assessment results reported to the Assessment Team. Phase 2 is the semester a second assessment is conducted and assessment results reported to the Assessment Team.

**QUESTION FOR MEETING:** Courses will be submitted to the Curriculum Committee for their 5-year review in Phase ___ (1A or 1B?). SLO modifications should be included as part of the normal course modification process. How will decision affect CC deadlines?

Discipline Course Timetable  
Faculty will list discipline courses here and indicate when SLOs will be assessed and courses reviewed.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>XXX 101</td>
<td>1A</td>
<td>1B</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XXX 102</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1A</td>
<td>1B</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XXX 130</td>
<td>1A</td>
<td>1B</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XXX 145</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1A</td>
<td>1B</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Non-Discipline Course Assessment Timetable (5 yrs)**  
To be completed using information from other disciplines.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ZZZ 101</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AAA 122</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YYY 201</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Check other program timetables to indicate assessment schedule for non-discipline courses.
Program/Course SLO Assessment Reporting Dates (5 yrs, 2010-2014)

Submit SLO Assessment Forms to Assessment Team according to the following chart:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Assessment Scheduled</th>
<th>Phase 1A</th>
<th>Phase 1B</th>
<th>Phase 2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Composition of the Program Assessment Team:

*Faculty will indicate if the program assessment team will include community members or members from outside of the program.*

Curriculum Central has been modified to include this statement as part of the standardized information included on each course syllabus for fall 09.

*With the goal of continuing to improve the quality of educational services offered to students, Leeward CC conducts assessments of student achievement of course, program, and institutional learning outcomes. Student work is used anonymously as the basis of these assessments, and the work you do in this course may be used in these assessment efforts.*
ACC 202 Student Learning Outcomes (SLOs)  

SAMPLE COURSE MAP shows how each course SLO aligns with the PLOs. This course map will be created with Phase 1A when the course is scheduled to be assessed. Use the following codes to indicate students’ expected level of performance of PLO: Introductory (I) - student is introduced to the outcome; Practicing (P) - student is expected to practice outcome during the semester; and Mastery (M) - student is expected to demonstrate mastery of the outcome.

1. Analyze, record, and report equity and long-term liability transactions related to corporations from both an issuer and investor perspective using GAAP.
3. Analyze financial statements using horizontal analysis, vertical analysis, and financial statement ratio techniques.
4. Describe the concepts of managerial accounting and explain how they are applied to various business models.
5. Analyze, record, and report the activities of a manufacturing company using process cost, job order cost, and standard cost accounting systems.

Map of PLO to Course SLO

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ACC 202</th>
<th>PLO 1</th>
<th>PLO 2</th>
<th>PLO 3</th>
<th>PLO 4</th>
<th>PLO 5</th>
<th>PLO 6</th>
<th>PLO 7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SLO 1</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>I</td>
<td></td>
<td>I</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SLO 2</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>P</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>I</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SLO 3</td>
<td>I</td>
<td></td>
<td>P</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>P</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SLO 4</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>M</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SLO 5</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>M</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Institutional Learning Outcomes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Critical Thinking and Problem Solving</th>
<th>Written, Oral Communication and Use of Technology</th>
<th>Values, Citizenship, and Community</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Our graduates are able to examine, integrate, and evaluate the quality and appropriateness of ideas and information sources to solve problems and make decisions in real world situations.</td>
<td>Our graduates are able to use written and oral communication and technology to discover, develop, and communicate creative and critical ideas, and to respond effectively to the spoken, written, and visual ideas of others in multiple environments.</td>
<td>Our graduates, having diverse beliefs and cultures, are able to interact responsibly and ethically through their respect for others using collaboration and leadership. Our graduates are able to engage in and take responsibility for their learning to broaden perspectives, deepen understanding, and develop aesthetic appreciation and workforce skills.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Mission

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Access</th>
<th>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.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Learning and Teaching</td>
<td>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. The College is committed to the achievement of student learning.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work Force Development</td>
<td>To provide the trained workforce needed in the State, the Asia-Pacific region, and internationally by offering occupational, technical, and professional courses and programs which prepare students for immediate and future employment and career advancement.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal Development</td>
<td>To provide opportunities for personal enrichment, occupational upgrading, and career mobility through credit and non-credit courses and activities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Development</td>
<td>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.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diversity</td>
<td>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.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Crosswalk, Planning Agendas, Self Study 2006

Planning Agenda Crosswalk

Listing of unduplicated Planning Agendas

All items dealing with the assessment, evaluation and monitoring of the Program Review and Annual Review Processes have been grouped under together and listed as the last Planning Agenda, Item 39.

Other items that deal with the similar issues have also been grouped and numbered in the chart below.

Text in gray indicates editorial comments and will not be included in the narrative of the Midterm Report.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Standard 1</th>
<th>Planning Agenda from 2006 Self Study</th>
<th>Planning Agenda #</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I.A.1.</td>
<td>• 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.</td>
<td>39.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I.A.2</td>
<td>• The College will establish and follow guidelines that are based on inclusive dialogue in future revisions of the mission.</td>
<td>1.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I.A.3.</td>
<td>• 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.</td>
<td>1.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I.A.4.</td>
<td>• 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.</td>
<td>39.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I.B.1.</td>
<td>• 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.</td>
<td>2.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I.B.1.</td>
<td>• 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.</td>
<td>3.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I.B.1.</td>
<td>• The College will assess the effectiveness of the Program and Annual Review processes in improving student learning and institutional processes.</td>
<td>39.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I.B.2</td>
<td>• The College’s Program and Annual Review processes will be assessed to determine their effectiveness in improving student learning and institutional processes.</td>
<td>39.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I.B.2</td>
<td>• The College will evaluate its Program and Annual Review processes in determining appropriate goals and objectives and make changes as needed.</td>
<td>39.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I.B.3</td>
<td>• 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.</td>
<td>39.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I.B.4.</td>
<td>• The Annual Review process will be assessed and changes for improvement made as needed.</td>
<td>39.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I.B.4.</td>
<td>• As with previous prioritizing process, the Annual Review process will be assessed and changes for improvement made as needed.</td>
<td>4.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I.B.5</td>
<td>• 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.</td>
<td>39.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I.B.6.</td>
<td>• The College will evaluate the effectiveness of its Program and Annual Review processes and make changes for improvement.</td>
<td>39.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I.B.7</td>
<td>• 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.</td>
<td>39.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I.B.7</td>
<td>• 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.</td>
<td>39.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standard II</td>
<td>Planning Agenda from 2006 Self Study</td>
<td>Planning Agenda #</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II.A.1.a.</td>
<td>• 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.</td>
<td>5.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II.A.1.b.</td>
<td>• The College will continue to collect and analyze data on student achievement of SLOs and make changes as necessary to ensure that its delivery systems and modes of instruction are appropriate and effective.</td>
<td>6.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II.A.1.c</td>
<td>• 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.</td>
<td>39.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II.A.2.a.</td>
<td>• Faculty will develop a written policy on course SLO assessment as part of the review of the Curriculum Revision and Review Policy.</td>
<td>7.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II.A.2.b.</td>
<td>• The responsibilities of the Assessment Team will be permanently assigned to an administrative office in order to ensure that policies continue to be followed.</td>
<td>8.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| II.A.2.c    | • 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.  
  **Split into 2 separate Agenda Items-see below** | 39.               |
| II.A.2.b.   | • 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. | 9.                |
| II.A.2.e    | • 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. | 10.               |
| II.A.2.d    | • 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. | 11.               |
| II.A.2.e    | • 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. | 12.               |
| II.A.2.e    | • 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.  
  • Course assessment policies and procedures will be documented in the revised Policy on Curriculum Revision and Review. | 7.                |
| II.A.2.f    | • 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. | 12.               |
| II.A.2.g    | • 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. | 13.               |
| II.A.2.h    | • The College will use the data from SLO assessment to consider how student achievement of course SLOs relates to the awarding of credit. | 14.               |
| II.A.2.i    | • 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. | 15.               |
| II.A.2.i    | • The Curriculum Grid will be extended to include all courses that satisfy the AA General Education core. | 15.               |
| II.A.2.i    | • The College will develop a plan to assess the extent to which graduates achieve program SLOs. | 16.               |
| II.A.3.a    | • 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. | 15.               |
| II.A.3.b    | • 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. | 17.               |
| II.A.3.b    | • 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. | 18.               |
| II.A.5.     | • The College will develop a mechanism to track external licensure, certification, and/or employment after graduation.  
  • 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. | 19.               |
### II.A.6.c
- To ensure ease of access of students and the public, the College will commit appropriate resources and personnel to redesign the College’s website.

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>20.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### II.A.7.b
- 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.

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>21.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### II.B.1.
- The College will assess its Program and Annual Review processes to determine their effectiveness in supporting student learning needs through Student Services.

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>39.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### II.B.2.a
- The College, through its Creative Services Office, will ensure that the catalog is produced and made available in a timely manner.

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>22.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### II.B.2.d
- To ensure ease of access of students and the public, the College will commit appropriate resources and personnel to redesign the College’s website.

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>20.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### II.B.3.c.
- Academic Divisions and Student Service Division will collaborate to address concerns raised in the Annual Review process regarding counseling and advising.

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>23.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### II.B.3.d.
- The Program and Annual Review processes will be evaluated to determine their effectiveness in enhancing student understanding of diversity.

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>39.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### II.B.3.e.
- The College will continue to work with its sister campuses in evaluating COMPASS and make changes for improvement.

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>24.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### II.B.4.
- The Program and Annual Review processes will be evaluated for their effectiveness in contributing to the achievement of student learning outcomes in Student Services.

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>39.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### II.C.1.a.
- 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.

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>39.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### II.C.1.b.
- 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.

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>25.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- The Head Librarian will develop an institutional information literacy vision statement in collaboration with the administration.

### II.C.1.c
- Academic Support Units, as part of their Annual Review, will continue to assess staffing needs to support student learning.

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>26.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### II.C.1.d
- As part of their Annual Review, Academic Support Units will assess staffing needs to support student learning.

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>26.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### II.C.1.e.
- 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.

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>27.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### II.C.2.
- The College’s Program and Annual Review processes will be assessed for their effectiveness in determining improvements needed in learning support services.

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>39.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standard</td>
<td>Planning Agenda from 2006 Self Study</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
<td>------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III.A.1.c</td>
<td>• 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. &lt;br&gt;• 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.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III.A.1.c</td>
<td>• 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.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III.A.1.c</td>
<td>• The College will revise and standardize lecturer evaluation guidelines and include references to effectiveness in producing student learning outcomes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III.A.2.</td>
<td>• The College will assess the Program and Annual Review processes to ensure that they appropriately address staffing needs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III.A.4.a.</td>
<td>• 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. [workplace violence, s. harass, disabilities, GLBTI]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III.A.5.a</td>
<td>• 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. &lt;br&gt;• 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.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III.A.5.b</td>
<td>• The Innovation Center for Teaching and Learning will develop indicators of success for professional development activities relating to achievement of student learning outcomes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III.A.6.</td>
<td>• The College will assess the effectiveness of the Program and Annual Review processes in identifying and meeting staffing needs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III.B.1.a.</td>
<td>• 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.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III.B.1.b.</td>
<td>• The College’s Administration will address the need for an additional access road to campus.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III.B.2.a.</td>
<td>• The College will evaluate the effectiveness of its Program and Annual Review processes in developing long-range capital plans and make changes for improvement.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III.B.2.b.</td>
<td>• The College will evaluate the effectiveness of its Program and Annual Review processes in assessing physical resource needs and makes changes for improvement.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III.C.1.a.</td>
<td>• The College will evaluate the effectiveness of the Program and Annual Review processes in responding to the campus’ information technology needs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III.C.1.b.</td>
<td>• The College will evaluate the effectiveness of the Program and Annual Review processes in responding to technology training.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III.C.1.c</td>
<td>• The College will ensure that processes for acquiring, maintaining, and upgrading or replacing technology are consistently applied, without exception.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III.C.1.c</td>
<td>• The Divisions/Units will develop a plan for replacement of faculty/staff computers on a regular basis.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III.C.1.c</td>
<td>• The College will assess the effectiveness of the Program and Annual Review processes in identifying technology needs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III.C.2.</td>
<td>• Both the Program and Annual Review processes will be assessed in their effectiveness with technology planning and changes for improvement made as needed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III.D.1.a</td>
<td>• 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. &lt;br&gt;• The College will assess the Annual Review process to insure that assessment and evidence drive financial and institutional planning.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III.D.1.b.</td>
<td>• 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. &lt;br&gt;• 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.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III.D.1.d.</td>
<td>• 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.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III.D.2.a.</td>
<td>• 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.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III.D.2.b</td>
<td>• The College will assess the effectiveness of its Program and Annual Review processes in allocating funds to support student learning programs and services.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standard IV</td>
<td>Planning Agenda from 2006 Self Study</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| IV.A.1      | • The Administrative Team will document and share information so that campus members can see the effect of planning and policy-making.  
• The College will monitor the budget allocations that are based on assessment and Annual Review results to determine the integrity of the process. | 35. |
| IV. A.5.    | • 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. | 36. |
| IV.B.1.e.   | • The College and the OVPCC will work with the BOR to establish regular review of BOR policies and procedures. | 37. |
| IV.B.1.f.   | • The BOR and the OVPCC, with faculty from each college, will develop an appropriate program for BOR development and new member orientation. | 37. |
| IV.B.1.g.   | • 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. | 37. |
| IV.B.1.i.   | The College and the OVPCC will work with the BOR to assist the BOR in becoming more involved and informed with the accreditation process. | 37. |
| IV.B.2.d.   | • The College will implement the second phase of the Annual Review process. | 38. |
| IV.B.3.a.   | 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. | 37. |
| IV.B.3.b.   | • The College will work with the OVPCC to develop methods for evaluating the UHCC System Office. | 37. |
| IV.B.3.c.   | • 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. | 37. |
| IV.B.3.e.   | • 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. | 37. |
| IV.B.3.f.   | • The College will work with the OVPCC and UH system to review and revise written policies and procedures to reflect the 2005 Reorganization | 37. |
| IV.B.3.g    | • The College and the OVPCC will continue to develop, make public, and regularly review structures, policies, and procedures for improvement. | 37. |