Leeward Community College
Senate Agenda
Wednesday, September 12, 2003
1:00 - 4:00 pm
AM 209

Special Meeting

I  Senate Review of the Midterm Accreditation Report

II  Scheduling Initiative

III  Adjournment
    *Future Senate Meetings: September 24, October 15, November 5 and 26, December 10.
    Special Meeting scheduled for Friday, September 12.
LEEWARD COMMUNITY COLLEGE
2003 – 2004 Faculty Senate

APPROVED Minutes of the September 12, 2003 Meeting

James Goodman, Chair
Nancy Buchanan, Vice Chair
Candace Hochstein, Secretary


SENATORS EXCUSED:  N. Buchanan, K. Kahn, P. Lococo, M. Nakano, S. Palombo.

GUESTS:  Kay Caldwell

CALL TO ORDER:  The Special meeting to discuss the Midterm report and Tuesday/Thursday Schedule Initiative was called to order at 1:10 p.m. with a quorum.

The Faculty Senate recommends the following regarding the Midterm Report:

-The Senate recognizes that the Midterm Report must be up front with the various issues. The Senate feels that the tone of the Midterm Report should avoid excuses. Examples of the can be found on:
  -page 1, bullet 2 on the strike issue. Delete reference to this. It should then read: After consulting with his administrative staff, the then Accreditation Liaison Officer, and the Executive Committees of both the Faculty Senate and the Campus Council, the Chancellor organized seven AICs because one of the eight recommendations (safety and storage of student records) could be addressed by the Dean of Student Services and the Registrar (Interim Report 2). The Chancellor completed the organization of the seven AICs to ensure broad campus participation in the spring of 2001....
  -page 3, last paragraph. Delete the entire last paragraph.

-The Senate recognizes that the college has made significant progress in creating a system by which systematic and cyclical review may occur for Student Learning Outcomes. It recommends that a system is put in place where someone revisits and evaluates whether or not the Student Learning Outcomes which have been established are valid (see page 5, under Assessment of the Progress Made in Addressing the Team’s Recommendation).

-That a summary of the Shared Governance policy be included in the Midterm Report (page 6, Campus Council Constituency Roles and Governance). The Senate further recommends that the Midterm report state what the Shared Governance policy does.
- That an explanation of what the 360 degree Evaluation is, of the procedures, and how faculty are selected to complete the evaluation. A copy of the 360 degree evaluation should be included in the appendix. (page 8, under Administrative Instability and Turnover, page 12)

- The removal of two sentences on page 9, second paragraph. They are the second and third sentences. "The Staff Development Officer has developed and implemented a supervisory Skills Workshop of two days duration that has been offered once during Spring 2003 semester and once during the Summer 2003. The workshop is available to all levels of supervisory positions from administration through division chair and unit head positions to the level of sub-unit supervisory positions.

- That administrative positions will be added as they have been approved by all levels, and when the budget issues have been resolved (page 12, last paragraph).

- That the same language be used when referring to units or areas. Eg. Student Services is an Area with units under it.

- That clarification be made regarding PHI’s. That LCC is using PHI’s for Carl Perkins purposes, and that modified PHI’s will be used for unit area program reviews. (page 14)

- Concerns regarding the timetables of the review of the findings and recommendations of the Academic Service Units and the Strategic Plan for Information Technology appear incorrect. The timelines need to be checked and clarified (page 22, first two bullets).

**Motion 03-29: (Imada/Chernisky) To approve the Midterm Report with the Senate’s recommendations.**

**PASSED – Unanimously**

Kay Caldwell was asked to come to the Senate to clarify any misunderstandings that may have occurred regarding the Tuesday/Thursday Schedule Initiative. She explained how the Language Art’s division constantly has problems scheduling classes due to the limited classroom space available, and the fact that the Language courses meet four times a week, creating problems with the Tuesday/Thursday schedule. In the past, the Language Arts division was able to meet scheduling needs by borrowing classrooms from UH West Oahu and other divisions. This is becoming more difficult. The suggested Schedule Initiative was made to increase the number of course offerings during high demand times, thereby meeting student needs. The proposal was discussed by the Division Chairs in June as to the pro’s and con’s. The Division Chairs said that they would be willing to try and have meetings at 1:30 instead of the 12:30 time slot on Tuesday and Thursday. Kay will try to schedule lecturers to teach during the 1:30 time slots so that faculty will be free for meetings. She does feel that if agreed upon, the scheduling change should be reviewed in three semesters. So a sunset clause is appropriate.
Discussion of the various issues faculty members shared via email or to various senators ensued. The general feeling of the senate was that if the schedule initiative is attempted, that an evaluation of how it impacts attendance of faculty and student meetings be done.

**Motion 03-30: (Imada/Yokotake) The proposed Tuesday/Thursday Schedule Initiative is approved with a one and a half year (3 semester) Sunset provision (Spring 2004, Fall 2004, and Spring 2005). Data will be collected on the effects of the schedule change on faculty and student committee meetings by the affected parties. The schedule will revert back in Fall 2005 unless a review of the data collected justifies a continuance.**

**PASSED-Y=13, N=1, Ab=0**

**ADJOURNMENT:** The meeting was adjourned at 4:20 PM.

**RESPECTFULLY SUBMITTED:** Candace Hochstein, Secretary
Aloha Faculty and Staff:

With this emergency message I am requesting that the instructional faculty at Leeward Community College consider voluntarily adding up to five students per class depending upon limitations related to classroom size, availability of equipment stations and pedagogical concerns (e.g. lab/studio courses, writing intensive courses). The administration can simplify the process for you by raising the caps to your class or classes if you inform your division chairs of your intent to increase your class caps. This will reduce the hassle of having students pursuing you to seek your permission to add the class. It will also help us to get the word to the Bookstore that additional books will have to be air mailed. I have never made a formal request such as this, but it comes during an academic year that presents the campus community with the most serious budget shortage we have faced in recent memory.

Cliff Togo, Director of Administrative Services presented a revealing exposition of the budget at the Leadership Retreat held at Aloha Stadium this past week (August 12). Cliff will reprise the presentation at the Opening Convocation on Tuesday, August 19, but I will summarize the aspects that relate to course offerings.

Leeward Community College faces an array of unfunded mandates (e.g., assessments for UH Foundation, Alumni Association, Workmen's Compensation, etc.) that total $886K taken in conjunction with Governor Lingle's restriction of our budget at $332K. The total of more than $1.2 million would have been enough to fund the lecturer/overload budget for the entire academic year. However, for the past two years we have been budgeting $1.4 million for lecturer/overload and we have spent more than that in each year while hitting
the target of 90% or better fill rates in our classes.

The cumulative impact of the unfunded mandates and the budget restrictions have required the customary cuts in supplies and student help. Additionally, a number of vacant positions have been allowed to remain unfilled, and the assessment on special funds has been increased (e.g., OCET and Summer School). However, after all of this, drastic cuts in the lecturer/overload budget were necessary to produce a balanced spending plan for the year. Instead of the $1.2 million we had hoped for under a „worst case” scenario we have $658K.

Since the schedule of Fall semester courses was assembled and publicized long before these budget figures were available, we already have committed more than the allocated amount for lecturer/overload funds for the entire academic year. The Deans and Division Chairs have been working hard to identify low enrolled classes to bring us within the budgeted amount for lecturer/overload courses. They are using a 70% fill rate as the cutoff to identify low enrolled classes. Cutting courses cuts tuition collections but the average lecturer/overload course costs $3855 for salary costs alone and it produces approximately $2800-$3000 of tuition revenue.

We can entertain three hopeful prospects for this academic year:
- If we keep to our budget for lecturer/overload courses we give ourselves hope that we can restore some of the lecturer taught courses in the Spring if Governor Lingle releases some or all of the restricted funds.
- By cutting low enrolled classes now and allowing some of our full-time professors to take their contractually mandated „teaching load reduction” up front in the fall semester we can schedule them for the full 15 credits in the Spring when students will be ravenous for seats in classes.
- We can draw inspiration from this crisis to study the prospect of a cap on the total enrollment of students that the campus can serve given the relatively fixed amount of General Funded support that we receive each year. Since we are funded with a relatively static $12.8 million of General Fund monies per year regardless of enrollment trends we may wish to identify the number of students that our funds can support based on the average of 9 credits per semester that each student will take. Once that number of admissions to the College is reached we can consider the prospect of hanging out the „lot full” sign and stop taking new students.
If the Governor's restriction is not restored we will have to delete up to 250 lecturer-overload classes from our Spring schedule, a reduction of 30%. This is why I am asking you to open additional seats in your classes because we cannot add more classes to the schedule now and even a complete restoration of the budget restriction will not be enough to run a full schedule in the Spring. The gravity of the situation is such that I hope you can help, and I pledge that we will look for the steps necessary to bring predictability back to the budgeting for our credit course offerings.

Doug Dykstra
Vice-Chancellor &
Chief Academic Officer
Aloha Faculty Senate and Campus Council,

The following summary of the Division Chair’s and Academic Support Unit Head’s retreat held in late May addresses an issue that may help the campus to offer more courses in the prime time hours of the week. Given the possibility that we may have to cut back on some of our courses, I believe it is all the more important that we offer as many of the classes as we can during the hours that our predominantly youthful student population seems to prefer.

The downside of the initiative is that it takes the mid-day Tuesday-Thursday meeting hour away, however past scheduling practices reflect a substantial drop-off of classes beginning as early as 1:30 pm under current conditions. With the addition of a 12 noon class period on Tuesdays and Thursdays I suspect the drop-off of classes will be even greater at that hour.

As you will see I am a little behind my expected timeline for making this proposal available, but that is a reflection of how many unexpected developments in budget and other campus affairs occurred between mid-May and August. Below please see the initiative summary. We would like to schedule courses by this method beginning Spring 2004 semester.

SCHEDULING INITIATIVE:

James West’s proposal to open an additional class period on Tuesday-Thursday sequences produced very supportive comments from the group at-large. Hence the DOI has agreed to make a proposal available during the Leadership Retreat as a first order of business in the Fall Semester. The DOI will seek to expedite the request by conferring with Faculty Senate leadership to assure an early decision in time for Spring Semester scheduling of courses.

The proposal in brief summary calls for moving the starting time of classes on Tuesday-Thursday back a half hour as follows:

- 7:30-8:45 a.m.
- 9:00-10:15 a.m.
- 10:30-11:45 a.m.
- 12:00-1:15 p.m.
- 1:30-2:45 p.m.

This proposal would open an additional prime time class period on the T-Th sequence and use the available classroom facilities more efficiently. Meetings could be scheduled for the 1:30 time period or later if necessary because this time period is under-utilized under normal circumstances.

I hope this idea will meet with your approval. If it requires more extensive discussion including campus forums we can accommodate that, but then we will need to postpone this change until next academic year if it meets with approval.

Division Chairs
Administrative Team
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Division</th>
<th>Classrooms</th>
<th>Sections</th>
<th>Possible Prime Time Sections</th>
<th>% of Possible Prime Time Sections</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Arts and Humanities</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>147</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>86%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business Technology</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Language Arts</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>195</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Math and Science</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>196</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>64%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Sciences</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>67%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Voch Tech</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>133%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

** Based on figures from Fall 2001. The number of sections offered by Language Arts in the Fall semester has grown to over 200.
Leeward Community College's Focused Midterm Report Revised Timeline
Receipt Due Date to ACCJC: 10/15/03

8/29/03 AIC Oversight Committee Reviews Draft.

9/5/03 Draft #2 distributed to all members of the Faculty Senate and Campus Council for consolidated input and comment from each body to the Vice Chancellor.

9/9/03 Campus Council Meets to Review.

9/12/03 Faculty Senate Meets to Review (Vice-Chancellor and Report Editor beg leave to attend discussion and record notes on suggested changes).

9/12/03-9/18/03 Editor finalizes the Focused Midterm Report under the supervision of the Vice-Chancellor.

9/19/03 Chancellor signs off on the Report.

9/19/03 Report hand-delivered to the Office of the UH Vice President for Academic Affairs for approval by the VP and the BOR Chair.

10/8/03 Approved Focused Midterm Report returned to LCC for mailing to ACCJC & Report posted on the LCC Accreditation website for the information of the campus community

10/15/03 Receipt Due Date at ACCJC
Hi Doug and Susan,

Attached are the Unapproved minutes of the Faculty Senate's recommendation's to the Midterm report. I will send the approved minutes as soon as I can.

Candy-

Candace Hochstein
Faculty Senate Secretary

Attached to Doug response.
Aloha,

Candy and Jim. You will find my report written into your Senate Special Meeting minutes. Hope this is satisfactory...Doug
Aloha, Chair Goodman, et. al. I hope I have answered your concerns which you will find in italicized and underlined format below. Susan and I worked from her notes to finish the Mid-term report. These minutes arrived after I had sent the “finished” product to the Chancellor for approval. Where-ever possible I tried to accommodate your concerns even though some of this was new to us. As soon as Mark Silliman approves, I will ask that the draft along with appendices are put on the Accreditation web-site to replace the earlier draft that resides there now. I will notify the campus when the final is up and available.

Doug Dykstra

LEEWARD COMMUNITY COLLEGE
2003 – 2004 Faculty Senate

UNAPPROVED Minutes of the September 12, 2003 Meeting

James Goodman, Chair
Nancy Buchanan, Vice Chair
Candace Hochstein, Secretary


SENATORS EXCUSED: N. Buchanan, K. Kahn, P. Lococo, M. Nakano, S. Palombo.

GUESTS: Kay Caldwell

CALL TO ORDER: The Special meeting to discuss the Midterm report and Tuesday/Thursday Schedule Initiative was called to order at 1:10 p.m. with a quorum.

The Faculty Senate recommends the following regarding the Midterm Report:

-The Senate recognizes that the Midterm Report must be up front with the various issues. The Senate feels that the tone of the Midterm Report should avoid excuses. Examples of the can be found on:
-page 1, bullet 2 on the strike issue. Delete reference to this. It should then read:
After consulting with his administrative staff, the then Accreditation Liaison Officer, and the Executive Committees of both the Faculty Senate and the Campus Council, the Chancellor organized seven AICs because one of the eight recommendations (safety and storage of student records) could be addressed by the Dean of Student Services and the Registrar (Interim Report 2). The Chancellor completed the organization of the seven AICs to ensure broad campus participation in the spring of 2001.

*Advice taken and implemented. D.D.*

-page 3, last paragraph. Delete the entire last paragraph.

*Paragraph substantially re-written to avoid an apologetic or excuse mongering tone. D.D.*

-The Senate recognizes that the college has made significant progress in creating a system by which systematic and cyclical review may occur for Student Learning Outcomes. It recommends that a system is put in place where someone revisits and evaluates whether or not the Student Learning Outcomes which have been established are valid (see page 5, under Assessment of the Progress Made in Addressing the Team's Recommendation). There is some element of cross coverage provided by the Program Review policy addressed later which should assure that this issue is reviewed and revisited. DD

-That a summary of the Shared Governance policy be included in the Midterm Report (page 6, Campus Council Constituency Roles and Governance). The Senate further recommends that the Midterm report state what the Shared Governance policy does.

-That an explanation of what the 360 degree Evaluation is, of the procedures, and how faculty are selected to complete the evaluation. A copy of the 360 degree evaluation should be included in the appendix. (page 8, under Administrative Instability and Turnover, page 12) System HRO has no such document in its possession. Selection of faculty is random as the Mid-term report indicates. Random selection implies a blind process of selecting the faculty. Questionnaire received by faculty is included in Appendix #3 and mention has been added to the section about respondent's ability to provide written feedback on the administrator being evaluated. DD.

-The removal of two sentences on page 9, second paragraph. They are the second and third sentences. "The Staff Development Officer has developed and implemented a supervisory Skills Workshop of two days duration that has been offered once during Spring 2003 semester and once during the Summer 2003. The workshop is available to all levels of supervisory positions from administration through division chair and unit head positions to the level of sub-unit supervisory positions. Done... D.D."
That administrative positions will be added as they have been approved by all levels, and when the budget issues have been resolved (page 12, last paragraph). *LCC’s current budget takes into account the new administrative positions and paragraph as currently written indicates that some positions await the pending approval of the College’s reorganization plan.* DD

That the same language be used when referring to units or areas. Eg. Student Services is an Area with units under it. *I believe this has been corrected.* DD

That clarification be made regarding PHI’s. That LCC is using PHI’s for Carl Perkins purposes, and that modified PHI’s will be used for unit area program reviews. (page 14) *Whatever notes we had available were incorporated into the final copy.* DD

Concerns regarding the timetables of the review of the findings and recommendations of the Academic Service Units and the Strategic Plan for Information Technology appear incorrect. The timelines need to be checked and clarified (page 22, first two bullets) *Timelines have been checked and seem reasonable with spring 2004 as the first point of reference and recommendations due to campus governance bodies in fall 2004. Allowing a calendar year seems a reasonable timeline.* DD

**Motion 03-29: (Imada/Chernisky) To approve the Midterm Report with the Senate’s recommendations.**

PASSED — Unanimously

Kay Caldwell was asked to come to the Senate to clarify any misunderstandings that may have occurred regarding the Tuesday/Thursday Schedule Initiative. She explained how the Language Art’s division constantly has problems scheduling classes due to the limited classroom space available, and the fact that the Language courses meet four times a week, creating problems with the Tuesday/Thursday schedule. In the past, the Language Arts division was able to meet scheduling needs by borrowing classrooms from UH West Oahu and other divisions. This is becoming more difficult. The suggested Schedule Initiative was made to increase the number of course offerings during high demand times, thereby meeting student needs. The proposal was discussed by the Division Chairs in June as to the pro’s and con’s. The Division Chairs said that they would be willing to try and have meetings at 1:30 instead of the 12:30 time slot on Tuesday and Thursday. Kay will try to schedule lecturers to teach during the 1:30 time slots so that faculty will be free for meetings. She does feel that if agreed upon, the scheduling change should be reviewed in three semesters. So a sunset clause is appropriate. Discussion of the various issues faculty members shared via email or to various senators ensued. The general feeling of the senate was that if the schedule initiative is attempted, that an evaluation of how it impacts attendance of faculty and student meetings be done.

**Motion 03-30: (Imada/Yokotake) The proposed Tuesday/Thursday Schedule Initiative is approved with a one and a half Sunset provision (Spring 2004, Fall 2004, and Spring 2005). Data will be collected on the effects of the schedule change**
on faculty and student committee meetings by the affected parties. The schedule will revert back in Fall 2005.

PASSED-Y=13, N=1, Ab=0

ADJOURNMENT: The meeting was adjourned at 4:20 PM.

RESPECTFULLY SUBMITTED: Candace Hochstein, Secretary
Hi Doug,

Here is the report with revisions/additions from last Friday’s AIC Chairs meeting. It’s beginning to take shape and the content is looking MUCH better. There are a few spots that I think still need some tweaking—section on COMPASS testing, PHIs, College-Identified Concern #41 is blank; there may be more. I hope you’ll be able to clear up some of the bumps and pukas.

Until the next go-around next Friday...

Susan
PREPARATION OF THE FOCUSED MIDTERM REPORT

The Accrediting Commission for the Community and Junior Colleges (ACCJC) reaffirmed the accreditation of Leeward Community College on January 19, 2001, with one requirement, that the College submit an Interim Report by November 1, 2002.

An Interim Report, authored by Clement Fujimoto, was submitted on October 7, 2002. Although the visiting team’s Evaluation Report contained eight recommendations, the Interim Report focused on three—Curriculum Revision and Review, Campus Council Constituency Roles and Governance, and Administrative Instability and Turnover.

The Focused Midterm Report begins with the process described in the Interim Report. To summarize:

- Chancellor Mark Silliman (then Interim Provost) “proposed the establishment of eight Accreditation Implementation Committees (AICs) to address respectively the eight accreditation recommendations and the related College-identified concerns [Action Plans]” (Interim Report 1).

- After consulting with his administrative staff, the then Accreditation Liaison Officer, and the Executive Committees of both the Faculty Senate and the Campus Council, the Chancellor organized seven AICs because one of the eight recommendations (safety and storage of student records) could be addressed by the Dean of Student Services and the Registrar (Interim Report 2). Although delayed by a faculty strike in April, the Chancellor completed the organization of the seven AICs to ensure broad campus participation in the spring of 2001. The seven AICs are made up of faculty and staff from all campus units and constituencies. Committee membership was finalized in spring of 2001. The seven Accreditation Implementation Committees are as follows:

  1. Curriculum Revision and Review
  2. Campus Council Constituency Roles and Governance
  3. Administrative Instability and Turnover
  4. Degrees and Certificates (Learning Outcomes and General Education Component)
  5. Program Reviews/Program Health Indicators
  6. Placement Testing Impacts
  7. Strategic Planning for Technology and Information/Learning Resources

- An Accreditation Implementation Oversight Committee made up of the Chairs or Co-Chairs and Vice Chairs of the seven AICs, the College’s Chancellor, Accreditation Liaison Officer, Institutional Research Analyst, and an ex-officio faculty member who is an ACCJC Commissioner, was created in Fall 2001 to oversee and coordinate all of the accreditation recommendations.
In addition to addressing three carryover concerns from the 1994 accreditation visit, this Focused Midterm Report addresses the five new recommendations made by the 2000 visiting team and the College-identified issues from the 2000 Self-Study. The three carryover concerns are:

1. Campus Council Constituency Roles and Governance (Standards 10B.8, 10B.9, 10B.10) - "The team recommends that the college clearly define the role of all constituencies on the Campus Council" (Evaluation Report 7).

2. Administrative Instability and Turnover (Standard 10B.4) - "The team recommends that the college analyze factors that may be contributing to administrative instability and turnover and develop appropriate local responses" (Evaluation Report 7).

3. Curriculum Revision and Review (Standards 4D.2, 4D.6) - "The team recommends that curriculum review and revision be made a systematic and cyclical process with the goal of assuring academic rigor and integrity in all courses and programs" (Evaluation Report 6).

The five new recommendations are:

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

2. "... that the college identify and make public expected learning outcomes for all its degree and certificate programs; that the general education component of all degree programs be published in clear and complete terms in the general catalog; that the general education component be based on a philosophy and rationale that are clearly stated and publicized; and that criteria be provided by which the appropriateness of each course in the general education component is determined" (Evaluation Report #).

3. "... that the college review the changes in placement scores that have resulted from its use of the COMPASS test and develop appropriate response strategies in the student services and instructional areas to ensure that students achieve their educational goals in as timely and efficient a manner as possible" (Evaluation Report 8-9).

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

5. "...that the college formalize its planning procedures in the areas of technology and information and learning resources to address needs in the following areas: determining the sufficiency of information and learning resources, planning for the acquisition and maintenance of educational equipment and materials, ensuring accessibility of
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information and learning resources, providing professionally qualified staff, ensuring sufficient and consistent financial support, forging outside agreements, and evaluating the adequacy and effectiveness of learning and information resources and services” (evaluation report 9).

this report drew heavily from the final reports submitted by each of the seven AIC’s in April 2003. the report underwent review by the faculty senate and campus council in August 2003. the community-at-large also had significant opportunity for input and revision via the college’s accreditation website. extensive AIC meeting notes were also made available on the website to provide information on the college’s progress in addressing accreditation concerns and to solicit college and community based input during the entire three year process.

a number of unforeseen circumstances has required the college to adjust, sometimes considerably, its original plans for addressing the accreditation recommendations and college-identified action plans. although we find ourselves presently satisfied with our progress in a number of areas, others underwent less progress than we had intended. furthermore, the editor formerly assigned to complete this report took ill, and a new editor, less familiar with the issues and history, stepped in at the last minute to complete the task. the college takes the ACCJC recommendations and its own self-identified recommendations very seriously. thus, although the report may suggest little progress in certain areas of concern, the issues at hand are still very much being addressed by all employees of the college.
CURRICULUM REVISION AND REVIEW (Standards 4D.2, 4D.6)

Recommendation

"The team recommends that curriculum review and revision be made a systematic and cyclical process with the goal of assuring academic rigor and integrity in all courses and programs" (Evaluation Report 6).

Concerns of the Visiting Team

There continues to be no formal system, policy, or practice to ensure consistency of course content, objectives, and standards from the time a course is approved to the present, and division chairs should ensure that all syllabi are regularly compared with their relevant outline[s]...[and] are consistent with the outline on record for that course. Periodic review of established Core Outlines should be formalized and institutionalized to assure the currency and continued appropriateness of curriculum content, instructional methods, course activities, and student competencies. (Evaluation Report 6).

College’s Response/Action Taken on the Recommendation

Since the interim report was written, the committee met on September 10, October 1, October 15, and November 19, 2002, and in the spring 2003 semester, on February 28th. A campus-wide open forum was held October 10. The revised draft was sent to all academic divisions for review and endorsement and then was presented to the Faculty Senate at their December 11 meeting and passed unanimously (with amendments) at their February 5 meeting. The policy was sent to the Chancellor on March 12, 2003 and signed by him on March 20. See Appendix # for a copy of the policy titled Curriculum Revision and Review.

The purpose of the policy is to establish “procedures for institutionalizing curriculum revision and review, and for the periodic review of core outlines and course syllabi with the goal of assuring academic rigor and integrity in all courses and programs and of assuring the continued appropriateness of curriculum content, instructional methods, course activities and objectives, and student competencies” (Final Report of the AIC-CRR 1).

The policy calls for the division/discipline coordinators to be responsible for initial curriculum revision and review. All courses must be reviewed at least every six years, with divisions determining the schedule. The review by the faculty will ensure the academic rigor, integrity, and currency of the core outlines and their continued articulation with the courses of system colleges.

If faculty determine no changes are necessary, the division chair will input this information into Curriculum Central. If changes are deemed necessary, normal procedures for curriculum modifications will be followed.
Curriculum Central will be modified so that the essential elements needed for course syllabi are standardized with the same initial information. This standard information will become the first page(s) of each course syllabus. Additional pages of the syllabus will reflect the individuality, style, and creativity of the instructor. Each discipline will compare the core outlines of the revised courses with the individual syllabi of the faculty within the current semester. If the syllabi do not reflect the required elements of the core outline, the discipline, along with the division chair, will work with the faculty to correct the discrepancies within the current semester.

During the spring 2003 semester, 13 meetings were held with faculty from each discipline to explain the policy. A proposal was made and agreed to by the Curriculum Committee, the Faculty Senate as a whole, and the Vice Chancellor/Chief Academic Officer to have an “amnesty” period of three weeks at the end of the semester for the discipline coordinators to input student learning outcomes (SLOs) into their courses without involving the usual Curriculum Committee process. The results were that 90+% of the courses being offered in the fall 2003 schedule were modified.

Curriculum Central was also modified as stated in the approved policy. Faculty were able to produce the first page of their syllabus, which included the essential elements—most especially the SLOs—in time for the fall 2003 semester.

At the start of the fall semester, division chairs and coordinators were instructed by their respective deans to implement the last two sections of the policy and report on their findings. Results will be documented and posted on the assessment webpage.

Assessment of the Progress Made in Addressing the Team's Recommendation

The College has made significant progress in creating and implementing “a systematic and cyclical process “of curricular revision and review. The issue of “assuring academic rigor,” however, remains a faculty responsibility and will be addressed by the disciplines.

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

To ensure uniformity in class offerings, in fall 2003, the discipline coordinators/division chairs will analyze and compare the syllabi with the appropriate core outlines.
CAMPUS COUNCIL CONSTITUENCY ROLES AND GOVERNANCE (Standards 10B.8, 10B.9, 10B.10)

Recommendation

"The team recommends that the college clearly define the role of all constituencies on the Campus Council" (Evaluation Report 7).

Concerns of the Visiting Team

In response to Commission recommendations in 1994 that "the college develop and implement a written policy that articulates a decision making process that is representative and that clearly states the role of faculty, support staff and students[, t]he College set up the Campus Council, a representative governance body...and established a Charter and By-laws for the body....However, at the time of the team visit, there was considerable tension on campus regarding the roles of constituent groups in the Campus Council" (Evaluation Report 6-7).

College Response/Action Taken on the Recommendation

After "widespread input from all campus constituencies," the Shared Governance Policy and Principles of Shared Governance were approved by the Faculty Senate on November 27, 2002 and by the Campus Council on March 6, 2003 (AIC-CCCRG Memo titled Completion of Mission...). Chancellor Mark Silliman approved the policy on May 15, 2003. On May 22, 2003 the Chancellor mass emailed the campus to announce the approval of the policy as well as to share the final text of the policy. The policy was also placed in the FYI Handbook, a manual provided to all new hires and a major component of all new hire orientations. The AIC on Campus Council Constituency Roles and Governance also wrote Report on the Relationship of the Faculty Senate to the Campus Council and a description of Campus Council Constituencies to explain and further clarify the roles of the faculty Senate and Campus Council and the constituencies they serve. This report was accepted and approved by the Provost on May 30, 2003. See Appendix # for copies of The Shared Governance Policy of Leeward Community College, Principles of Shared Governance, and Report on the Relationship of the Faculty Senate to the Campus Council and a description of Campus Council Constituencies.

Assessment of the Progress Made in Addressing the Team's Recommendation

The policy addresses the visiting team's concerns by clarifying the composition and roles of each governing body and by providing the campus with a written policy which further identifies and clarifies each of governing bodies and their roles with regard to college-wide issues such as the budget and overall academic planning.

Plan of Actions to Be Completed Before the Next Self-Study and Evaluation Visit
To ensure the continued success of the College’s efforts, a policy review committee will be formed to address concerns as to whether a policy is being followed, abused, or is in need of revision. The Director of Policy, Planning, and Assessment will be tasked with setting up the committee and appointing an ombudsman to listen to and follow-up on complaints and concerns.

All approved policies will be placed on the College’s website for access by all interested and affected parties.
ADMINISTRATIVE INSTABILITY AND TURNOVER

Recommendation

"The team recommends that the college analyze factors that may be contributing to administrative instability and turnover and develop appropriate local responses" (Evaluation Report 7).

Concerns of the Visiting Team

In 1994, the Commission noted, “instability caused by frequent turnover in administrative positions.” In 2000, the College’s Self-Study acknowledged “awareness that the small number of administrators led to a depletion of energy and will power.” The Evaluation team “also noted that the administrative evaluation system is unclear, and administrators typically do not receive any information or documentation regarding their evaluation once it is completed, which suggests a lack of constructive feedback that would assist in their professional growth” (Evaluation Report 7).

College’s Response/Action Taken on the Recommendation

The AIC on Administrative Instability and Turnover made a number of recommendations intended to alleviate the problem of administrative turnover and to address the concerns of the visiting team. Some of the proposed solutions or recommendations include: providing administrators with pay increases; insurance coverage for professional liability; appropriate on-the-job training or administrative internships for would-be administrators from the faculty or staff; more meaningful and helpful evaluations and feedback for professional growth and improvement; opportunities and funding to attend conferences which will benefit the College as well as the administrator; and relief from heavy workloads and stressful working conditions through additional staffing. Some of these suggestions, especially those requiring additional funds and system-wide agreements, are not within the College’s control.

Since the committee’s suggestions were made, Chancellor Mark Silliman has implemented several of them. The first, called for administrators to receive constructive feedback on their job performance, and it was already in progress as an annual review process. In recent years, the UH administration has sent by email an evaluation form to selected faculty and administration known as a 360° Evaluation. This evaluation technique randomly selects a total of 45-50 respondents from three categories. First, peers or colleagues working at the same level of responsibility may be drawn from throughout the system, next subordinates from the campus and finally “constituents” whom the administrator serves from the campus provide the three categories of respondents. The evaluation format asks the respondents for a rating of the administrator employing a Likert Scale to gauge performance in eight areas. These evaluations are completed and returned to the Provost/Chancellor to share with administrators. Although the evaluations are confidential, the Chancellor and the administrator are able to use the results as a constructive way of determining how past performance has been perceived by
the campus community. Finally, Chancellor Silliman has supplemented the 360° evaluative system with a request that all Administrative officers including himself prepare specific professional and personal goal statements to be shared with the administrative staff at the beginning of the academic year. In the end of year review of the results of the 360° evaluation the Chancellor and each administrator also discuss the progress made toward accomplishing identified goals.

Staff development measures have been taken in line with the AIC Committee recommendations as well. The Staff Development Office has developed and implemented a Supervisory Skills Workshop of two days duration that has been offered once during Spring 2003 semester and once during the Summer 2003. The workshop is available to all levels of supervisory positions from administration through division chair and unit head positions to the level of sub-unit supervisory positions. Additionally, the administrative team has been authorized to budget funds for one professional development trip per academic year for each administrator. Administrators are also experimenting with President Evan Dobelle’s suggestion of spending a day out of their offices to allow for concentrated, undisturbed attention to their duties and to help alleviate morale problems. The effect of the aforementioned practice can not yet be determined due to the short time since it has been implemented. However, this new feature of the administrative milieu and practice at the college enables the administrative team the freedom to focus time, effort and attention on projects requiring concentrated effort, or otherwise requiring time away from the desk. The discipline and demands of the desk generally dictate time modules of no more than twenty uninterrupted minutes before the next inquiry, request or problem arises. The day away from the desk allows administrators some respite from this discipline without damaging the College because the administrative team remains accessible by cellular phone and/or email for pressing emergencies. Moreover, the days away from the desk are spaced out to assure that the campus is at all times served by the Chancellor or the Vice Chancellor.

Finally, the System Human Resources Office is committed to filling new administrative posts with a salary figure that is equal to at least the 20th percentile of the College and University Professional Association for Human Resources (CUPA) index of comparative salaries for administrators nationally. Although the System had hoped to bring all administrators up to this level, budgetary constraints have required the fall-back position of bringing newly engaged administrators up to this level.

Suggestions produced by a campus-wide Reorganization Committee to relieve the heavy administrative workload by taking on additional staff, have proven much more difficult to implement. Chancellor Silliman had appointed the Reorganization Committee to determine if the College’s programs and services would be improved if changes in its organizational structure were made, a move strongly recommended by then-Chancellor of the Community College System, Dr. Joyce S. Tsunoda. After its investigations, the Reorganization Committee concluded that changes might be beneficial. However, before going ahead with specific changes at the college level Chancellor Silliman decided that it would be better to wait until the larger reorganization changes proposed by the newly appointed University of Hawaii System President, Evan Dobelle, were put into effect.
Under this new UH system reorganization, the Office of the Chancellor for the Community Colleges has been replaced with the Council of Chancellors, the Provosts of the community colleges have become the Chancellors of their respective campuses, and Chief Academic Officers (CAO) have been created at each community college. The Provost becomes a Chancellor and will be in charge of budget and external matters. Although the job description of the new Chancellors remain to be seen, it is clear that the post carries the authority of a Chief Executive Officer of the campus with reporting lines direct to the President of the University.

Chancellor Silliman took the University of Hawai‘i reorganization as the cue to propose a College reorganization that would mesh with the system reorganization. Pursuant to this end, a Chief Academic Officer’s (CAO) position was proposed that will entail general supervisory responsibility over Student Services, the Office of Continuing Education and Training (OCET) as well as the previous duties overseeing the academic programs and their support services. The Dean of Student Services and the Director of OCET would both be addressed as Deans and fall under the purview of the CAO along with three other officers: two Assistant Deans to be made Deans, placing them on the same level with the heads of Student Services and OCET (the position of Assistant Dean of Instruction will be upgraded and titled the Dean of Arts and Sciences, and the Assistant Dean for Academic Services will also be upgraded to Dean of Academic Services). A new administrative position, Dean of Career and Technical Education, will be added on the same line of responsibility. The replacement of an Assistant Dean of Instruction by two new Deans replaces a staff administrator with two line administrators who will subsume the duties of a Dean of Instruction as it relates to the respective academic divisions under their charge (see Appendix for organizational charts).

Two other administrators will report directly to the Chancellor: 1.) the already existing Director of Administrative Services with oversight of the Human Resources Office, Business Office and Operations and Maintenance, and 2.) the proposed Director of Planning, Policy, and Assessment, with oversight of the institutional research and assessment services, the strategic planning process, the accreditation process, and the marketing strategy for the college. These positions will not be directly under the CAO but will have the status on campus similar to the Deans.

Under the present structure, the Dean of Instruction oversees all six of the College’s academic divisions. Under the proposed structure, the Dean of Arts and Sciences would be responsible for four divisions, and the Dean of Career and Technical Education for two. Such a division of labor should alleviate the stressful work load situation confronting the Instructional Services Office and address the evaluation team’s recommendation. It is also hoped that placing student services and OCET functions directly under the CAO will better coordinate campus affairs, especially since there is often overlap between the various services. Finally, the addition of a Director of Policy, Planning and Assessment will address the ongoing challenges of effective and efficient program review and strategic planning for a campus that is located in the fastest growing district of O‘ahu.
This restructuring plan was unveiled in January 2003 and there has been great discussion regarding its merits throughout the campus. Chancellor Silliman facilitated a broad based campus discussion by employing mass emailing of the plan, its rationale and accompanying proposed organizational charts. Additionally, the Chancellor hosted a campus forum that was attended by more than 80 faculty and staff where concerns were gathered and adjustments made in the organizational chart. Both the Faculty Senate and the Campus Council have struggled with trying to understand its positive and negative effects. Nevertheless, the Faculty Senate passed the reorganization proposal on Wednesday, March 5th, while the Campus Council approved it on Thursday, March 6th. Both bodies wanted it understood that constituent faculty and staff be represented in the development of job descriptions, as well as the selection process for the new positions and their eventual occupants. The College will need to revisit accreditation concerns in regards to administrative instability once the administrative structure stabilizes some. Presently, the Committee feels it is too early to institutionalize further evaluative procedures.

Assessment of the Progress Made in Addressing the Team's Recommendation

The use of the 360° Evaluation system as devised by the system has its flaws; however, it does provide a broad based source of information about administrator strengths and weaknesses. Taken together with the discussion of goals statements, the review of the results of the 360° provides each member of the administrative team a chance to hold constructive discussions with Chancellor Silliman to review personal performance in the context of the overall campus situation. The effect of these evaluative measures has been perceived by the administrative team as being a constructive team building measure.

The staff development measures taken are all appropriate responses to the problem of administrative turnover insofar as each can contribute to alleviating the sense of isolation that sometimes bedevils the career of an administrator. For instance, the supervisory skills workshop brings all levels of supervisors together to consider the challenges that all face in common. The commitment to a professional development trip each academic year helps to break the geographic isolation from administrative colleagues outside the state. Finally, the day away from the office has the potential to free the administrators from the tyranny of the desk and helps to accomplish goals requiring concentrated effort or allows direct personal interaction with campus constituents.

Finally, the proposed reorganization of the administrative structure including the addition of two new administrative posts represents the most significant of the measures taken to reduce the stress caused by understaffing. The addition of a dedicated administrator to oversee planning, policy and assessment is consistent with the challenges facing a college that is located in the fastest growing district of O'ahu. As the demands placed upon the College grow, its programs and policies must make demonstrable contributions to its surrounding service-area communities. Moreover, the creation of a new line authority position for instructional services enables the College to dedicate one dean to the Arts and Sciences transfer program and another to the Career and Technical education program that will play an increasingly important role as the communities of West O'ahu continue to grow.
Plan of Actions to Be Completed Before the Next Self-Study and Evaluation Visit

To ensure the continued success of the College’s efforts, further review of the effectiveness of the 360° Evaluation system as a feedback system for administrators will be done. The Human Resources Office of the System level has devised the system and is charged with implementing it. Informally, administrators have indicated that the system tends to aggregate too many activities to be evaluated within the eight fields that it asks respondents to review. Other possible issues relate to the selection of respondents in a manner that assures that the constituents selected as respondents actually are supervised by the administrator to be evaluated.

The reorganization of the college administration is complete as it applies to the Chancellor and the Chief Academic Officer positions. However, the College will need to advertise and fill the CAO position during the Fall 2003 semester. The other changes proposed in the reorganization must all be approved by the System Human Resources Office and the College is prepared to submit the plan for this review during the fall 2003 semester. Pending the selection of a CAO the College may be required to fill the Dean of Arts and Sciences position. Pending the approval of the reorganization plan the College must then fill the Dean of Career and Technical Education position, as well as the Director of Planning, Policy and Assessment position. Finally, pending the reorganization of the Student Information System (BANNER) Office, the College may have an opening for the Dean of Student Services position. At least two and possibly all four of the aforementioned positions will be filled during the spring 2004 semester as conditions may require. The College has permanent occupants serving in four of its administrative posts including the Chancellor, Director of Administrative Services, Director (Dean under the reorganization) of OCET, and Assistant Dean (Dean under the reorganization) of Academic Services.
PROGRAM HEALTH INDICATORS

Recommendation

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

Concerns of the Visiting Team

Program review needs to be done across the campus, in all programs, and especially student services, to effect a process that will guide decision making and program improvement.

College Response/Actions Taken on the Recommendation

Since the Accreditation Team's visit in October 2000, the College has taken a more holistic approach to program review and student learning outcomes. The AIC on Program Review/Health Indicators developed a policy in response to the accreditation team's recommendation. After receiving broad-based input from a campus-wide open forum and review by the Faculty Senate on February 12, 2003 and the Campus Council on March 6, 2003, the policy on unit/area reviews (program reviews) was submitted to the Chancellor for approval on March 24, 2003. The policy was signed and approved by the Chancellor on May 12, 2003. The Unit/Area Review (Program Review) Policy supplements the University of Hawaii, Executive Policy – Administration, E5.202 Review of Established Programs, June 1987 and modifies the PHI model. This policy provides the structure and process for review of all programs and services regarding performance improvement and student learning outcomes and develops a basis for decision-making. See Appendix for a copy of Unit/Area Review (Program Review) Policy.

The Faculty Senate appointed a chair for the proposed Program Review Committee, a subcommittee of the Faculty Senate responsible for program review of instructional programs. This committee will be similar to the current Curriculum Committee (with representation from each division) and carry out the policy regarding instructional program reviews under the direction of the Vice Chancellor/Chief Academic Officer. One of the first tasks the Program Review Committee will undertake will be to incorporate the work of faculty assessment committee members who have designed assessment instruments for writing, speech, and math. These assessment instruments will become part of the instructional program review process, to the extent possible. To help the committee set goals and priorities the data received from the College's administration of the Academic Profile from Educational Testing Service (ETS), to a random sample of students in spring 2003, will be used to establish benchmarks for reading, writing, math, and critical thinking.
In spring 2003, the Student Services units began identifying outcome measures for their units. This information was passed along to the individual units to assist in setting goals and procedures.

**Assessment of the Progress Made in Addressing the Team's Recommendation**

The College is pleased with its creation of a policy of program review for instructional and non-instructional units and areas. The College created and adopted a policy on program review that divided the College into units and established a person responsible for each unit, developed a template to be used for reporting outcomes and their measured performance, and determined that there would be annual program reviews for all units of the College.

Due to the extraordinary time commitments placed on Student Service personnel by the implementation of the Banner Student Information System, the Visiting Team's specific charge regarding student services has not proceeded as expeditiously as we had hoped; however, the process of creating the policy has enabled the College to make important decisions with regard to the relevance and applicability of its other program review process, PHIs.

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

To ensure the continued success of the College's efforts at establishing regular program reviews, the Unit/Area Review (Program Review) Policy will be implemented. In Spring 2005, the administrative team and the Faculty Senate will evaluate the College's progress toward achieving the goals of the review policy and make recommendations for altering the process if necessary.

The individual units under Student Services will begin their data collection in fall 2003. Individual units will establish procedures and timelines for their program reviews that comply with the policy and fit their unit's needs. Other non-instructional administrative support units/areas will begin to develop outcome measures for their units at the discretion of the Chancellor and unit Dean/Directors. Individual units will establish procedures and timelines for program reviews that comply with the policy and fit their unit's needs. Data collection will begin in spring 2004.

The College plans to develop an assessment website in fall 2003 where assessment information and the approved template report forms may be posted and a draft of an assessment handbook is currently in process.
LEARNING OUTCOMES

Recommendation

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

Concerns of the Visiting Team

Learning outcomes and the general education component of all degree programs are not included in the college catalog. The general education component should be based on a clearly stated and publicized philosophy and rationale as well as criteria for course appropriateness in the determination of the general education component.

College Response/Action Taken on the Recommendation

Leeward Community College has three degree programs (A.A., A.S., and A.A.S.) and several certificate programs. The general education component of all degree programs and learning outcomes for these degrees and certificates were formulated and approved at the systems level and can be found in Chancellor for Community Colleges Memo #6004 (November 4, 1996) and University of Hawaii General Education Project Memo, dated March 17, 1997. (An additional skills standard, "non-linear thinking," was added by the LCC Senate.*) These outcomes were incorporated into the 2002-2003 LCC Catalog.

The philosophy and rationale for the general education requirement is clearly stated on page 12 of Appendix 2 of CCCM# 6004. This two-paragraph statement presents a clear rationale and philosophy for the general education component and does so at the System level. These were incorporated into the 2002-2003 LCC Catalog.

The criteria for the appropriateness of the inclusion of courses into the general education component were, again, established at the systems level. University of Hawaii General Education Project Memo, dated March 17, 1997, provides an explanation of the mechanism through which these standards were developed. The appropriate section reads as follows:

"The skill standards set forth in this document are the result of (1) a 1995-96 survey of faculty, the results of which were presented at 12 campus and system meetings, (2) a 1996 survey of graduating/leaver students at all university of Hawaii campuses, (3) five system-wide meetings of faculty and administrators,
and (4) faculty responses to previous drafts of these skill standards” (Page 2 of 10).

General Education Outcomes and Associate in Arts Degree Competencies (pages 45-49 in the 2002-2003 LCC Catalog) are shared with all of the Divisions and Curriculum Committee members as a reminder that any course proposed for the core needs to conform to the requirements denoted in the relevant documents.

The College held discipline meetings during the spring 2003 semester to explain the new policy on curriculum revision and review, and the importance of student learning outcomes (SLOs). All faculty were emailed samples of SLOs, developed by LCC faculty, to serve as examples, and a group of faculty agreed to serve as mentors/guides for anyone requesting assistance in developing SLOs for their own courses. 90+% of fall 2003 courses were modified in Curriculum Central to include SLOs.

Assessment of the Progress Made in Addressing the Team's Recommendation

The College identified the expected learning outcomes for all its degree and certificate programs and published the information in the College catalog. The philosophy and rationale for the general education component were also included in the College Catalog.

One of the initiatives already completed by the College was the Educational Testing Services’ Academic Profile Exam. This exam measured students’ general education competencies in the areas of reading, writing, math, and critical thinking. The results suggested that the students at Leeward Community College perform at a level comparable to community college students nationally.

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

To ensure the continued success of the College’s efforts, the program review policy and the curriculum revision and review policy will be implemented so that the general education requirements of all degree and certificate programs are continually appraised.
PLACEMENT TESTING IMPACTS

Recommendation

“The team recommends that the college review the changes in placement scores that have resulted from its use of the COMPASS test and develop appropriate response strategies in the student services and instructional areas to ensure that students achieve their educational goals in as timely and efficient a manner as possible” (Evaluation Report 8-9).

Concerns of the Visiting Team

The College’s use of the COMPASS placement test resulted in “an increase in students placing into remedial courses and a decrease in students placing into college-level courses, especially in writing” (Evaluation Report 8).

College Response/Action Taken on the Recommendation

Because the COMPASS test cut off scores could not be changed and ACT data had to be received and reviewed before the College could make any decisions regarding the validity of the test’s interpretation and cut-off scores, the College implemented the following strategies to address this recommendation:

1. Upon completion of the COMPASS test, every incoming student receives a one-on-one interview with a member of the testing/counseling staff. This is done to ensure that each student understands his/her own test scores. At this time, it is also determined if the student has experienced any problems relative to the testing session or if s/he has any concerns relating to his or her placement.

2. Both English and Math disciplines have developed waiver systems to accommodate students who feel that the COMPASS test did not place them accurately. In English, students write an essay and/or retake the reading test. In Math, department members review high school math classes and grades and interview the student, or the student is retested with the LCC Math test (LCC’s former placement instrument and current back-up math test). After one or both of these actions, a decision on math placement is made.

3. In addition, for the Math portion of the COMPASS test, the order of the questions has been changed and the algebra questions appear first.

4. Math 22, a course designed to provide students with further work in algebra and preparation for advanced mathematics courses, and English 18/19, two courses created to provide students with essential reading and writing skills, have been added to the curriculum to help students prepare for college level work.
In addition, current response strategies that focus on test preparation are:

1. Introductory letters sent to students who plan to attend LCC now include the ACT website (http://www.act.org/compass/index.html) and the campus locations of the test prep book, Chart Your Success on the Compass as two more than adequate resources for students needing further preparation for the COMPASS test. In addition to being available on campus at the LCC Library, the LRC, and the Math Lab, the test prep books can be found at LCC-Waianae, public libraries in the area and Waipahu High School. Moreover, the Assessment Coordinator is in the process of making the book available to three other area high schools.

2. The LRC staff is aware of the ACT website and facilitates students wishing to learn more about COMPASS and take practice tests.

3. Test preparation at the high schools includes counselors coming to LCC to take the COMPASS test as well as the Assessment Coordinator setting up four area high schools (Pearl City, Campbell, Waialua, and Waipahu) for onsite testing. The latter began with Campbell in mid-October 2002.

4. The Assessment Coordinator, in cooperation with Waipahu High School and the Chancellor’s Office, offered the opportunity to take the COMPASS test to 500 juniors at Waipahu High School in the spring of 2003.

5. The Assessment Coordinator keeps track of the waivers in both English and Math to see how many exceptions were made and to follow-up on the students who received the waivers. In English, 69 students were tested and 20 were granted waivers. Of those 20, 5 did not register and there is no information on 4. Of the 11 who registered for the higher class, 8 passed (4 earned an A; 1 earned a B; 3 earned a C; 1 withdrew; 1 received an I or incomplete; 1 received an N). Therefore, 72.7% successfully completed the course. Data is currently being collected on students who receive Math waivers.

6. In March 2003 the community college system reported to the campus the results of the four year Hawaii CC campuses/ACT validity study. Our English and Math faculties are currently studying the ACT recommendations and will recommend changes in cut-off scores in the near future. The availability of this data will facilitate the refinement of our current cut-off scores in order to provide students with the most accurate placement.

Assessment of the Progress Made in Addressing the Team’s Recommendation

The College’s current practice of employing a multi-test system is pedagogically appropriate with regard to placement testing.

Plan of Actions to Be Completed Before the Next Self-Study and Evaluation Visit
To ensure the continued success of the College's efforts, system-wide cut-off scores and the validity of testing mechanisms will be explored and analyzed. The College will also participate in a system-wide meeting to look at alternatives to the COMPASS tests.
STORAGE AND SAFETY OF STUDENT RECORDS

Recommendation

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

Concerns of the Visiting Team

Student records and files are stored in three locations and may not be secure.

College Response/Actions Taken on the Recommendation

The Permanent Record Card (PRC), the College's first student record system, was used until 1989. These paper transcripts have been scanned to optical disc. The PRCs are now stored in fireproof cabinets in a separate building (DA Building) away from the Admissions and Records Office. Data from the computerized Aldrich Student Information System, in use from 1989 through April 2002, was saved on computer data tape and optical discs and stored in fireproof media containers located in the Library building.

With the adoption of the SCT Banner Student Information System in April 2002, student records are no longer stored in computers located on campus. All student records from the Aldrich SIS have been migrated to the new Banner SIS. All current student records are kept on the Banner computer located on the University of Hawaii Manoa campus. The University practices standard data backup procedures.

Assessment of the Progress Made in Addressing the Team's Recommendation

The College believes it has successfully addressed this recommendation.

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

None
STRATEGIC PLANNING FOR TECHNOLOGY AND INFORMATION/LEARNING RESOURCES

Recommendation

"The team recommends that the college formalize its planning procedures in the areas of technology and information and learning resources to address needs in the following areas: determining the sufficiency of information and learning resources, planning for the acquisition and maintenance of educational equipment and materials, ensuring accessibility of information and learning resources, providing professionally qualified staff, ensuring sufficient and consistent financial support, forging outside agreements, and evaluating the adequacy and effectiveness of learning and information resources and services" (Evaluation Report 9).

Concerns of the Visiting Team

Long-term planning practices in the areas of technology and information and learning resources have not been formalized so as to provide a basis for local decision-making and as a blueprint for advocacy within the System.

College Response/Action Taken on the Recommendation

Currently, the campus is in the process of a major reorganization. The proposed organization restructures Academic Support into five divisions under a Dean of Academic Services. As part of this reorganization, Campus Server Services, College Computing Labs, Computer Repair, Networking, and Campus Computing have been organized into one division, the Information Technology Group. The reorganization required each Academic Service Unit to formally adopt functional statements clearly stating the responsibilities and activities of each division. In addition, during spring 2003, the Academic Service Divisions drafted formal mission statements. These activities have clarified sometimes ambiguous roles and, particularly in the case of the Information Technology Group, have brought coherence and order to computer services.

The reorganization has positioned the College and the Academic Service Divisions to make greater strides in strategic planning, local decision-making, and advocacy with the system. The next step is the establishment of formal policies and procedures to ensure adequate, accessible, and effective technology and learning resources for the population the College serves.

Two activities are underway to address these concerns. In order to receive the broad-based support necessary for the overall campus to have input into long-term planning for technology and information/learning resources, the AIC for Strategic Planning and Information/Learning Resources, with representation from across the campus, was created to develop a process for formalizing planning and policies for Academic Services. Each Academic Unit will review recommendations from the AIC, document current practices, determine proposed strategies, and develop annual assessment tools that
utilize internal and external validity to measure the success of these unit goals. Currently, a formal study is being undertaken to evaluate adequacy and effectiveness of present services. This study will consist of a survey of all academic units. With input from the survey, each division, in collaboration with the Dean of Academic Services, will develop a set of annual goals. The goals will serve as an evaluative tool at year’s end.

The second process is to create a formal Strategic Plan for Information Technology Committee to also document current practices and determine plans for the future. The end result will be a Strategic Plan for Technology that aligns itself with the current Strategic Plan for Information Technology created for the University of Hawaii System. The AIC for Strategic Planning and Information/Learning Resources plans adoption and implementation in the following timetable:

- Review of the findings and recommendations of the Academic Service Units will be presented to the Faculty Senate and Campus Council in spring 2004.
- The Strategic Plan for Information Technology will be presented to the Faculty Senate and Campus Council in spring 2004.
- The draft of these findings will be posted on the campus website.
- Forums will be held in spring 2004 to address campus concerns.
- Findings and recommendations of the Academic Service Units and the Strategic Plan for Information Technology to be approved by the Faculty Senate, the Campus Council, and the Chancellor.
- The Dean of Academic Services will implement the recommended policies and procedures of the findings and recommendations of the Academic Service Units and the Strategic Plan for Information Technology.
- The final draft of these findings will be posted on the campus website.

Assessment of the Progress Made in Addressing the Team’s Recommendation

The College believes it has made significant progress in this area and has a firmly established framework for future actions.

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

To ensure the continued success of the College’s efforts, the AIC for Strategic Planning and Information/Learning Resources’ timetable will be implemented as described. This will result in the College having a Strategic Plan for Information Technology in which to establish and prioritize the College’s needs and goals in the areas of information technology and learning resources.
COLLEGE-IDENTIFIED CONCERNS

STANDARD 1 - INSTITUTIONAL MISSION

1. 1.4 Evaluation and Revision. “The campus at large, including faculty, staff, students, and administrators, will be given the opportunity to review the mission statement before any additional changes are made by any one group” (46).

During spring 2001, Chancellor Mark Silliman decided to postpone any review of the College’s current mission statement because the Strategic Plans of both the UH System and UH Community Colleges were undergoing review and these initiatives had potential implications for the mission statements of the individual UH campuses. During spring 2003, after the Strategic Plans for the UH System and UH community colleges were finalized, major parts of the System’s reorganization plans were implemented, and administrative positions filled, and a committee to review the College’s mission statement was formed. In the beginning of the fall 2003 semester, the committee will present the College’s present mission statement, its recommendations, and schedule for review of the mission statement.

STANDARD 2 – INSTITUTIONAL INTEGRITY

2. 2.1 Representation of the College to the Public. “The College will compile and maintain an up-to-date listing of current publications that represent their programs and services” (50).

In fall 2001, Kathleen Cabral, LCC Publication Specialist, compiled an inventory of publications to determine the quality and accuracy of the College’s publications (See College Publication Inventory and Assessment, September 24, 2001). The Publication Specialist will conduct an inventory of all College publications every January and maintain a file of all listed publications in her office.

3. 2.9 Institutional Self-Evaluation. “The College needs to assign responsibility for the Website to a staff member or hire a webmaster to maintain the Website” (62).

Staff member Randall Araki, LCC Webmaster, has been given the responsibility of maintaining and improving the College’s website.

STANDARD 3 – INSTITUTIONAL EFFECTIVENESS

4. 3A.3 Accomplishment of Mission and Purposes. “The College will identify the time frames for conducting program reviews, identifying specific offices of responsibility, and developing outcome measures for the systematic review of programs and services for all of its activities” (69).
The newly adopted policy calls for annual program reviews of all units of the campus: Instruction, Academic Support, Student Services, Admin Services, OCET, and the Chancellor’s office. Each administrator is responsible for the assessment of his or her unit.

The Deans of Arts and Sciences and Career and Technical Education will work with the Faculty Senate to form a Program Review Committee to carry out the policy regarding instructional program reviews. Under direction of the Dean of Instruction, the committee will determine the areas of instructional programs to be assessed, the order of assessment, and timelines.

Previous faculty assessment committee members have designed assessment instruments for writing, speech, and math. To recognize these efforts and the work that has already been accomplished, the committee will incorporate these assessment instruments into the instructional program review process.

In spring 2003, the College administered the Academic Profile from Educational Testing Service to a sample of 200 students to establish benchmarks for reading, writing, math, and critical thinking.

For the Non-instructional units of the College, the policy states that administrators will be responsible for assessment of their units. Individual units will establish procedures and timelines for their program reviews that comply with the policy and fit their unit needs.

In spring 2003, the Student Services units began identifying outcome measures for their units. Because of the significant time commitments required of the Student Services personnel with the implementation of the Banner system, however, that unit has not moved as expeditiously as they would have liked.

Other administrative support units/areas will begin to develop outcome measures for their units at the discretion of the Provost and unit Dean/Directors. Individual units will establish procedures and timelines for their program reviews that comply with the policy and fit their unit needs. Data collection will begin in spring 2004.

Additionally, campus-wide activities focused on assessment include developing an assessment website where each unit will be able to post its assessment information using the template approved with the policy. A draft of an assessment handbook (currently in process) will be reviewed by all units with a projected completion date for a final approved handbook in spring 2004. Finally, in spring 2005, the administrative team and the Faculty Senate will evaluate the progress of the College in achieving the aims of the review policy and make recommendations for altering the process if necessary.

5. 3C.1 Specification of Intended Outcomes and Documentation of Their Achievement. "The Academic Assessment committee will develop methods to assess and document student achievement in the remaining competencies specified in Standards 4B.3, 4B.6 and 4C.4" (77).
In lieu of a campus-wide academic assessment committee, the College adopted a policy that delegates responsibility for program review to each unit administrator. With oversight by the respective Deans, all academic/instructional areas of the campus will be under the purview of the new Faculty Senate subcommittee on program review.

6. 3C.1 Specification of Intended Outcomes and Documentation of Their Achievement. "The College will develop methods to measure and document the achievement of its intended institutional outcomes in areas outside of academics" (77).

Non-instructional areas/units will be modeled according to the approved organizational structure. The units within one area will be reviewed at the same time. What happens in the area will be determined by the units and the Dean/Director and/or Chancellor.

STANDARD 4 – EDUCATIONAL PROGRAMS

7. 4A.1 General Provisions: Educational Needs. "The College will develop a better survey mechanism to collect data about the educational needs and wants of its students and the community-at-large" (87).

A new course evaluation form was developed by OCET in the summer of 2001 to assess the College's noncredit programs. See Appendix #. The evaluation form will be used to assess Motorcycle Safety Training in summer 2003. The form may undergo revision at the end of fall 2003 following recommendations by staff, faculty and students.

8. 4B.3 Degree and Certificate Programs: Expected Learning Outcomes. "Policies and procedures of assessment in learning outcomes will be completed by the LCC Assessment Committee. Implementation of policies and procedures will be based on the recommendations of the committee in consultation with faculty" (95).

In lieu of the assessment committee, the campus established a Faculty Senate subcommittee to be called the Program Review Committee in order to address the assessment of student learning outcomes in all instructional/academic areas.

9. 4B.5 Degree and Certificate Programs: Competence in Language and Computation. "Policies and procedures of assessment in learning outcomes will be completed by the LCC Assessment Committee. Implementation of policies and procedures will be based on the recommendations of the committee in consultation with faculty" (95).

In lieu of the assessment committee, the campus established a Faculty Senate subcommittee to be called the Program Review Committee in order to address the assessment of student learning outcomes in all instructional/academic areas.
10. **4B.6 Degree and Certificate Programs: Documentation of Technical and Professional Competence.** "Policies and procedures of assessment in learning outcomes will be completed by the LCC Assessment Committee. Implementation of policies and procedures will be based on the recommendations of the committee in consultation with faculty.

In lieu of the assessment committee, the campus established a Faculty Senate subcommittee to be called the Program Review Committee in order to address the assessment of student learning outcomes in all instructional/academic areas.

11. **4C.1 General Education: Publication of General Education.** "The College will identify in the LCC Catalog which specific courses are general education courses" (98).

The College describes its general education courses in the 2002-2003 LCC Catalog on pages 50-55.

12. **4C.1 General Education: Publication of General Education.** "The College will determine and clearly indicate in the LCC Catalog which general education courses are required for each program" (98).

The College describes its general education courses in the 2002-2003 LCC Catalog on pages 50-55.

13. **4C.2 General Education: Philosophy and Rationale.** "The College will add an explanation of the College's general education philosophy and a rationale for the general education requirements to the LCC Catalog" (100).

The College describes its general education philosophy and rationale in the 2002-2003 LCC Catalog on page 45.

14. **4C.3 General Education: GE Program Content and Methodology.** "Policies and procedures of assessment in learning outcomes will be completed by the LCC Assessment Committee. Implementation of policies and procedures will be based on the recommendations of the committee in consultation with faculty" (95).

In lieu of the assessment committee, the campus established a Faculty Senate subcommittee to be called the Program Review Committee in order to address the assessment of student learning outcomes in all instructional/academic areas.

15. **4C.4 General Education: Competence in Oral and Written Communication, Scientific and Quantitative Reasoning, and Critical Analysis/Logical Thinking.** "Policies and procedures of assessment in learning outcomes will be completed by the LCC Assessment Committee. Implementation of policies and procedures will be based on the recommendations of the committee in consultation with faculty" (95).
In lieu of the assessment committee, the campus established a Faculty Senate subcommittee to be called the Program Review Committee in order to address the assessment of student learning outcomes in all instructional/academic areas.

16. 4.D.1 Curriculum and Instruction: Processes for Establishing and Evaluating Educational Programs. “The College will investigate the present Program Health Indicators in relationship to the College’s mission and institutional evaluation and planning and insure that faculty are informed about and participate in this process” (104).

The new Unit/Area Review (Program Reviews) Policy modified the existing PHIs to establish a direct relationship process between unit/area/college mission, evaluation, and planning. The College is currently reviewing its mission statement. The relationship between PHIs and the College’s mission will be analyzed during this review process.

17. 4D.1 Curriculum and Instruction: Processes for Establishing and Evaluating Educational Programs. “The College will evaluate the Liberal Arts AA degree program and integrate this evaluation with those of all the other established academic programs as part of the overall institutional evaluation and planning” (104).

In lieu of the assessment committee, the campus established a Faculty Senate subcommittee to be called the Program Review Committee in order to address the assessment of student learning outcomes in all instructional/academic areas.

18. 4D.2 Curriculum and Instruction: Quality of Instruction, Academic Rigor, and Educational Effectiveness. “The College will give instructors the final grades of all sections of the courses they taught so that they can compare the grades they gave with the aggregate grades of all other sections of the same course” (107).

No action to be taken. It was determined that the amount of work required to accomplish this was not commensurate with the amount of benefit it might produce for the few faculty who desire the information.

19. 4D.2 Curriculum and Instruction: Quality of Instruction, Academic Rigor, and Educational Effectiveness. “The College will gather random samples of Course Outlines for specific courses taught at the College and at other institutions in the System, compare them, and determine if they show the same academic rigor” (107).

The curriculum revision and review policy states that review of course outlines for academic rigor and educational effectiveness will be done on a regular cycle of at least every six years. The policy allows for each discipline to determine how they will evaluate the rigor, integrity, and currency of their courses.

20. 4D.3 Curriculum and Instruction: Evaluation of Student Learning. “The College will revisit the use of the F and N grades and determine whether the rules for
their use need to be clarified and/or standardized. The result of this will be clearly publicized to both faculty and students” (109).

The Faculty Senate was given this task and asked to survey the campus for feedback on this historically volatile issue....

21. 4D.3 Curriculum and Instruction: Evaluation of Student Learning. “The College will identify the minimum letter grade for each prerequisite and state in the LCC Catalog descriptions of all affected courses” (109).

Divisions will be instructed to make corrections in time for the 2004-2005 College Catalog.

22. 4D.5 Curriculum and Instruction: Delivery Systems and Modes of Instruction” The College will evaluate the long-term need for alternative delivery systems and provide funding for those deemed important to the College’s mission” (115).

The College is currently reviewing the mission statement. Any action in this area would be premature.

23. 4D.6 Curriculum and Instruction: Course and Program Design, Approval, Administration and Evaluation. “The College will resolve the credit-non-credit differences and integrate various evaluation components and processes into its overall institutional evaluation and planning” (118).

A representative from OCET will work closely with the Program Review Committee to develop a form that aligns credit and non-credit courses according to competencies. All courses will go on a form and the forms will be web based for ease of access. Once OCET’s courses become part of the Banner system, non-credit and credit courses will be clearly integrated.

24 4D.7 Curriculum and Instruction: Electronic Delivery Systems. “The College will insure that the appropriate resources are provided to its DE program as the number of sections offered and student enrollment change” (122).

The Strategic Plan for Information Technology Committee will develop a strategic plan to explore the College’s resource needs, especially in the area of distance education.

STANDARD 5 – STUDENT SUPPORT AND DEVELOPMENT

25. 5.9 Student Records. “The College will look into purchasing fire-resistant containers that are especially designed to protect tapes and film. The College will re-locate the back-up tapes that are currently in the Admissions and Records Office to another building on campus that is at a distance from the computers where the hard disk resides” (140).
See discussion on STORAGE AND SAFETY OF STUDENT RECORDS on page #

26. 5.10 Evaluation of Student Services. "The Student Services Division will review the PHI to determine if measures identified and the criteria established are appropriate for each of the programs evaluated. Revisions will be made appropriately. The Dean will work with each program to develop a dynamic instrument that will help the Division identify ways in which it can continually improve its delivery of services." (142).

The implementation of Banner has significantly impacted the Student Services Division and has delayed progress in this action. Is this enough? Changed to p. 11.

27. 5.10 Evaluation of Student Services. "As stated in Standard 3C.1, the College will form an Institutional Assessment Committee to develop methods to measure and document the achievement of intended outcomes in Student Services as well as academic and other non-academic areas" (142).

The College chose to delegate responsibility for assessment to each unit administrator rather than to a campus-wide assessment committee. The Dean of Student Services will oversee the assessment of his or her unit.

STANDARD 6 – INFORMATION AND LEARNING RESOURCES

28. 6.1 Sufficiency of Information and Learning Resources. "The College will clearly communicate plans regarding information and learning resources to faculty and staff" (147).

No action taken to date. Plans are in place for a strategic plan to be created and posted on the campus website for broad-based review.

29. 6.2 Acquisition and Maintenance of Educational Equipment and Materials. "The College will reconvene the Strategic Planning for Information Technology (SPIT) Committee, which will be tasked with coming up with goals and recommendations regarding technology on campus" (149).

The Strategic Plan for Information Technology Committee will develop a strategic plan to explore the College's resource needs, especially in the areas of Information and Learning Resources.

30. 6.3 Accessibility of Information and Learning Resources. "The College will develop a plan to reassess learning resource needs based on demands from winter and two summer sessions" (151).

The College has determined that funds from the summer and winter sessions are adequate to support annual summer and winter session course offerings.
31. 6.7 Adequacy and Effectiveness of Learning and Information Resources and Services. “The College will develop a plan so that all Learning Resource units conduct surveys of users to assess the effectiveness and currency of their services and resources” (158)

The Strategic Plan for Information Technology Committee will develop a strategic plan to explore the College’s resource needs, especially in the areas of Information and Learning Resources.

STANDARD 7 – FACULTY AND STAFF

32. 7A.3 Qualifications and Selection: Criteria for Selecting Faculty. “The College will, with regard to changes in faculty position advertisements from initiating units to higher levels of review, improve communication and consultation in both directions” (166).

The LCC Human Resources Office is responsible for monitoring all job advertisements. The system-wide Human Resources Office is responsible for approving all job advertisements.

33. 7B.1 Evaluation: Evaluation of Staff. “The College will evaluate the new APT and Administrative evaluation procedures are implemented, the College will evaluate the procedures for effectiveness and fairness” [exact quote] (170)

The APT and Administrative evaluation procedures are mandated by the System’s Human Resources Office. The College has no authority to change or amend the procedures.

No action to be taken.

34. 7C.1 Evaluation: Opportunities for Professional Development. “The College will explore ways to allow time for all categories of staff to learn and improve skills” (174).

The College offers extensive staff development opportunities through its Staff Development Office.

35. 7C.1 Evaluation: Opportunities for Professional Development. “The College will develop an ongoing faculty-run teaching forum to exchange ideas on campus” (174)

Currently there are a number of faculty-run activities that encourage the exchange of ideas on campus. Three of them are The Center for Innovation and Teaching and Learning, an institute dedicated to the sharing of teaching and learning innovations, various opportunities organized by and for faculty through the Staff Development Office, and the Distance Education Mentoring Program.
36. **Evaluation: Opportunities for Professional Development.** "The College will implement a supervisory skills training program open to all supervisors including staff members who supervise student assistants" (174).

Annual workshops on supervisory training occur in the spring and summer of each year. Both are well attended and described as worthwhile by administrators.

**STANDARD 8 – PHYSICAL RESOURCES**

37. **Appropriateness and Adequacy of Space Allocation.** "The College will work with the Facilities Planner at the Chancellor's Office and the faculty and staff to justify the expansion of the College and to examine ways to redesign and reallocate current space according to changing needs and functions. The College will revisit its Long Range Development Plan to support this effort" (184-185).

In 1995, the College completed its Long Range Development Plan (LRDP) which was approved by the Board of Regents in January 1996. The LRDP serves as a planning guide for future physical plant development based on updated educational specifications provided by the College. Although the LRDP serves as a plan for future campus development, there is no guarantee that the development will actually materialize. The decision to fund campus development is made at the UH System, Legislature and Governor's level.

No action to be taken.

38. **Appropriateness and Adequacy of Space Allocation.** "The College will look into fire safety codes to insure that it is in compliance" (pp 184-185)

The University of Hawaii's Environmental Health and Safety Office recently visited the College to assess fire safety. The College was authorized to spend $1,118,600 for "Fire Safety Improvements." Construction was completed in summer 2003 and replaced the College's existing fire alarm system.

39. **Access, Safety, Security, and Healthy Environment.** "The College will look into improving entry access to the LRC and Library and will explore options for providing covered parking or a covered drop-off and pick-up area and a Handi-van phone line for persons with disabilities" (189).

After looking into options for covered parking or a covered drop-off and pick-up area for Handi-van users and other disabled persons, it was determined that current budgetary constraints prevent the College from receiving the necessary funds to provide this convenience. The College has included and will continue to include, in its list of needed Repairs and Maintenance projects, automatic doors for the Library building doors to more fully comply with ADA code.
40. **8.3 Access, Safety, Security, and Healthy Environment.** "The College will vigorously pursue construction of a second access road for the campus" (189).

In 2001, the Legislature appropriated to the State Department of Transportation, Capital Improvement Projects fund, $5.25 million dollars in FY 2001-2002, for planning, design, and construction of the Leeward Community College Second Access Road.

**STANDARD 10 – GOVERNANCE AND ADMINISTRATION**

41. **10B.4 Institutional Administration and Governance: Administrative Officer’s Training, Experience, Duties and Responsibilities.** "The College will insure that administrators are given annual written evaluations of their strengths and weaknesses and be held accountable for making changes in the areas of weaknesses" (224).

42. **10B.4 Institutional Administration and Governance: Administrative Officer’s Training, Experience, Duties and Responsibilities.** "The College will insure that faculty and staff have a significant opportunity to comment on the job performance of administrators with whom they work" (224).

The 360° Evaluation system provides ample opportunity for administrators to be evaluated by 40-50 persons each year.

43. **10B.4 Institutional Administration and Governance: Administrative Officer’s Training, Experience, Duties and Responsibilities.** "The College’s process for evaluating administrators will itself be evaluated on a regular basis" (224).

The College’s Program Review Policy will ensure that administrators are evaluated on a regular basis.

44. **10B.6 Institutional Administration and Governance: Faculty Role in Institutional Governance.** "The College will widely publicize the roles and responsibilities of the Campus Council" (229).

The College’s Shared Governance Policy, with a description of the various governing bodies and their roles, can be found on the campus website, in the FYI Handbook, and LCC Catalog.

45. **10B.6 Institutional Administration and Governance: Faculty Role in Institutional Governance.** "The College will communicate to all faculty and staff the decisions and actions of the Campus Council" (229).

Campus Council minutes are printed regularly in the Campus Bulletin.
46. 10B.7 Institutional Administration and Governance: Faculty Senate Input
Regarding Institutional Governance. "The Faculty Senate will put [the] revised
Charter and By-Laws into effect" (230)

The Faculty Senate’s revised Charter has been put into effect, with the possibility that the
By-Laws will be revised in fall 2003 or spring 2004.

47. 10B.8 Institutional Administration and Governance: Faculty Participation in
Governance and on Appropriate Policy, Planning and Special Purpose Bodies. "The
College will communicate its process for shared decision-making to make it clearer and
more fully understood by the faculty" (232).

The College’s Shared Governance Policy, with a description of the various governing
bodies and their roles, can be found on the campus website, in the FYI Handbook and-
LCC Catalog.

48. 10B.9 Institutional Administration and Governance: The Role of Staff in
Institutional Governance. “The College will develop a formal organization for the
Operations and Maintenance group with formal by-laws” (233).

Formal by-laws were adopted by the Operations and Maintenance staff in May 2002. See
Appendix #.
Preliminary list of documents needed in Appendix

- 1997 Midterm Report
- 2002 Interim Report
- (6) Organizational Charts
- Shared Governance Policy
- Curriculum Review Policy
- O & M Bylaws
- Jean Hara’s list of assessment initiatives
- AIC Committee members
- AIC Final reports
- 2000 Self-Study
- 2000 Evaluation Report
- Unit/Area Review Policy
- Report on the Relationship of the Faculty Senate to the Campus Council and a description of Campus Council Constituencies
- “College Publication Inventory and Assessment,” September 24, 2001
- OCET course evaluation form
- 2002-2003 LCC Catalog
- 2003-2004 LCC Catalog
- "Chancellor for Community Colleges Memo" #6004 (November 4, 1996)
- Academic Service Unit Functional Statements
Hello Senators,

Regarding the division chair’s meeting on Monday, where it was reported that the Scheduling Initiative was a “courtesy announcement” to the Senate or in other words a “done deal;” I was informed, that was the opinion of only one division chair.

Despite the fact that the Division Chairs have been discussing this for a year or so—this past week was the first time that the Senate had heard anything about it and in your Chair’s estimation, it is not a “done deal.” I firmly believe that if a recommending body such as the Faculty Senate is perceived as being overly compliant or a “rubber stamp,” it is as destructive to its integrity and the college as being overly obstructionist and picayune.

I have always sought to represent our Senate and the faculty to the administration of our campus and the system as one based on mutual respect rather than suspicion, but if such a major change as the schedule initiative is implemented without review and approval of the Faculty Senate, then that trust is ruptured. Even though this initiative originated from the Division Chairs, this issue affects faculty (in content) and the principle of Shared Governance (in practice and process).

One of the greatest obstacles to the proposed schedule change is the loss of that time on TTH that has traditionally been reserved for workshops and meetings. Both the time for the instructors and appropriate meeting rooms that are normally available, such as for the Curriculum Committee would be limited. Faculty and Staff development workshops may have difficulty attracting participants, even if they could find available rooms. These are the type of concerns that many faculty members have cited as reasons for more input to the proposal before it is implemented.

As we have all followed the e-mail arguments, there is apparently so much more to this initiative than the simple “let’s give it a try.” At our Special Meeting in AM 209 on Friday, September 12 at 1:00, we will discuss the Scheduling Initiative after we have reviewed the Midterm Report. At that time, the Chair will entertain a motion to assign the Scheduling Initiative to a Senate Committee to gather more faculty input and consider the various other options that have come in since last week.

James Goodman
Faculty Senate Chair
UH-Leeward Community College
808-455-0613

Friday, September 12, 2003 America Online: CandyHochstein
Hello Senators,

Thank you for your approval of Diane Sakai as the replacement for Senator Pond while he is on a one-year leave from his teaching duties to serve as the acting Dean of Arts of Sciences.

A few Senators wondered why a member from Academic Support was nominated while there are presently no Senators from Social Science. It was the recommendation of the Committees on Committees that reasoned that Social Science had been tapped the last few times and perhaps this replacement should be offered to an individual from the Library. It is still within our by-laws to appoint an additional Senator from an underrepresented division and I am inclined to support that idea, if for any reason to maintain our quorum during session. But we will discuss that at our meeting this Wednesday.

So, by your consent, I will notify Diane and send her the agenda for this Wednesday's meeting.

James Goodman  
Faculty Senate Chair  
UH-Leeward Community College  
808-455-0613
Hello Senators,

I am sending this Excel document that I received about a year ago that lists all the UH salaries. It is dated Sept 27, 2001 so this would be pretty good date to compare administration salaries. I don’t have the figures that I read for you last Wed. with me about the current LCC salaries but if anyone does perhaps you can make a comparison for us.

For example the monthly salary for the Interim Provost Mark Silliman is listed as $7,118 (or $85,000 per year) compared to $107,000 (I think) for the Chancellor of LCC. We haven’t sent out the formal questions that the Senate had for Mark Silliman yet, but I spoke with him last week about some of them and he said that he would like to answer the questions in person at our Faculty Senate meeting on the 24th.

Regarding the report of the Chancellor of the Community College at Hilo making $200,000, I checked on that at the BOR meeting last week. Shirley Daniel, who is that college’s Interim Chancellor, was until recently a faculty member at the Manoa College of Business Administration and is paid by by endowed seat at the college. Even in 2001 she was making $12,346.36 a month! She was asked by Dobelle to be the Interim Chancellor while the system looks for a new one. So as it turns out, the endowed seat at the UH College of Business Administration is paying the salary for the Interim Chancellor of the Community College at Hilo. Much to Mark’s or Ramsey Pederson’s (HCC) disappointment, this does not establish a precedent for other Chancellor salaries.

I’ll see you at our special meeting on Friday,

James Goodman
Faculty Senate Chair
UH-Leeward Community College
808-455-0613