MEMORANDUM

TO: All Faculty and Staff
SUBJECT: Accreditation Team Report

Attached for your review and study is the letter from Dr. Robert Swenson, Executive Director of the Accrediting Commission for Community and Junior Colleges, Western Association of Schools and Colleges, informing us of the reaffirmation of our accreditation, and the accreditation report itself. Also attached is my letter of appreciation to Dr. Swenson.

In the face of fiscal adversity, we have much to accomplish in the near future, so I recommend that you read the report and begin to think about ways to implement the recommendations it contains.

Philip K. Age, Provost
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Attachments
DEAR DR. ROBERT E. SWENSON:

On behalf of the faculty, staff, and students of Leeward Community College, I'd like to thank you for your letter informing us that our accreditation has been reaffirmed.

We recognize that our experiment with combining the development of our Educational Development Plan and the Accreditation Self-Study was less successful than we had hoped, although we are still very satisfied with the resulting document. In any event, our next self-study will be conducted differently.

Having reviewed the report, I believe that it will be very helpful to all of us in our development in the next few years. As I wrote you earlier, the evaluation team did an excellent job in their brief visit, and we fully appreciate the depth they were able to reach in their evaluations. We are looking forward to implementing as many of the recommendations as possible, and have already started in several areas.

Please convey our deepest thanks and appreciation to Dr. McCuen and the members of the team, as well as to the members of the Commission.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

Philip K. Ige
Provost
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cc: Mary Naughton
January 25, 1979

Dr. Philip K. Ige
Provost
Leeward Community College
96-045 Ala Ike
Pearl City, HI 96782

Dear Dr. Ige:

The Accrediting Commission for Community and Junior Colleges, Western Association of Schools and Colleges, at its meeting January 22-23, 1979, reviewed the Institutional Self-Study Report and the Report of the Evaluation Team which visited Leeward Community College on November 8-10, 1978. I am pleased to inform you that accreditation has been reaffirmed.

Under the policy of periodic review, accreditation is without limit of time unless terminated by the Accrediting Commission for Community and Junior Colleges. Institutions make annual reports to the Commission and are reviewed periodically as explained in the January, 1978, Handbook of Accreditation and Policy Manual. The date of record for the next review period for Leeward Community College is July 1, 1979.

The Commission expressed concern about the quality of the Leeward Self-Study. The effort to coordinate the preparation of the system Educational Development Plan with the ACCJC self-study report was not successful in the judgment of the visiting team and the Commission. The College failed to deal with all of the self-study requirements in the ACCJC Handbook. The team also gained the impression that the faculty was not completely serious about the self-study process. These two concerns are explained more fully in the summary section of the team report.

The Commission wishes to apprise you that the recommendations contained in the Evaluation Report represent the observations of the evaluation team at the time of the visit. A college may concur or disagree with any part of the Team Report, but it is hoped that the report will be used for the improvement of the educational services of the institution.
I am sending you one copy of the Evaluation Team Report, which you are at liberty to use in any way you may wish. Additional copies may be duplicated as needed. The Commission urges you to give the report appropriate dissemination to your College staff and constituency.

On behalf of the Commission, I wish to express continuing interest in the advancement of the College's educational programs and services. Professional self-regulation is the most effective means of countering the increasing encroachment and regulation by external agencies.

Sincerely yours,

Robert E. Swenson

RES:brb

Enclosure: One copy of the Evaluation Team Report

cc: Miss Mary Naughton, Accreditation Liaison Officer
    Evaluation Team Members
SUMMARY STATEMENT

Leeward Community College has all the necessary elements of an excellent institution: a talented, dedicated teaching staff, a carefully conceived curriculum, and an excellent physical plant. There is every evidence that the staff understands the college’s mission and is committed to it. The staff evinces a pride in the accomplishments of Leeward, a pride most notably demonstrated by effective classroom teaching. Supporting the curriculum and teaching staff is an adequate library, run by competent, creative staff members.

The student services programs at Leeward are well designed, well staffed, and therefore highly successful. Similarly, college efforts to reach into the community and fulfill special needs not being met on the main campus are commendable.

Unfortunately, these accomplishments and strengths are not easily identified in the college’s self-study. This is probably a reflection of two factors. First, careful faculty-administrative coordination was not implemented consistently throughout the entire self-study process, leaving the visiting team with the impression that the college staff was not completely serious about the self-study process. Second, the college used a unique approach to the self-study, which increased the difficulty of the validation process. These two observations are not meant to denigrate the self-study approach used by the college. In fact, combining the state-required Educational Development Plan with the accreditation self-study is a good idea. However, in taking this approach, it is necessary to deal with all the requirements of both projects. While the college’s self-study is forthright in recognizing problems needing attention, it furnishes rather meager appraisal data on which to base forecasts of solutions to problems.

A thorough self-study at this particular time in Leeward’s history is, in the opinion of the visiting team, an especially critical need. The team is concerned because some serious problems must be dealt with if future college development is to be successful. It should be noted that some of these problems are longstanding and chronic. For example, the fiscal difficulties at Leeward Community College persist; yet, no useful purpose is served by dwelling upon the fiscal constraints faced by the college. These constraints currently exist everywhere in American higher education. A useful purpose can be served, however, if the college staff and the central university staff together approach the problems that are within their ability to solve immediately and without need for fiscal outlay. Before expanding on these
problems, the team wishes to draw attention to the fact that it sees
the appointment of a strong chancellor for the community colleges as
a positive sign in the sense that now the badly needed stability of that
key position may be acquired. The team is convinced that the major
problems at Leeward can probably be solved only if the central
university administration works cooperatively with the college.

Of primary importance, in the opinion of the evaluation team, is the
need for the college faculty and administration to develop a means for
systematic and precise communication. It would appear that the central
university administration might help this process in at least two ways.
First, it might establish a staff development program for the college
administration designed to improve communication skills. The twin
problem of staff turnover and small staff numbers have left the admin-
istration in need of staff development and extra cooperation from the
central office staff. Second, the central office staff could take a
significant step toward improving the faculty-administration communi-
cation problem if it would discourage end runs by faculty to the central
office and establish clear guidelines for communication, both up and
down, between the college and the central office.

Policy development is the other major area that needs early attention,
as pointed out by the previous visiting team. Considerable confusion
exists at the college about such basic matters as the process for
development of new programs, the staff evaluation process, the faculty
load policy, and budgeting and accounting procedures. Because this
confusion leads to uneven action in these vital areas, the final result
is a general deterioration of staff morale and effectiveness.

The visiting team believes that if these problems are given serious,
early attention, the fine tradition established by Leeward Community
College over the past decade will be but a prelude to an even greater
decade ahead.
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Introduction

The evaluation team visiting Leeward Community College on November 8 and 9, 1978, set as its central mission the validation of the college's self-study. This validation process was carried out in various ways. All material sent to team members prior to the visit, including the college's self-study, was studied beforehand. The day before the visit the team met to discuss the self-study process used by the college, the institutional evaluation process to be followed by the team, and the college's self-study document. During the course of the visit, the team met with faculty, students, administrators, support staff, and the chancellor of the community college system in individual interviews and in group meetings. The team members also observed numerous classes. Throughout the visit, the college staff was available to the team when needed, and they were cooperative in assisting the team at all times. Throughout the validation process, the team attempted to focus on the extent to which Leeward Community College is meeting its objectives and providing quality instruction for its students.

The college originally set November 8, 9 and 10, 1978, for the evaluation visit, not realizing at the time that November 10 was a legal holiday. Upon realizing this conflict, the college staff indicated a willingness to have key staff members available on November 10. However, after assessing the situation, the team chairman decided to compress the visit and complete the work in two full days. It was the unanimous opinion of the evaluation team that the visit was successful and accomplished all objectives despite the compressed schedule.

The evaluation team felt that the college did not approach the self-study in a completely organized, serious manner. This was reflected in some sharp differences of opinion between faculty and administration as to the process used for carrying out the self-study. All members of the college's self-study steering committee were not involved in the development of all sections of the self-study. This lack of participation eventually led to the chairperson of the faculty senate signing the self-study "with major reservations."

The lack of careful coordination in the self-study accentuated the difficulties for Leeward because a unique approach was used. Because the college needed to revise the 1976 Educational Development Plan for submission to the Board of Regents, it was decided to combine that effort with the accreditation self-study. This was an intelligent approach and one that should be encouraged. However, taking such an approach without careful coordination of the college staff and without careful attention to the basic elements of a self-study (description, appraisal, forecast), does not serve the college as it should. The result of such a self-study is difficult for an evaluation team to deal with. Specifically, in this case, the visiting team found it difficult to locate appraisal information used by the college to develop its forecast material.
The body of this report is presented in straight narrative fashion, using the section headings from the 1975 Handbook of Accreditation, which was used by the college for its self-study. Team recommendations are underlined for easy staff reference. The last section of the report relates to the responses by the college staff to the recommendations of the previous visiting team.

FUNCTIONS AND OBJECTIVES

It is evident that Leeward Community College has given serious attention to the formulation of mission, goals, and objectives during the past five years. This attention has resulted in the formulation of a comprehensive mission statement reflecting the college commitment "to help people learn." Although the college faculty and administration participated in the formulation of the college goals and objectives, students and the community at large were apparently little involved. It is possible that a greater shared sense of mission and a stronger sense of community involvement and pride in Leeward could be achieved in the future if student and community representation were included in the process of formulating goals and objectives. As a related observation, it is noted that almost no attention was given to the institutional goals and objectives in the college general catalog for 1978/79. While the two-paragraph statement at the beginning of the catalog suggests the philosophy and concerns contained in the Educational Development Plan, it may be of some value to extend such a statement to give greater visibility to the positive attitudes and commitments to students in the learning process that are well stated in other college documents.

Leeeward Community College has stated over 100 objectives pertaining to all of the major functions of the college. However, because the majority of the institutional objectives refer to processes or activities rather than outcomes, it is suggested that greater attention be given in the future to the formulation of objectives with outcomes that can be measured in terms of the college's mission, that is, to help people learn.

Overall, there is evidence of an active and continuing dialogue among all segments of the college community concerning institutional goals and objectives. There is a strong sense of commitment to the future and an evident pride in the achievements of the past. The college has important strengths that can only be helped by further extending this dialogue to include students and members of the community.
EDUCATIONAL PROGRAM

Leeward Community College has a sound educational program. There are, as there are at all colleges, also some weaknesses in the program, and most of these are recognized in a candid and forthright manner in the self-study.

In the self-study, recognition is given to the fact that serious attention needs to be directed to the general education program at the college. It might be helpful for the college, as it pursues this effort, to define general education more specifically than "...all courses in the curriculum..." Consequently, a first step in the general education examination might be a college-wide study to redefine general education.

The college staff has also recognized that students who come to Leeward are offered a rather narrow range of occupational programs. However, all evidence indicates that the staff is making a serious effort, within severe fiscal limitations, to correct this restriction.

The evaluation team also concurs with the college's assessment of needs in the developmental programs. There is, indeed, an apparent need to better coordinate the developmental programs that are now spread among various divisions. The self-study also recognizes the need for new courses in developmental education to meet the needs of the college's clientele.

The visiting team did not detect any clear recognition of a need to assist instructors in improving and evaluating teaching. There is no college-wide program for evaluating the quality and outcomes of instruction. This by no means implies that the quality of instruction at Leeward is suffering. On the contrary, the team members recognized much skilled and thoughtful teaching. Nevertheless, some faculty do perceive a need for a concrete plan to evaluate instructional outcomes. Consequently, the college might want to develop such a plan to assist faculty in evaluating teaching.

Division chairpersons expressed considerable concern about the fragmented program development process discussed in the college self-study. However, several of these individuals seemed unsure as to whether or not they should acquire any special skills necessary for program management. This frustration seemed to be created because the division chairs perceive themselves as spending an unnecessary amount of energy in political activities when they would rather work on program development and management. In order to strengthen the participation process at Leeward Community College and to help the department chairs focus their energy on the substantive issues of program development, it is suggested that the college consider a staff development program just for division chairs. This program might focus on the development of skills in curriculum assessment and management as well as on the
development of a clear statement of responsibilities for division chairs, especially as these responsibilities relate to those of the college administration. The role and responsibility of the college administration in this area should also be given serious attention if the participation process is to be strengthened.

The evaluation team believes that Leeward Community College can effectively respond to the above recommendations because it has a faculty experienced in management as well as committed to meeting the needs of its students. The recommendations are made with the view that divergent ideas add to the vitality required for change, but a framework for orderly progression is required if the college is to benefit from the talented faculty resources.

INSTITUTIONAL STAFF

The college self-study deals incompletely with the issues related to staffing. However, through the various interviews, it was possible to determine that the faculty selection process for both full and part-time personnel is satisfactory and receives general endorsement from the professional staff. It is applicable to on-campus and off-campus assignments, with significant instructional participation through the six divisions. However, the professional evaluation process appears to be abbreviated, nebulous, and lacking in consistency. In addition, there was no evidence of a process for evaluating administrators, counselors, and librarians. Evaluation of part-time instructors at off-campus locations is limited since classroom observation is not practiced generally as an instrument of assessment. The team therefore recommends that a comprehensive evaluation policy be developed for all professional staff at Leeward Community College.

The team was unable to locate a written faculty load policy. It is therefore recommended that serious consideration be given to the development of a load policy that will provide greater consistency and equity across the entire college.

A related concern arises from the frequent references in the self-study to faculty reassignment in order to accommodate more occupational curricula. This is a most worthy objective and one that must be met if Leeward is to offer any new occupational programs. However, this objective will probably not be met in the absence of both a policy statement for reassignment and specific criteria to be used in making the reassignment.

The Office of Staff and Institutional Development (OSID), media center, and several other campus components have assigned positions that are funded through Title III, Advanced Institutional Development Program (AIDP). Staff in-service education, among other activities, could be
seriously curtailed when this special funding is terminated in June, 1979. Every effort should be extended by the college to continue these worthy activities, even if categorical monies are not forthcoming.

The team was impressed with the OSID because of its numerous activities on behalf of the entire college. As a focal point for staff in-service education, OSID fulfills its responsibilities with diligence and results.

The team was impressed with the services of the clerical and maintenance staffs at Leeward Community College. They are talented, dedicated, and gracious. Morale is excellent, job turnover is light, and the results are positive.

STUDENT SERVICES

The college's self-study of student services programs is positive and candid although it is somewhat limited. Despite the student services staff's limited involvement in the self-study process, it is clear that the general program objectives are being met by competent and enthusiastic individuals. These individuals are commended for developing an excellent student services program. Both the associate dean and coordinator have openly acknowledged the areas requiring attention. They have also nurtured the staff's capabilities for effectively addressing a wide range of student needs. Progress in the variety and quality of services to students since the last accreditation visit is evident. With the expected loss of federal AIDP funds which support key counseling and clerical positions, new resources to sustain the program's momentum will be required. Serious consideration should be given to identifying staffing strategies and resources to continue the services developed before the termination of federal funding assistance.

Evaluations of staff performance, even within apparently strong and vibrant programs, are not readily nor consistently available. To reinforce and encourage continued professional growth, it is recommended that a more systematic procedure for staff evaluation and development be established for all student services personnel.

PUBLIC SERVICES AND OFF-CAMPUS PROGRAMS

Leeward Community College offers an extensive community services program which includes credit and non-credit courses at off-campus centers, community problem-solving projects, and cultural activities associated with a campus theater complex or other public facilities.

Of particular importance is the Waianae-Nanakuli Education Center which is an effective agency offering credit and non-credit classes and counseling services to Oahu citizens living in a relatively
remote and economically depressed area. Though the prospects for the success of this center are good, it is vital that continuing efforts be directed toward an official state recognition of 7.5 existing FTE staff positions as being clearly identified with Leeward Community College. Until such recognition, these funded but temporary personnel assignments could be eliminated, thus forcing possible closure of the Waianae-Nanakuli Center.

Credit classes are also offered on military bases in cooperation with the university's College of Continuing Education and Community Services. The courses scheduled respond to popular demand. Some consideration might be given to expanding the "demand" offerings and thus developing an educationally sound program of courses characterized by variety and continuity. Instructional divisions at Leeward Community College should be consulted in this process. More specifically, in relationship to divisional consultation, the Community Information and Resources Center (CIRC) is advised to consult with the Social Science Division in coordinating campus human resources activities. The CIRC Title I projects need to be related to the Division's community practicum and special topic series. This kind of cooperation assumes more serious proportions as the Social Science Division anticipates the establishment of a two-year curriculum in human resources.

The Leeward Community College Theater is an impressive facility which supports a large variety of campus and community cultural events. Continuous programming and burgeoning attendance create the inevitable problem of calendar conflicts. Strongly recommended is the establishment of a scheduling process created in cooperation with the primary parties whose interests are involved. Perhaps this schedule could be put out a year in advance. Campus instructional events should be given highest priority. If needed, a written policy may assist in further eliminating the apparent present difficulties.

The high quality level of Leeward Community College's community service program is evidenced by a maturity that reflects commitment to purpose and pride in achievement.

LIBRARY AND OTHER LEARNING RESOURCES

Leeward Community College offers comprehensive learning resource services to its students and staff. The current library staffing level is adequate to meet the demands of the college. The staff appears to be well qualified and helpful to students and staff who take advantage of library services. Especially noteworthy is a library instructional unit which has been developed and improved by the staff over the past several years. Through this program, over 4,700 individual tests of proficiency in the use of the library were administered at Leeward during the 1977/78 academic year.
In general, the library collection has been well maintained, although recent fiscal constraints have prevented the expansion of the collection in some needed areas. In this regard, it should be noted that a haphazard pattern of funding has controlled the purchase of library materials, supplies, and equipment over the past five years. Decisions for allocating funds to instructional support services might be better balanced between the needs of the college for additional staffing and other services and the need to maintain and expand a serviceable library collection of both print and nonprint material.

It has been the practice at Leeward to develop learning resource services near the physical facilities which house the instructional and faculty offices assigned to designated academic disciplines. In light of the discussions over the past two years about the issue of centralization vs. decentralization of learning resource services, it is perhaps time that some priority be given to achieving institutional consensus on this issue. Overall, the library and learning resource staff reveal a high sensitivity to the needs of students and a strong commitment to providing professionally excellent service.

PHYSICAL PLANT AND EQUIPMENT

The facilities of the college -- classrooms, laboratories, library and service areas -- are excellent and will serve the community for many years to come. A deep concern for the long-range view of providing education in a pleasant and functional campus environment is apparent. The process for justifying and approving new buildings combines state and local demographic studies; furthermore, local college preference is weighed along with state objectives for post-secondary education.

The approval process for new facilities is not well understood by most people at the college. In particular, there is the sense that someone somewhere at the state level weighs college preference against state policy but there is no clear sense of who is responsible or where those matters are debated and resolved. An effort by the college and state leadership to demystify approval mechanisms would increase understanding and trust among the parties concerned.

It appears that Capital Improvement Project (CIP) funds for major remodeling and repair are obtainable without too much difficulty from state-level authorities. However, small projects that must be funded by the general budget are difficult to accomplish due to the college's fiscal constraints and priorities in other areas. Funds for remodeling and repair might be handled more effectively with faculty and staff preparing budget proposals that incorporate these items. In this way, the administration can decide the most suitable avenue for funding, as well as be made aware of the program needs for its general budget requests. General budget items, of course, will have to compete with each other. It would also be useful to make a clear distinction between a CIP and local maintenance and repair which must come from the college's general funds budget. State policy should make it clear how one justifies the former, and the latter might be handled more effectively from a contingency reserve managed by the college provost.
The evaluation team must question the accuracy of the self-study in the area of facilities. The hints in that document of poor maintenance and the references to aging facilities are inconsistent with the visible quality of the well-maintained physical plant.

FINANCIAL RESOURCES

It is apparent that Leeward Community College has been wisely financed. Facilities and equipment are excellent, the grounds are trim, and the staff is superior. Recent funding constraints have weakened support, and the self-study is replete with references to austerity. Such references occurred in conversations with members of the faculty and staff at all levels during the visit by the team. But there is little visible evidence that instructional needs are not being met, indicating that all persons concerned are making an effort to make do with what they have in the way of resources.

An effort has been made to protect staff while sacrificing non-personnel areas of the budget. Such a strategy, while appearing to be humane and protective of the educational program, will work in the short range only. A long-range strategy must provide for adequate staff and supplies and equipment. To sacrifice the latter is to diminish the quality of instructional programs. An examination of some enrollment, staffing, and budget figures from fiscal year 1975-76 to the present reveals that the college staff has grown at a faster rate than has the budget. Student registrations have increased at a lower rate than has either the staff or the budget. The team recommends that serious attention be paid in the budget process to the balance between program support and program staffing levels and the student enrollment that justifies both. Any long-range financial plan must take into account the utilization of staff resources, inasmuch as personnel costs consume most of the budget. The development of a policy on faculty load, recommended elsewhere in this report, would be a useful and highly desirable step to help insure the best use of valuable and expensive professional staff.

The quarterly reversion of unspent budget funds by category seems inappropriate for a postsecondary educational institution. This arrangement diminishes institutional flexibility and ruins the incentive for economy. While the team recognizes that this is a matter of systemwide practice and not an issue which the college could autonomously resolve, it nevertheless recommends that (1) the college be permitted to account for budget expenditures at the end of each fiscal year, rather than quarterly, and that (2) the college be permitted to accumulate and carry over ending balances in defined budget categories. The team believes that better use of funds might be achieved, and an incentive to economy created through this approach.
There seems to be a sense of resignation among faculty and division chairpersons about budget and finance. They complain that they are convened for informational purposes only, not for substantive participation in the discussion of solutions to problems and issues. Information flows downward, and solutions tend to await decisions from central authority. For example, the final distribution of the most recent budget, which fell short of expectations, was symmetrical, with all unit funding based on the prior year's budget, rather than on any priority basis. Priority decisions will require productive discussion between division heads and administration and open sharing of information. Simply waiting for dispensation from authority provides everyone with an excuse for not trying harder themselves. Finance will remain mysterious until persons with budget responsibility at all college levels confront difficult questions, such as priorities, frankly and face-to-face.

INSTITUTIONAL GOVERNANCE AND ADMINISTRATION

The stated goals of open and participatory decision making are admirable and can be achieved at Leeward Community College. All of the essential elements for effective governance and institutional management are present. This fact is particularly apparent in the high caliber of the staff and in the diligence of faculty and administrators managing the current affairs of the college and planning for an uncertain future. But these noteworthy attributes are not enough if Leeward is to maintain its present distinction, let alone achieve thoughtful developments in program and service under conditions of fiscal constraints and changing student needs.

Community colleges pay a heavy price for instability and turnover in leadership. Often the consequences are loss of morale, confusion in mission, and erosion of common efforts. Although the staff is to be commended for its persistent quality performance during a decade of turnover at the provost and chancellor levels, the consequences of such instability are apparent. More seriously, the visiting team senses little coordinate efforts at the college to use its impressive staff talents to compensate for political decisions outside its control. The college staff has recognized this fact in the self-study.

The overriding recommendation of this team is for the administration and faculty to face their differences -- to talk things out person to person, to resolve problems at the college level, and to avoid the damaging practice of making end runs to external power sources. It might also prove productive if key members of the central university staff could be involved in this process of opening up and defining lines of communication. This is said with full awareness that there is less open conflict between faculty and administration than on many college campuses and that pride in Leeward is universally shared.
Nevertheless, indications of fragmentation and faltering team work are present in the self-study itself and in the behavior and attitudes of people. The following observations and specific recommendations are presented in anticipation that an able staff will pull together and reaffirm the excellence that has characterized Leeward's service to the state and to the national community college movement.

It is widely agreed that the administrative staff at Leeward Community College is lean and in some areas overworked. System-wide fiscal constraints make the addition of more administrators unlikely, even if such additions would be desirable. This reality highlights the importance of continuing the modification of administrative arrangements and rationality in the choice of highly qualified persons for unfilled positions and for future replacements. The following specific recommendations are made:

Dean's Level Restructuring

Progress has been made on the recommendation of the 1973 accreditation team that the functions of public services and of student services be structurally differentiated from the Office of the Dean of Educational Services and that the responsible administrators be directly accountable to the provost. This reorganization has yet to be approved by the chancellor, and some role conflicts still exist. In fully consummating this reorganization, we recommend that the head of student services be raised to a full deanship in view of the scope and importance of this program at Leeward Community College. Furthermore, consideration might be given to changing the title of the Dean of Educational Services to Dean of Instruction. This should not diminish the executive functions of the dean in the absence of the provost.

Division Chairs

Because of the small administrative staff, the instructional affairs can only be properly managed if the division chairs and the administration, particularly the dean, work cooperatively and with mutual respect. Although many community colleges have redefined division chairs as management, the Leeward model has much merit with its potential of bridging the related interests of faculty and administration. The following recommendation is made to strengthen management and decision making and to forestall trends toward alienation and dysfunction in governance.

Regular Administrative Council meetings should be held with proper information and leadtime for faculty consultation. Differing points of view should be studied when formulating policies and procedures. Just as the chairpersons seek support for their essential leadership and management functions, they should be ready to carry out college policies and put the welfare of students and the institution above
selfish interests. As bridges between faculty and administration, division chairs might be more authentically selected jointly by the division faculty and the provost.

Faculty Role in Governance

Leeward Community College is fortunate to have a strong faculty senate and a system-wide policy (likely to be approved by the Board of Regents) granting the senates a major role in college governance. This happy situation could be diminished should the senate leadership view its domain as an insulated governance system rather than as an essential part of college-wide governance. Specifically, the stated goals of shared decision making are more likely to be achieved if the senate initiates and responds to efforts to improve working relations with the college administration. Equally important will be vigilance in serving the college's interest within the broader politics of the university. If this is to occur, key members of the central university staff probably should be involved with the college administration and faculty in discussions to develop policy on the respective roles of these groups.

Information and Institutional Research

The self-study and the visiting team's observations suggest the need for more systematic generation, dissemination, and use of decision-making information. This is particularly true in areas of appraisal and evaluation. Shared governance is most likely to thrive if constituent groups are well informed on issues for decision making and if the decisions themselves are grounded in accurate and substantive information. It is hoped that the position of Director of Institutional Research will soon be filled with a highly qualified person who can work with the full staff in designing, conducting, and disseminating studies which will improve forecasting institutional needs and evaluating existing programs.

Last, the visiting team recommends the development of an administrative and policy handbook. This would be particularly useful in clarifying responsibilities, including those of the division chairs, and in diminishing role-conflicts in an open and participatory system.
RESPONSES TO RECOMMENDATIONS MADE BY THE PREVIOUS VISITING TEAM

The evaluation team tried to determine the adequacy of each of the college staff's responses to the recommendations made by the previous visiting team. The team felt that, in almost every case, the college had either made an adequate response to these recommendations or had given a suitable rationale for not doing so. Comments are included here only in those cases where the team felt additional attention should be given. Some previous recommendations continue to be concerns of the current visiting team and those have been dealt with in the body of the report under the appropriate sections and referenced in this section.

Educational Program

The cooperative education entries in the college catalog have been redesignated, but the relationship of hours of work to unit credit does not appear to be clear to students.

The role and responsibilities of division chairs should still be of concern to the college. The evaluation team has made recommendations dealing with this in both the educational program and the governance sections of this report.

The present report continues to call for an examination of the balance between vocational and "other" programs at the college.

Student Services

Although the college has not adopted the previous accreditation team's specific recommendations under the section on "Meeting the Needs of the Disadvantaged," the increased level of programs and services is apparent. The need for coordinating on and off-campus services to the college's disadvantaged clientele remains, and an overall strategy clarifying the relationships between and among existing programs and services may be useful.

Institutional Staff

The continuing need for a systematic faculty evaluation process is discussed in the institutional staff section of the present report.

Financial Resources

The concerns raised by the previous team in this area continue to be concerns of the current team and are so stated in the financial resources section of this report.

Institutional Governance and Administration

The concerns raised by the previous team in this area continue to be concerns of the current team and are so stated in the institutional governance and administration section of this report.