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Leeward is one of the seven community colleges in the State University of Hawaii System and one of the four community colleges located on the island of Oahu. Since the College opened in 1968, it has served a diverse group of students and provided access to a wide geographic region including the community of Waianae.

Leeward College has many fine faculty and staff members, whose commitment to education is laudable. The record of the transfer program is solid, and a number of fine career programs serve students well. The College offers a comprehensive program of student and instructional support services and has creatively re-engineered existing space to accommodate new programs and changing program and college needs. The team observed a fine physical plant that is generally well maintained on a day-to-day basis. Despite limited space, physical facilities provide an environment conducive to learning and supportive of college functions. While State funding is becoming increasingly limited, the current level appears to be adequate to maintain good quality programs and services.

The informal system by which Leeward has operated in the past was adequate during periods of stable or growing enrollments and budgets. However, this informal system may not be effective as the College confronts the difficult decisions that it will be facing in the next several years. There is a need for the College to develop more formal systems and procedures which are consistently applied.

The team has made a number of recommendations related to Commission standards; these specific recommendations are referenced in the appropriate standard and are offered for consideration by Leeward. Among these recommendations are two, which the team has identified as major and which the team believes merit immediate response from the College.

At the time of the last accreditation visit in 1988, the College had completed a planning document, the Educational Development Plan. In 1991, the College adopted an Academic Development Plan, described as a successor to the EDP, which listed ten major goals and numerous implementation plans related to each of the goals. Additionally, there have been other planning activities and assessments of institutional effectiveness undertaken between 1988 and the time of the visit. However, neither the assessment nor planning activities and plans for implementation appear to be sustained, systematic, coordinated or connected.

The College has a number of governance bodies including the Academic Senate and the Provost's Advisory Council. However, there is considerable confusion among campus constituencies about their role in policy making. There is no written policy delineating the role and responsibilities of policy making groups, nor is the role or responsibilities of the College constituencies in governing, policy making and other such groups clear.

Major Recommendation. The team recommends that the College create a planning process which is formal, college-wide, systematic and coordinated. The process should set college direction, identify institutional priorities, and use program reviews and research in each sector of the College to measure effectiveness. Planning should be done on an annual basis and should ensure that individual area plans are linked to and reflect the college-wide plan. All segments of the College community should be involved in the process. The college-wide planning process should drive the budget. (1C, 1C.1, 1C.2, 1C.3, 1C.4, 1D, 1D.1)

Major Recommendation. The team recommends that the College develop and implement a written policy which articulates a decision making process which includes persons in the process who will be affected by the decisions and which clearly states the role and participation of faculty, support staff and students on College governing, policy making, planning, budgeting and special purpose bodies. (8C.1, 8D.3, 8E.2, 8F.2)
INTRODUCTION

Leeward Community College is one of the seven community colleges in the State University of Hawaii System and one of the four community colleges located on the island of Oahu. The mission of the College is in conformance with the Chancellor's vision whereby the four colleges on Oahu specialize, complement and collectively meet the comprehensive community college mission.

Since the College opened in 1968, it has served a diverse group of students and provided access to a wide geographic region. West Oahu, which is part of Leeward's service area, is predicted to rapidly increase in population. The College is to be commended, particularly, for its commitment to serving the community at Waianae and for providing access to the Native Hawaiians in that area by establishing a center which offers most of the courses required to earn an Associate degree and a number of support services.

The College's accreditation was last reaffirmed in 1988. As noted by the evaluation team at that time and validated by the current team, Leeward is effectively meeting the needs of the communities it serves. This is particularly noteworthy as the College has had to deal with a number of challenges, the most significant being the imposition of budget reductions and the reallocation of its current limited physical facilities to house new programs and services.

During our visit, we were most impressed as we met with each faculty and staff member who through words and deeds sincerely and conscientiously consider it THEIR job "to help people learn." The students at Leeward, as shared with the team, acknowledge and appreciate this personal assistance and support. The team was also impressed by the comprehensiveness of Leeward's student and instructional support services and commend the staff, who work in those areas where space is limited, for the service that they are providing. The quality of the faculty and staff and their commitment to the mission of Leeward are outstanding.

The team believes, however, that the College can be even more effective if policies, processes and procedures are developed, formalized and written and then systematically and consistently applied. This general observation will be reflected in the discussion section of each standard and in the team's recommendations.

Assessment of the Self-Study

The report appears to be consistently organized, well researched and comprehensive. The report satisfactorily addressed each of the standards, provided clear and specific examples to support the self-study's conclusions and referenced a number of supporting documents. It is obvious to the team that careful attention was paid to identifying not only the College's strengths and weaknesses but also areas to be improved.

The Abstract was very well written, particularly the Overview section in which themes for directions for development were identified. The team affirms and validates the five themes.

In a number of instances, however, where the evaluation identified concerns and issues, no plans were specified. We understand that there was a decision not to include plans if either the College believed that the College's actions could not remedy the situation or if plans were already in the discussion/early implementation stage. As a consequence, the team strongly encourages the College to continue to work on those areas of concern identified in the
evaluation sections even though no plans were stated, to proceed with the planning agendas in
the self-study report, and to establish a system to track progress in addressing the concerns
which have been identified.

The team expressed some concern related to the limited participation of students, staff and
administrators as members of the self-study committees. The team suggests that the College
consider this concern within the context of the team's observations in Standard 8.

Finally, the team thanks the College for the effort put forth in making the visit pleasant and
smooth. We found the staff to be accessible, enthusiastic and candid, which resulted in a
productive visit.

RESPONSES TO RECOMMENDATIONS OF
THE PREVIOUS TEAM

Except in a few instances, the College has generally responded adequately to the
recommendations made by the last evaluation team. The analysis of the College's response to
each of the previous team's recommendations is provided in the related Standard.

STANDARD ONE - INSTITUTIONAL INTEGRITY, PURPOSES,
PLANNING AND EFFECTIVENESS

Responses to Recommendations of Previous Team

Two recommendations were made by the previous team: one related to responsibility and
implementation of the EDP and a second recommending coordination of the self-study process
with development and revision of the EDP to include participation by students and all
segments of the College staff.

Up to the time of the College's interim report in 1991, the College appeared to have developed
an effective plan of action for response to the previous team's major recommendation related
to the implementation of the Educational Development Plan. The team, however, saw no
evidence of continuing activity between 1991 and the date of its visit. In addition, the team
found no evidence of a plan of action for implementation, a process for revision or procedures
for assessing the progress towards implementation of the Academic Development Plan,
described as an extension of the EDP, subsequent to its development in 1991.

There is no evidence that consideration was given, during the major portion of the self-study
process, to coordinating the self-study process with the development and revision of the EDP
(or of the ADP), although some consideration late in the self-study process has occurred. The
team's concern related to participation of students and all segments of the College staff in the
self-study process was noted earlier. The College's plans to develop a process for further
development and revision of the ADP, which will provide for participation among all segments
of the College community if implemented, is an appropriate response to this recommendation.

Observations

The College in response to the Chancellor's 1990 update to the System mission reviewed its
own goals and objectives and re-examined the College philosophy statement during the 92-93
year. As a result of this extensive activity, a revised College philosophy statement was
adopted in 1993 for which the College is commended. This work certainly lays an excellent
foundation for the planning and evaluation activities to be undertaken in the future.
Additionally, there have been planning activities and assessments of institutional effectiveness undertaken since the last accreditation visit. These activities have resulted in a 1991 plan of action for implementing the EDP, on-going assessment of the progress made in implementing the EDP between 1989 and 1991, development in 1991 of a timeline and assignment of responsibility for continuation of implementation of the EDP, the development of the Academic Development Plan in 1991, program review of vocational programs utilizing the Program Health Indicators model, the development of a program review process in student services and a review during 93-94, student and faculty surveys, and some discipline specific and ad-hoc task force studies.

The ADP which covers the period 1991-1996 includes timelines for implementation of plans; however, the timeframe for most of the plans are in the 91-92, 92-93 and 93-94 years.

At the System level, the Board of Regents and the Chancellor's Office have produced master plan documents, developed and made available data and conducted research, the most comprehensive of which was the Comparative Assessment of Performance study.

Conclusions

The establishment of the research unit at the System office has produced much useful data for the System. The data collected and the research conducted by the System office does not, however, always meet College needs because it is either not college specific or is not presented or analyzed in a format useful to the College. Data collected and research conducted at both the System and College level appear not to be well coordinated or connected. The College has a clear need to conduct its own research and has identified that need by requesting approval of an APT research position. The researchers at the System office are available to the college on a request basis; however, this informal system may not provide the type of concerted and consistent research effort that the College has identified that it needs for planning, evaluation and decision making. The College might consider other avenues by which this function would be performed because of the importance of this function to its evaluation and planning activities.

There are a number of planning activities being conducted by the College and the University of Hawaii System and master planning documents have been produced. There appears to be a great deal of planning taking place at different levels and at different locations, but the College has not successfully brought these attempts together into an overall plan for the College.

At the College, there is no one person responsible for planning; it is unclear as to how program reviews and other research and data collecting activities are connected to either the planning or budgeting process; there is not always a clear connection between the goals of the ADP and the budget process; there is no clearly assigned responsibility for implementing the plans in the ADP; there is no system for evaluating progress in implementing ADP plans; and there is no process for periodic review and revision of the ADP (although there is a plan to update the ADP in 1996).

It is particularly significant that one of the major recommendations of the last evaluation team dealt with issues related to assigning responsibility for the EDP implementation, annual adjusting of the EDP and criteria or measurements for evaluating progress.

It is the team's conclusion that beyond the development of a planning document (such as the EDP or the ADP) and the program health indicators review of vocational and student services programs the College has not made the type of sustained commitment and effort required for assessing institutional effectiveness, for utilizing that assessment in planning, and for developing and implementing an on-going planning process.
Recommendations

1.1. The team recommends that the College create a planning process which is formal, college-wide, systematic and coordinated. The process should set college direction, identify institutional priorities, and use program reviews and research in each sector of the College to measure effectiveness. Planning should be done on an annual basis and should ensure that individual area plans are linked to and reflect the college-wide plan. All segments of the College community should be involved in the process. The college-wide planning process should drive the budget.** (1C, 1C.1, 1C.2, 1C.3, 1C.4, 1D, 1D.1)

1.2. The team recommends that the College develop and implement a means for meeting the College’s research needs to include coordinating the campus research effort, furnishing usable data for planning, program review and other institutional decision making processes, providing technical assistance in designing research studies and serving as a liaison with the System research office. (1D, 1D.1)

**major recommendation

STANDARD TWO - EDUCATIONAL PROGRAMS

Responses to Recommendations of Previous Team

Four recommendations were made by the previous team: that advisory committees be strengthened by the inclusion of more business/community leaders; that Perkins Act funding be better understood by faculty; that the scheduling process and pattern be reviewed to ensure that the schedule is based on student needs; and that serious consideration be given to an advisory committee to provide oversight to the entire community services program.

Advisory committees appear to have been strengthened, although committees are not uniformly active or productive. The College is encouraged to continue its effort to enhance advisory committees and commended for the progress shown to date.

The faculty survey results indicate good progress in informing faculty of Perkins Act funding; however, because regulations have changed and will again in 95-96, ongoing orientation should be considered.

Neither the written response nor the team’s observations indicate that the College has responded adequately to the recommendation related to class scheduling, primarily if the statement in the self-study that budget is the major determining factor is accurate and validation that current scheduling meets student needs is based primarily upon opinions of students who are enrolled. The current schedule pattern does not appear to be constructed to meet the needs of working adults or disadvantaged students, and significant differences exist between day and evening programs. The recommendations of the previous team to review the schedule to better serve students is still valid. If anything, the need for this step has become even more important due to the limited resources available and the predicted growth in the service area.

The College considered the recommendation related to the community services program and determined that the individual advisory boards are needed for each program and, therefore, determined not to formulate a single advisory committee. As the College revises its ADP, consideration should be given to establishing priorities and setting direction for the College’s community services programs, if not through a single advisory committee then through some
other process that will review and set priorities for the community services program in a more holistic fashion and within the context of the College mission and goals.

Observations

Leeward College has many fine faculty and staff members, whose commitment to education is laudable. The record of the transfer program is solid, and a number of fine career programs serves students well. Though the College offers no developmental education (non-credit) courses, students have access to these courses through the College's cooperative arrangement with the State office of education.

The College faculty are commended for ensuring that all students receive a copy of the course outline (course syllabus) for their classes. These course outlines are reviewed as part of the faculty evaluation and tenure process.

Several educational standards issues are in transition. For example, recently the College adopted a revision to grading standards. Formerly, the College utilized an "N" grade and the "F" grade was not issued for any reason; but, as a result of a recent change, both the "N" and "F" grades are utilized by some faculty at the same time that other faculty continue to utilize only the "N" grade. The College has expended a great deal of effort and has revised the list of core courses for the Associate in Arts degree so that students who transfer are well prepared for upper-division course work. The College offers Associate in Science degrees in a broad range of fields; however, the general education components differ significantly among the AS degrees. Variations occur in the number of units, in the types of courses required, and in the breadth of educational experiences. Finally, the College has begun to develop skills prerequisites for some courses, which currently vary considerably for courses with similar levels of content, modes of instruction and evaluation procedures.

A comprehensive Academic Development Plan was prepared in 1991, which delineates ten college goals. Below each of the ten goals are listed a series of implementation plans. Neither the goals nor the implementation plans are prioritized.

Educational planning and program review are not conducted on an annual, consistent cycle for review and update purposes (there is an annual program review of vocational programs). Instructional planning and priority setting does not appear to be based on a decision model driven by data. Budget priorities also appear not to be based on a decision model driven by planning although reference to the ADP occurs for some budget allocations.

The College offers an extensive and diverse non-credit program offering many professional training and personal development opportunities. The majority of these are the type referred to in Commission standards as community services classes.

Curricula are approved by the Curriculum Committee, which is generally representative. Because it is a committee of the Academic Senate, the Senate has reserved the right to reverse decisions of the Curriculum Committee. A curriculum handbook has been developed, and the College is commended for delineating the steps and components for approval of curriculum proposals. The College does not maintain or retain a complete master file of the official course outlines as they have been or are approved by the Curriculum Committee. Courses have been modified, but the faculty have not consistently followed the Curriculum Committee course modification process. As instructors are assigned to teach courses for the first time or as new faculty are hired, they are provided copies of course outlines (what is more commonly referred to as course syllabi) developed by other instructors for reference purposes in developing their own course outline rather than copies of the official course of record as approved by the Curriculum Committee.
Conclusions

The recent adoption of the "F" grade which was intended to partially replace the "N" grade has led to confusion and uneven application. This confusion and uneven application has led to grades being used to represent different conditions and levels of student achievement. The Academic Senate should adopt uniform definitions of the "N" and "F" grades and standards for their application. Students are entitled to the application of uniform standards of grading and uniform grading symbols.

The team supports the College's review of its AS degrees, particularly as relates to the adoption of a set of guidelines for AS general education requirements. The current review of skills prerequisites for courses is also encouraged. The faculty of Leeward traditionally have seen skills prerequisites as a barrier to its open door philosophy. They take justifiable pride in providing special support to students with skills deficiencies. Although this effort may require several years of concentrated activity for implementation, the skills prerequisite information provided to students and the rest of the College will provide a learning environment more conducive to student success.

Educational planning does not occur in a systematic and formal manner. There were references to the ADP in the self-study; however, the ADP has not been reviewed since it was prepared in 1991. The College does not have an annual, consistent cycle of review and update. Instructional planning and priorities generally operate according to an interactional model in which relationships and institutional memory tend to determine what is done, rather than a decision model driven by data and planning. Although some reference is made to the ADP, funding decisions do not appear to emerge from a planning process that prioritizes; and the institution does not yet appear to have developed an allocation model consistently driven by student need and educational program assessment. The College has taken good first steps towards collaborative instructional allocation decisions; i.e., the division chairs and instructional administrators established priorities for equipment replacement. This experience was viewed very positively by most who participated and this process can be the foundation for subsequent efforts if formalized.

Although vocational programs use the program health indicators model of program review and the student services division has developed a program review system, program evaluation of non-vocational instruction is fragmented and lacks common criteria.

The team expressed serious concern related to the absence of a complete and up-to-date master file of approved outlines of record. The students have no assurance that courses as taught are as described in the College catalog or in the original outline approved by the Curriculum Committee or that the same course taught by different instructors are similar in content, objectives and standards. This balance between professional judgment and a coherent curriculum is always a difficult one, but students have a right to expect that the content and standards of sections will be similar.

It is also of great concern to the team that no formal system, policy or practice exists to ensure consistency of course content, objectives and standards from the time that a course is approved to the present. It is apparent that many courses have evolved over time as determined by individual faculty members. In the absence of the ability to consistently access and make reference to the original outline of record, there is no means of determining whether the current course or different sections of the same course bear any resemblance to the original course. A notable exception to this are the core expectations established for writing courses. These appear to establish shared student outcomes so necessary for laddered curricula, without mandating the particular methods or strategies a faculty member will employ. The curriculum coordinating councils are another bright spot but more is clearly needed.

The team strongly encourages the College to develop and maintain a complete and up-to-date master file of official courses of record; that modifications to courses be processed through the
The informal system by which Leeward has operated in the past was adequate during periods of stable or growing enrollments and budgets. However, this informal system may not be effective as the College confronts the difficult decisions that it will face in the next several years. The team believes the College must develop systems which allow evaluation of programs in a systematic way. The team encourages the instructional unit to commit substantial energy to the rapid development of formal, consistent and systematic educational program review and planning models which drive priorities within instruction without delay.

The community services program also needs to become more systematic in its hiring, curriculum development and evaluation processes.

Although the College has begun to look at skills prerequisites, it has not begun to deal with many of the more complex issues. The College has developed a few guidelines or methods for determining appropriate prerequisites, but lacks articulated procedures for reviewing prerequisites and their relationship to student success. The team encourages the College to develop effective and standardized methods for addressing these complex issues. Similarly, in order to assure equity in grading, the College needs to clarify the distinction between the "N" and "F" grades and to educate faculty to apply these standards consistently throughout the instructional program.

Recommendations

2.1. The team recommends that curriculum documentation and review become systematic and consistent in order to ensure that variations are in the realm of professional latitude rather than substantive and qualitative in nature as at present. (2B.2, 2B.3)

2.2. The team recommends that the College review and revise the general education requirements for the Associate in Science degree so that requirements meet the expectations established by the accrediting commission in Standard 2C, regarding the content and methodologies of major areas of knowledge--the humanities, the fine arts, the natural sciences and the social sciences--as well as critical thinking. (2C.1, 2C.3, 2C.4)

STANDARD THREE - STUDENT SERVICES AND THE CO-CURRICULAR LEARNING ENVIRONMENT

Response to Previous Recommendation

One recommendation was made by the previous team: that the College consider an examination of the organization and staffing of student services for possible change and augmentation to increase both the efficiency and effectiveness of the program.

The College has responded to this recommendation. Subsequent to the 1988 accreditation visit, student services has augmented its staff by adding a new unit head in counseling; an APT position in financial aids; and, using state and federal funds, four full-time counselors, two half-time academic advisers and two half-time positions. Two new service centers--Student Life Development and Student Health--have been added. An examination of the organization and staffing of student services has been initiated by the new Dean of Student Services, who is using focus groups in each of the student services program areas to develop a reorganization plan and to conduct program review for purposes of evaluating efficiency and effectiveness.
Observations

The College's pattern of providing administrative leadership in the student services area, which relies heavily on faculty reassigned time, seems to be working well. Leeward offers a comprehensive student services program to its students. Though limited in space and staff, members of the unit exhibit high morale and are perceived positively by students and faculty. In their self-study, they have identified many of their weaknesses and have made planning recommendations to address them. Concerns identified in the self-study that are being addressed include: use of a review process to develop the student services division reorganization plan; development of specific procedures for student input into student services division planning, development and delivery of services; secure storage and back-up of student specific and term specific records. The Dean is also effectively using a Dean's Advisory Council for input. In addition, the Dean and staff have evaluated the register now and pay later policy and have determined that changes will be made in the Fall 95 semester to assure equity for continuing, non-delinquent students.

Concerns identified in the self-study not yet addressed are the development of specific mechanisms for gathering and analyzing data on student characteristics and needs and orientation for foreign students. The Dean and staff have plans to address these concerns as well.

Conclusions

The new Dean of Students has effectively organized to conduct program review and evaluation activities and has established a process for effective input by staff and students to address the reorganization and staffing issues raised by the previous accreditation team.

As the student services division continues and refines its program review and evaluation activities and develops input for the student services portion of the planning process or updated Academic Development Plan, attention should be paid to the following:

1. Inadequate space. While current space is not adequate, the student services unit is commended for the service it provides within this limitation. Critical facilities impact was observed in the student health center and the financial aids office. In those counseling or advising areas where there are no privacy panels, provisions for privacy needed to provide counseling should be made.

2. The issue of prerequisites was mentioned in Standard Two. Although the setting and validation of course prerequisites is an academic affairs responsibility, validated course prerequisites are also of concern to student services personnel who utilize course prerequisites in their advising and counseling activities.

3. Assessment tests always raise validity and reliability issues. The assessment tests at Leeward are used for mandatory student placement; therefore, the team expressed concern that the frequent changes made to the instruments (especially for the internally developed math tests) require repeated validation of appropriate student placement and at times may result in the utilization of placement recommendations not yet validated.

The student services division is making very good progress in the following areas: The College has a priority registration system that is perceived as equitable and fair by students and faculty. The establishment of the Dean's Advisory Council and the Division Priorities Task Force are both strong signs of the beginning of comprehensive, division-wide planning. Out of these structures a division-wide plan with priorities should emerge. The division's development of its own program health indicators model, when fully implemented, should provide excellent feedback as to how well each student services program is meeting its stated
objectives. Ultimately the full success of these processes (planning and program review) will depend on the College's ability to present its student data in a usable format for analysis.

The student services division should continue its initial attempts at unit-wide planning, priority setting and program review. It should continue to refine its planning and review mechanisms to assure itself that it is on track in meeting the objectives of its program units. Further, the student services division should take appropriate steps to assure that its efforts are integrated into the college-wide review, planning and prioritization processes and plans.

STANDARD FOUR - FACULTY AND STAFF

Response to Recommendations of Previous Team

Two recommendations were made by the previous team: that the practice of reassigned time be reviewed and evaluated and that the College address the recommendations made in its self-study.

The criteria, procedure and forms utilized for reassigned time developed by the Chancellor's office are utilized. It is apparent that the practice of part-time annual reassigned time continues at the College in lieu of other types of program support which might be more stable and permanent. The faculty and administration appear to view the current practice of reassigned time as productive and appropriate. The evaluation of the effectiveness of reassigned time versus other types of staffing to perform college functions should be reviewed on a regular basis. The College has made good progress in addressing the internally generated recommendations of the last self-study.

Observations

The College has an excellent and adequate staff who provide effective instruction and make valuable contributions in student services, learning resources, support services and administrative services. The current staffing levels among faculty, staff and administration is subject to a major change because of the expected large numbers at the College who plan to take advantage of the retirement incentive being offered by the University of Hawaii System at the end of the 94-95 year. The College is concerned that some of those positions will be reallocated elsewhere in the System.

Because the College is part of the University of Hawaii, system-wide criteria, qualifications and procedures for the selection of all personnel are clearly stated, public and directly related to institutional objectives. Job descriptions for all staff are kept in the personnel office. Teaching effectiveness is the principal criterion for the selection of teaching faculty. The College has a current affirmative action plan which addresses equity in the employment and diversity of staff.

Except in rare instances when lecturers are hired on an emergency basis, all faculty and staff meet minimum qualification standards. The evaluation procedure for all personnel, except lecturers and division chairs and unit heads, is conducted in a uniform and systematic manner.

Personnel policies and procedures affecting staff are clear, equitable and available. Specific criteria for determining faculty workload are stated in CCCM #2250 dated July 1, 1991. The workload for classes other than lecture is delineated.

Development opportunities are planned and available for each staff category. This function is assigned to a full-time staff development coordinator who not only organizes staff development activities on campus but also allocates funds for conferences.
The preceding statements do not apply to the non-credit (what the commission refers to as community services) program. The non-credit (community services) program staffing procedures—including minimum qualifications, procedures for selection and for evaluation—are not formalized nor are they standardized. The College should seriously consider whether the absence of uniform processes and procedures in the non-credit program creates problems of institutional integrity and/or of program effectiveness and quality.

The turnover among the administrative staff is a concern of the team. This issue is more fully addressed in Standard 8.

Conclusions

The College's commitment to staff development is commendable, and many faculty, in particular, have been assisted in curriculum development activities.

Because the College does not have a uniform policy and procedures for evaluation of lecturers, these faculty are subject to an inequitable situation and the effect on the quality and effectiveness of instruction is unknown. Further, the opportunities to intervene and provide staff development are lost.

In addition, the lack of an evaluation process for division chairs and unit heads again results in lost opportunities to provide useful feedback in providing more effective service in these areas.

Workload is an issue with some faculty. The team finds that the criteria as stated in CCCM #2250 to be clear and the directions for implementing and applying the criteria to be sufficiently specific. Some faculty, however, believe the workload criteria to be unfair when viewed from a total University of Hawaii System perspective and inequitably applied.

At the time of the visit, the division chairs and administrative staff were providing written justification for retention of the approximately 60 positions which may become vacant due to the upcoming retirements. Further college-wide discussion on the impact of the potential staffing changes should occur within the context of the College's refocus on its data gathering and analysis, program review and institutional planning activities.

Recommendation

4.1. The team recommends that a college-wide process of systematic evaluation of lecturers in credit courses be developed and implemented. This process should provide for evaluations at stated intervals with timely follow up. (4C.1)

STANDARD FIVE - LIBRARY AND LEARNING RESOURCES

Observations

The College offers a broad range of instructional support services, and staff in this area are serving students effectively despite limited resources.

The Library occupies the second and third floors of the building and affiliated learning resource and instructional support programs are situated on the first floor. The University of Hawaii at West Oahu has been allocated some of the second floor space.
The library staff consists of five full-time librarians, three of whom are nine month faculty and the other two are eleven month. Additionally, some nine month faculty are hired on an overload basis during the summer for special assignments.

Some of the current library holdings are outdated. However, severe budget restraints have not enabled the library to acquire and replace books and other library media, although there was a plan established to replace a percentage of library holdings each year. A librarian is assigned to each division to serve as a liaison to assist with that division's requests for acquiring and eliminating holdings. Further, there are plans to develop, with faculty input, a "Collection Development Document" which is intended to eliminate duplicate acquisitions, to eliminate materials that are outdated or no longer utilized, and to eliminate duplication of effort.

The library is utilized to its maximum during peak hours of the day and utilized well during the evening hours. Neither students nor staff indicated that the current hours of operation are not adequate.

The College's Educational Media Center has offered credit and non-credit courses over cable television to 220,000 homes on Oahu. One of the creative uses of this technology has been the provision of the lecture portion of a physical sciences course over cable television and the conducting of the laboratory on campus. Some of the courses offered through cable television were selected as a result of user survey results.

There is currently a computer committee that is co-chaired by the Assistant Dean for Academic Support and the Director of Administrative Services. The committee members include representatives from the various sectors of the campus. The committee has been charged with the task of looking at the total picture of computer technology on campus--including development of a long-range plan and recommendations for expansion of the present system, for servicing the present equipment, and for centralizing hardware and software purchases.

The College's outreach center at Waianae offers a wide array of courses although the number of sections offered each semester is limited. To support the students in these classes, the Waianae Center provides tutorial assistance, counseling and laboratory facilities for the students. Computers comparable to those on the main campus are also provided with a hookup to the State library system and the CARL system.

Library holdings at the Waianae site are extremely limited and for the most part outdated, especially in the health career center for the Allied Health programs. Although students at the Waianae site may access books at the main campus library by going to the main campus, there is presently no mechanism for Waianae students to request book delivery from the main campus library to the Waianae site. There is a State public library in Waianae.

Conclusions

Despite limited space, the learning resource and instructional support centers and the library appear to provide and support an environment conducive to learning. The inadequate library holdings and the outdated holdings need to be augmented on the one hand and weeded out on the other. The College is encouraged to proceed with, complete and implement its Collection Development Document.

The team observed several computer laboratories whose functions are duplicative in nature. Evaluation of the current computer laboratories and long-term planning for centralization of computers and for centralization of purchasing of computers and computer-related acquisition will enhance maximum utilization of equipment and effective utilization of limited resources including staffing.
The team observed during certain periods of the day numbers of students waiting for access to CARL terminals; the College should consider providing additional terminals.

There is a pressing and urgent need to provide adequate library services at the Waianae site. The outreach site does not have an adequate library; the State library located in Waianae does not have adequate college-level holdings; and a request for an inter-library loan in the State library system may take as long as two weeks.

Recommendation

5.1. The team recommends that the College provide equitable access to print media resources for students at the Waianae site. (5A.1, 5C.2)

STANDARD SIX - PHYSICAL RESOURCES

Responses to Recommendations of Previous Team

One recommendation was made by the previous team: that the College vigorously pursue support from appropriate governmental agencies of a second access road. It is obvious that the College has vigorously pursued a solution to this need. The College has not been successful due to a variety of political and state-wide constraints. It is apparent that this lack of success is not due to a lack of effort on the part of the College.

Observations

The team observed a fine physical plant that is generally well maintained on a day-to-day basis. There is currently a major deferred maintenance project underway which will replace all concrete rails.

Phase III of the construction facilities plan for Leeward has not been funded nor are there plans by the University of Hawaii System and Chancellor's office to fund this construction any time in the near future.

The College shares its facilities with the University of Hawaii at West Oahu. Classroom utilization during peak hours is at maximum. Faculty in some divisions share offices (most notably the Arts and Humanities and Language Arts divisions) and some conference and meeting rooms have been converted for other uses. In addition, space has been reallocated for new programs and for larger classrooms to accommodate instructional technology. The College is commended for its willingness to redesign interior spaces to accommodate changing needs and functions.

The College has a facilities master plan which is being updated for the first time since it was originally produced 28 years ago; this update to the facilities master plan will include a facilities utilization study. The Director of Administrative Services and the Auxiliary and Facilities Services Officer are currently working on a plan for scheduled replacement of maintenance-related equipment and maintenance prioritization. This plan will be utilized along with the College's current annually updated prioritized list of deferred maintenance and equipment replacement needs.

The facilities at Waianae are adequate for current needs; equipment is provided, appropriate space for an instructional support lab has been allocated and office space is available for counseling and administrative support. The science lab space is not yet being utilized as planned because of the inability to identify funds for purchase of equipment.
The Automotive Technology program is currently upgrading its facilities by adding a technical library and a central tool room and is also addressing OSHA standards issues. A listing of current equipment and tools which are needed to meet National Automotive Technicians' Education Foundation requirements has been prepared. There is an opportunity for the Leeward program to acquire equipment from the Windward program which has been closed.

Conclusions

While space is a concern in all areas of the campus, the College is making effective use of its current space; and current physical resources, with the exception of a few areas, appear adequate—though perhaps not optimal.

Classroom space, for example, is available in the afternoons, evenings and Saturdays. Most of the counseling staff, except for those in special programs, have private office space. Programs and functions housed in the three story Library/Learning Resources building are functioning effectively due to the cooperation of staff involved. Thirty of the 41 full-time faculty in Language Arts and 12 of the 26 in Arts and Humanities share office space. Additionally, full-time faculty share office space with lecturers. Scheduled office hours of faculty are staggered to the extent possible so as not to overlap. Some of the problems of space may be addressed as a result of the completion and implementation of the planned facilities utilization study. Further, the results might be more useful if members from the UH West Oahu provided input particularly in the review of Library space utilization.

The team suggests that, as part of the College's facilities utilization study, critical space, privacy and OSHA and Building Code needs be identified and addressed.

Despite lack of success to date, a second access road and additional public transportation are needs the College should continue to pursue.

The team recommends that the College conduct an overall assessment, planning and prioritization of equipment needs on a campus-wide basis. Such activity will become increasingly important as budgets become more restricted.

Recommendation

6.1 The team recommends that in conjunction with the master plan activities a college-wide plan for instructional and operation equipment acquisition, replacement, and maintenance be developed and utilized. (6B.2, 6B.3)

STANDARD SEVEN - FINANCIAL RESOURCES

Response to Recommendation of Previous Team

One recommendation was made by the previous team: that communication with administrators, division chairs, faculty, and staff regarding the budget making process become focused on the manner in which the budget implements the Educational Development Plan. Effort should be given to help college personnel at all levels understand their role in this process.

The local college appears to have many restrictions placed on them in the budget process. The administration has attempted to open channels of communication on the budget process using various techniques; but this communication has not focused on the manner in which the budget implements the EDP or ADP. However, the current budgetary constraints have initiated
college-wide discussion among faculty and staff in priority setting and in dealing with diminishing funds and resources. Continued efforts should be focused on communicating the manner in which the budget implements the Academic Development Plan, the successor to the EDP.

Observations

The College is reliant upon State funding and while State funding is becoming increasingly limited, the current level appears to be adequate to maintain good quality programs and services. Because the College is very tightly controlled by the State, there are no long-term liabilities or problems with cash flow or general fund reserves. There is evidence that some expenditures are referenced to the Academic Development Plan.

The policies, guidelines and processes for developing the budget are clearly defined by the University of Hawaii and followed. Financial planning is largely dictated by the University of Hawaii, but goals and priorities at Leeward have been identified in the 91-96 ADP, which lists broad goals and objectives with implementation plans generally planned for the 91-92, 92-93 and 93-94 timeframe. The process used to select the implementation plans to be funded is not clear.

The organization for financial administration is clearly defined. Financial reports are accurate, timely and routinely distributed. Risk management is handled by the State of Hawaii. The financial audit is part of the audit done for the University of Hawaii. The University of Hawaii Foundation also serves Leeward.

Although there is an individual who provides technical assistance, no single office or individual has been assigned responsibility for college fundraising and grants writing. As a consequence, this type of activity is dependent upon the interest and energy of individuals and is not coordinated.

Conclusions

Most recently, the budget process has provided opportunities for increased participation on the part of faculty and staff. The College is commended for that activity and encouraged to utilize the success of that effort to formalizing and systematizing a broadly participatory budgeting process.

It is also clear that funding requests for new or expanded programs, services or functions are considered only if they are part of the ADP. It is not clear that there exists a financial planning process that is based on an institutional planning process.

Because the community college system is able to carry forward, in fiscal year 94-95, up to 5 percent of its general fund appropriation into fiscal year 95-96 and is entering a new budget procedure described as lump sum budgeting, it needs to address the potential impact of this greater fiscal flexibility which allows it to do things prohibited in the past. This, of course, will require formal, college-wide, systematic and coordinated planning.

Finally, because the College has indicated a desire to seek more external funding, it is suggested that resource development be centralized in one office to provide coordination and a more effective and efficient effort and is reflective of campus priorities.
Responses to Recommendations of Previous Team

Three recommendations were made by the previous team: a major recommendation that the College give serious consideration to the establishment of a formalized process for shared decision making which is clear and well understood by the College staff; that ways to better reward productivity and to require more accountability for success of programs and students be instituted; and that the System and College consider the establishment of central data centers both on the campus and at the System office which collects, synthesizes and analyzes data.

It is not clear whether the College has fully responded to the recommendation that serious consideration be given to the establishment of a formalized process for shared decision making which is clear and well understood by the college staff. It is clear that a formal process for academic decision making through the Faculty Senate exists, but there is no formalized process for decision making beyond the area of academic decision making. While the Provost's Advisory Council provides a forum for the Provost to share issues of concern and solicit input, there is no written policy describing the responsibilities and procedures of the Council. More important, many participants view the Council as a one-way communication process from the Provost to the staff. Most recently, however, the Council has provided valuable input into prioritizing for budget reductions.

The written response in the self-study related to rewarding productivity and requiring more accountability appears to confuse rewarding staff with rewarding productivity. However, the team observed that the College has implemented some mechanisms for evaluation of programs and services, but it is not clear how the evaluations are utilized to reward productivity and require accountability. The College should evaluate how well it is rewarding productivity and requiring accountability for the success of programs and students.

The System has established a central data bank and collects, synthesizes and analyzes data. Such data is shared with the College but often is not in a format or analyzed in a manner most useful to the College. The College has identified the need for this function but has perceived that the inability to hire a College researcher is an insurmountable barrier. The College should consider other means by which it can meet this identified high priority need.

Observations

The Provost is committed to open communication with all campus constituencies. She is actively engaged in the day-to-day operations of the College and is committed to insuring compliance with the policies and regulations of the System, the University and governmental agencies. She recognizes the importance of an effective working relationship with the community college system and the University of Hawaii System.

Leeward has a very small administrative staff. The College believes in reassigning faculty to meet administrative needs whenever possible (e.g., grant writer/curriculum specialist, staff development specialist, etc.). Instructional administration consists of one dean and two assistant deans; student services has one dean. The bulk of divisional administration is carried out by division chairs and discipline coordinators; the former receive reassigned time and a monthly stipend. This organization is designed to foster participation at the operational level and minimize the campus bureaucracy. In general, decision making is conceived as a bottom-to-top procedure, starting at the division or unit level and culminating with the Provost. The College does not have adequate institutional research and analysis to support decision making, and this is recognized by faculty and administration.
The faculty have a strong Academic Senate which exercises appropriate authority over academic and professional matters. All curriculum proposals are reviewed by the Curriculum Committee of the Senate and recommended by the Senate for approval by the College administration and System. The faculty are deeply involved in hiring and evaluating peers including recommendations for tenure. Participation in campus committees is an important part of the evaluation process and faculty generally recognize the importance of this responsibility. However, the role of the Senate and the faculty at large in various policy making bodies is not always clear, and there are virtually no written policies that directly articulate these responsibilities.

Support staff fall into several categories including administrative, professional, technical (APT); clerical civil service; and other civil service (maintenance, grounds, etc.) The clerical group has a formal campus organization charged with representing them in campus decision making. Each of the support staff groups are represented by collective bargaining groups. In general, members of the support staff have had sporadic and limited participation on campus committees, and no policies directly address their participation. These groups do participate in staff development and representatives serve on the Staff Development Committee. The participation of support staff in the self-study was limited.

Students have an active and committed student government. It develops programs to encourage student participation in the campus environment. Several students serve on regular campus committees and a few participated in the development of the self-study. Again, the role of students in policy making is not clearly articulated, although the administration and faculty leadership appear to support their participation.

Conclusions

The Provost has taken a number of positive steps to communicate with the college community. As a result of the recent proposed budget reductions, for example, members of the staff became more involved in and knowledgeable of the budget process. The Provost is commended for this effort and encouraged to continue to maintain effective lines of communication.

As a result of the team members' comprehensive interviews with College staff, the team concludes that the College needs to clarify its campus communication process. The Provost frequently uses a consultative approach to share information and solicit the response of faculty and staff to that information. College staff do not always interpret these meetings as consultative in nature or that their input is being solicited. While the Provost truly values input from various constituencies and individuals on campus issues, she also at times has a strong personal perspective on an issue. This strong personal perspective, however, is sometimes interpreted by others as a final decision and not open to further discussion.

The Provost takes direct responsibility for the administrative integrity of the College. While the administration at Leeward is quite small, there is not sufficient delegation of authority and support for the autonomy of various administrative offices.

There has been an extraordinary amount of instability in the administrative staff. Five of the six administrators reporting to the Provost have changed since 1990; two of those positions have turned over twice. The faculty and staff have a difficult time orienting and adjusting to new supervisors. In addition, the operation and planning activities of the College are disrupted and lack continuity. While there may be a variety of reasons for these turnovers, the net effect is a serious limitation on administrative effectiveness.

The divisional chair management structure appears to be very effective and consistent with the institution's commitment to faculty centered management. The faculty are very satisfied with this arrangement, the deans have confidence in the chairs, and the management of the
The instructional program and student services programs seem to be efficient and responsive. However, the divisional chairs are not always included in the group deliberations on issues at the administrative level. Priorities and proposals are frequently adjusted by administration before sending them onto the System level without consultation with the chairs. Similarly, chairs receive responses to their requests for resources based on priorities that are different from the priorities agreed upon during the proposal process. While some of this priority adjustment can be attributed to the System level processes, the College needs to consider whether the current process provides division chairs with a substantial voice in matters which relate to their areas of responsibility and expertise.

The Provost has established an Advisory Council which meets on an ad-hoc basis to discuss issues presented by the Provost. The membership includes representatives of various campus constituencies (Senate, chairs, clerical staff, etc.) as well as the heads of non-instructional units of the campus. This Council clearly demonstrates the commitment of the Provost to open communications and staff input. The Advisory Council agenda is developed by the Provost, and there is no written policy delineating the role and responsibilities of the Council. The membership on the Council appears to support broad based communication rather than focused representation of major campus constituencies. Therefore, there is considerable confusion among campus constituencies about their role in policy making.

Recently at the request of the Provost, the Faculty Senate established an ad-hoc committee to set up a campus planning and budgeting process. In addition, in the past other ad-hoc bodies have been created by the Provost to address specific tasks. While the Provost has invited many interested parties to serve on these committees, there has not always been a clear relationship between these ad-hoc committees and the established governing bodies such as the Academic Senate. Clearly, campus governance and planning would be more effective, efficient and inclusive if a clear written policy on decision making were articulated which includes persons in the process who will be affected by the decisions and which clearly states the role and participation of appropriate campus constituencies on governing, policy making, planning and budgeting bodies.

Recommendations

8.1 The team recommends that the College develop and implement a written policy which articulates a decision making process which includes persons in the process who will be affected by the decisions and which clearly states the role and participation of faculty, support staff and students on College governing, policy making, planning, budgeting and special purpose bodies.** (8C.1, 8D.3, 8E.2, 8F.2)

8.2 The team recommends that the College and System stabilize the administrative staff of the College to insure the continuity and effectiveness of leadership, as well as limiting the disruption to the operating and planning procedures caused by frequent changes in the administrative staff. (8C)

**major recommendation
Report to the Accrediting Commission for Community and Junior Colleges

In its reaffirmation of accreditation of Leeward Community College in January 1989, the Accrediting Commission for Community and Junior Colleges requested a report by March 1, 1991 addressing the two major team recommendations stated in the summary of the evaluation report. These two recommendations are:

1. The team recommends that the college clearly and quickly delineate and articulate who is responsible for implementing and/or annually adjusting the EDP, the timelines for implementing its various stages, the criteria or measurements to be used to evaluate progress, and the institutional procedures to be put in place to assure success.

2. The team recommends that the college administration give serious consideration to the establishment of a formalized process for shared decision-making which is clear and well understood by the college staff. Such a process would recognize and facilitate the role of all parties in the governance of the institution and clarify and delineate the rights and responsibilities of its members.

Dr. Peter Dobson, Acting Provost during the accreditation team visit was appointed permanent provost in June of that year. He was immediately granted a year's leave to pursue an unusual professional opportunity, and in August Dr. Barbara Polk was brought in as Interim Provost for the year. Dr. Dobson resigned in March 1990, and in mid-September, Dr. Polk was confirmed as permanent provost, retroactive to August 1, 1990.

Despite these administrative changes and uncertainties, the college has now addressed both recommendations.

I. Implementation of the Educational Development Plan.

The college Educational Development Plan (EDP) covers the time period 1987 - 1993 and is the major statement of direction for development of the college (see Attachment A). It was prepared by a broad-based committee of faculty, staff and administrators, with substantial involvement of and input from the entire campus community. It sets forth eight goals for the college, encompassing a considerable range of activity.
Before Provost Dobson left, he requested detailed reports from each of his administrators on the progress toward implementation of EDP goals and objectives within their jurisdiction. Interim Provost Polk assumed personal responsibility for overseeing EDP implementation during 1989-90. Based on the reports left by Provost Dobson, Interim Provost Polk, in consultation with the administrators and with faculty and staff leaders at a leadership retreat, identified several areas which had not been addressed, as well as one area in urgent need of attention, and set these as priorities for the 1989-90 academic year. Deans and Directors were also asked to identify their priorities for the year in relationship to the EDP and to take responsibility for the objectives within their domain.

In summer 1990, Interim Provost Polk again reviewed progress on the EDP and published a detailed inventory of activities completed or underway and those areas which had yet to be addressed (see Attachment B). The inventory showed that the College had made good progress at this half-way point in implementing the EDP, with more than half of activities well underway and many objectives accomplished. This inventory was presented and discussed during Convocation Day in August at an open meeting of faculty and staff, attended by approximately 70 people. The inventory was also made available to faculty and staff through their chairs or unit heads.

During Fall 1990, the Provost convened an EDP Oversight Committee, composed of representatives of the academic divisions, student services and academic support services, with administrators serving in ex officio capacities. Meeting with the Provost, this group reviewed, corrected, up-dated, and refined the inventory. For those activities and areas still needing attention, the committee recommended priorities for attention, as well as the continuing appropriateness of certain activities. A small number of activities were deleted or substantially modified.

Using the priorities recommended by the committee and with the concurrence of the committee, Provost Polk placed all remaining activities on a time-line for the next two and one half years and assigned responsibility for each activity to an administrator, Instructional Division or Faculty Senate (Attachment C). Each administrator, in turn, has been asked to establish intermediate objectives and time lines for the areas under his or her responsibility. The priorities and time-lines established were presented and discussed with faculty and staff during the January 1991 Convocation Day.

The faculty/administrative EDP Oversight Committee will continue throughout the remainder of the EDP period. They are charged with responsibility for receiving and reviewing reports of administrators and committees handling majors aspects of the EDP, evaluating progress, advising on adjustments of the goals, activities and timetables, and recommending priorities for the following semesters.
The process of collecting and disseminating feedback on EDP progress, as well as the setting of priorities, timelines and responsibility for implementation, has revitalized interest in the EDP and awareness across the campus of its directions, as well as produced a sense of pride in the accomplishments based on the EDP.

II. Formalized Process for Shared Decision Making

In response to this recommendation, the Faculty Senate, during Spring 1989, developed a formal Process for "Faculty Input to Academic Policy Decisions" which covers policies affecting: admissions and graduation procedures, academic programs and academic standards, overload and assigned time policies, allocation of positions, evaluation processes, travel grants and sabbatical proposals. This procedure was approved by Acting Provost Dobson in May 1989. (See Attachment D)

Since that time, no policy has been implemented or changed which required use of the new process, so it remains untested. Interim Provost Polk referred several small proposed changes brought about because of changes in University of Hawaii articulation procedures to the Faculty Senate in Fall 1989, but the Academic Policy Committee of the Senate decided that the matters were basically procedural and did not require further consideration by the faculty. Another decision, on faculty teaching assignments, was handled through an ad hoc procedure established in the collective bargaining contract.

During the current semester, the college is considering major revisions of its graduation requirements for the A.A. degree, and a Faculty Senate two-year reconsideration of the college grading system is coming to a close. The procedure on faculty input will get its first test before the end of the academic year in resolving these two major policy issues.

Despite the existence of a formal process which was developed to meet the accreditation team recommendation, there are many other areas of decision making which could be more shared. Provost Polk has invited the Faculty Senate to indicate areas of concern and is developing a manual clearly showing the decision making procedures, including faculty and administrative roles, for each of the major routine decisions on the campus.

In addition, Provost Polk has directed the Dean of Instruction to use the Division Chairs collectively to help prioritize sabbatical requests, set equipment purchase priorities, and set allocations of the instructional supply budget to the Divisions. These discussions appear to be going well and have resulted in an increasingly shared understanding by this group of problems and concerns across the campus.
The Provost has also encouraged the Curriculum Committee to reconsider its role in review and approval of new courses and programs. In particular, the effort is to change the philosophy of the committee from that of assisting the faculty member in making the best possible case to the administration for approval of a course or curriculum change, to that of being the primary body responsible for defining and overseeing the standards and content of the college's curriculum. The Faculty Senate is currently looking at ways to restructure the curriculum review process to implement this change in philosophy.

Despite a prompt response to the accreditation team recommendation which was designed to handle the major past areas of concern, the development of shared decision making is an on-going process which will no doubt extend into areas not yet considered.