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PREPARATION OF THE FOCUSED MIDTERM REPORT

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

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

By letter dated January 17, 2003, ACCJC accepted the Interim Report “with the request that the college submit a Focused Midterm Report.” The report is to be followed by a visit by ACCJC representatives. In addition to the usual contents of a Midterm Report, which is required of all ACCJC accredited colleges, the College’s Focused Midterm Report is to focus on the three recommendations which in essence were carried over from the 1994 to the 2000 visiting team’s evaluation report.

The LCC 2003 Focused Midterm Report begins with the process described in the LCC 2002 Interim Report. To summarize

- Chancellor Mark Silliman (then Interim Provost) “proposed the establishment of eight Accreditation Implementation Committees (AICs) to address respectively the eight accreditation recommendations and the related College-identified concerns [Action Plans]” (LCC 2002 Interim Report 1).

- After consulting with his administrative staff, the then Accreditation Liaison Officer, and the Executive Committees of both the Faculty Senate and the Campus Council, the Chancellor organized seven AICs because one of the eight recommendations (safety and storage of student records) could be addressed by the Dean of Student Services and the Registrar (LCC 2002 Interim Report 2).

- The Chancellor completed the organization of the seven AICs in spring 2001 to ensure broad campus participation. The seven AICs, made up of faculty and staff from all campus units and constituencies, met in fall 2001. The seven Accreditation Implementation Committees are as follows:

  1. Curriculum Revision and Review
  2. Campus Council Constituency Roles and Governance
  3. Administrative Instability and Turnover
  4. Degrees and Certificates (Learning Outcomes and General Education Component)
  5. Program Reviews/Program Health Indicators
  6. Placement Testing Impacts
  7. Strategic Planning for Technology and Information/Learning Resources
• An Accreditation Implementation Oversight Committee made up of the Chairs or Co-Chairs and Vice Chairs of the seven AICs, the College’s Chancellor, Accreditation Liaison Officer, Institutional Research Analyst, and an ex-officio faculty member who is an ACCJC Commissioner, was created in fall 2001 to oversee and coordinate all of the accreditation recommendations. (See Appendix #10 for rosters of all original committee members.)

In addition to addressing three carryover recommendations from the 1994 and 2000 accreditation visits, which were discussed in the LCC 2002 Interim Report, this Focused Midterm Report addresses the five new recommendations made by the 2000 visiting team and the College-identified issues from the LCC 2000 Self-Study. The three carryover recommendations are as follows:

1. Campus Council Constituency Roles and Governance (Standards 10B.8, 10B.9, 10B.10) - “The team recommends that the college clearly define the role of all constituencies on the Campus Council” (ACCJC 2000 Evaluation Report 6).

2. Administrative Instability and Turnover (Standard 10B.4) - “The team recommends that the college analyze factors that may be contributing to administrative instability and turnover and develop appropriate local responses” (ACCJC 2000 Evaluation Report 7).

3. Curriculum Revision and Review (Standards 4D.2, 4D.6) - “The team recommends that curriculum review and revision be made a systematic and cyclical process with the goal of assuring academic rigor and integrity in all courses and programs” (ACCJC 2000 Evaluation Report 6).

The five new recommendations made by the visiting team from the LCC 2000 Self-Study are as follows:

1. “... that the college reexamine and adapt the application of the Program Health Indicators (PHI) model (or another appropriate program review model) to all its programs, and especially to student services, so that a structure, process, and culture are developed for its effective use in planning, decision making and program performance improvement” (ACCJC 2000 Evaluation Report 17).

2. “... that the college identify and make public expected learning outcomes for all its degree and certificate programs; that the general education component of all degree programs be published in clear and complete terms in the general catalog; that the general education component be based on a philosophy and rationale that are clearly stated and publicized; and that criteria be provided by which the appropriateness of each course in the general education component is determined” (ACCJC 2000 Evaluation Report 22).

3. “... that the college review the changes in placement scores that have resulted from its use of the COMPASS test and develop appropriate response strategies in the student
services and instructional areas to ensure that students achieve their educational goals in as timely and efficient a manner as possible” (ACCJC 2000 Evaluation Report 8).

4. “...that the college review its practices related to storage and safety of student records to determine if they are in compliance with established guidelines. The college should pay particular attention to requirements related to ensuring that files are protected from fire and other disasters” (ACCJC 2000 Evaluation Report 9).

5. “...that the college formalize its planning procedures in the areas of technology and information and learning resources to address needs in the following areas: determining the sufficiency of information and learning resources, planning for the acquisition and maintenance of educational equipment and materials, ensuring accessibility of information and learning resources, providing professionally qualified staff, ensuring sufficient and consistent financial support, forging outside agreements, and evaluating the adequacy and effectiveness of learning and information resources and services” (ACCJC 2000 Evaluation Report 9).

This Focused Midterm Report describes the actions taken since the submission of the College’s 2002 Interim Report and draws heavily from the final reports submitted by each of the seven AICs in April 2003. The report underwent review by the Faculty Senate and Campus Council in September 2003. The campus community-at-large also had significant opportunity for input and revision via the College’s accreditation website. Extensive AIC meeting notes were also made available on the website to provide information on the College’s progress in addressing accreditation concerns and to solicit college and community based input during the entire three-year process.

As with all multi-faceted projects, progress may be uneven across the span of issues addressed in this report. All issues have been addressed and some strategies for resolving concerns are more fully developed and formalized via the campus review process than others. The College takes the ACCJC recommendations and its own self-identified recommendations very seriously. Thus, although the report may suggest uneven progress in certain areas of concern, the issues at hand have been addressed and plans of action for more complete responses have been established.
CURRICULUM REVISION AND REVIEW (Standards 4D.2, 4D.6)

Recommendation

"The team recommends that curriculum review and revision be made a systematic and cyclical process with the goal of assuring academic rigor and integrity in all courses and programs" (ACCJC 2000 Evaluation Report 6).

Concerns of the Visiting Team

There continues to be no formal system, policy, or practice to ensure consistency of course content, objectives, and standards from the time a course is approved to the present, and division chairs should ensure that all syllabi are regularly compared with their relevant outline[s]...[and] are consistent with the outline on record for that course. Periodic review of established Core Outlines should be formalized and institutionalized to assure the currency and continued appropriateness of curriculum content, instructional methods, course activities, and student competencies. (ACCJC 2000 Evaluation Report 6).

College’s Response/Action Taken on the Recommendation

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

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

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

If faculty determines no changes are necessary, the division chair will input this information into Curriculum Central, the centralized online database where course
information is stored. If changes are deemed necessary, normal procedures for curriculum modifications will be followed.

Curriculum Central will be modified so that the essential elements needed for course syllabi are standardized with the same initial information. This standard information will become the first page(s) of each course syllabus. Additional pages of the syllabus will reflect the individuality, style, and creativity of the instructor. Each discipline will compare the core outlines of the revised courses with the individual syllabi of the faculty within the current semester. If the syllabi do not reflect the required elements of the core outline, the discipline, along with the division chair, will work with the faculty to correct the discrepancies within the current semester.

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

Curriculum Central (http://emedia.leeward.hawaii.edu/central/) was also modified as stated in the approved policy. Faculty are now able to produce the first page of their syllabus, which included the essential elements – most especially the SLOs – in time for the fall 2003 semester.

At the start of the fall semester, division chairs and coordinators were instructed by their respective deans to implement the last two sections of the policy; “#6. Each discipline will compare the core outlines of the revised courses with the individual syllabi of the faculty within the current semester” and “#7. If the syllabi do not reflect the required elements of the core outline, the discipline, along with the division chair, will work with the faculty to correct the discrepancies within the current semester.” (See Appendix #1.) The division chairs and coordinators were asked to report their findings to their respective deans. Results will be documented and posted on the assessment webpage.

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

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

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

To ensure uniformity in class offerings, from fall 2003, on a cycle of every six years, the discipline coordinators/division chairs have the tools needed to analyze and compare the syllabi with the appropriate core outlines.
CAMPUS COUNCIL CONSTITUENCY ROLES AND GOVERNANCE (Standards 10B.8, 10B.9, 10B.10)

Recommendation

"The team recommends that the college clearly define the role of all constituencies on the Campus Council" (ACCJC 2000 Evaluation Report 6).

Concerns of the Visiting Team

In response to Commission recommendations in 1994 that "the college develop and implement a written policy that articulates a decision making process that is representative and that clearly states the role of faculty, support staff and students[, t]he College set up the Campus Council, a representative governance body...and established a Charter and By-laws for the body....However, at the time of the team visit, there was considerable tension on campus regarding the roles of constituent groups in the Campus Council" (ACCJC 2000 Evaluation Report 6).

College Response/Action Taken on the Recommendation

The Shared Governance Policy of Leeward Community College and its related documents, Principles of Shared Governance, Report on the Relationship of the Faculty Senate to the Campus Council and a description of Campus Council Constituencies, collectively provide for a clear definition of the roles for all campus constituencies. The Shared Governance Policy and Principles of Shared Governance were approved by the Faculty Senate on November 27, 2002 and by the Campus Council on March 6, 2003 (AIC-CCCRCG Memo titled Completion of Mission, May 8, 2003) (See Appendix #2) after widespread input from all the campus constituencies. Chancellor Mark Silliman approved the policy on May 15, 2003. On May 22, 2003 the Chancellor mass e-mailed the campus to announce the approval of the policy as well as to share the final text of the policy. The policy was also placed in the FYI Guidebook (See Documents Room), a manual provided to all new hires and a major component of all new hire orientations. The AIC on Campus Council Constituency Roles and Governance also wrote Report on the Relationship of the Faculty Senate to the Campus Council and a description of Campus Council Constituencies to explain and further clarify the roles of the faculty Senate and Campus Council and the constituencies they serve. This report was accepted and approved by the Chancellor on May 30, 2003. (See Appendix #2 for copies of The Shared Governance Policy of Leeward Community College, Principles of Shared Governance, and Report on the Relationship of the Faculty Senate to the Campus Council and a description of Campus Council Constituencies.)

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

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

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

To ensure the continued success of the College’s efforts, a policy review committee will be formed to address concerns as to how well the policy is being followed. The Director of Policy, Planning, and Assessment will be tasked with setting up the committee and appointing an ombudsman.

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

Recommendation

"The team recommends that the college analyze factors that may be contributing to administrative instability and turnover and develop appropriate local responses" (ACCJC 2000 Evaluation Report 7).

Concerns of the Visiting Team

In 1994, the Commission noted, "instability caused by frequent turnover in administrative positions.” In 2000, the College’s Self-Study acknowledged “awareness that the small number of administrators led to a depletion of energy and will power.” The Evaluation team “also noted that the administrative evaluation system is unclear, and administrators typically do not receive any information or documentation regarding their evaluation once it is completed, which suggests a lack of constructive feedback that would assist in their professional growth” (ACCJC 2000 Evaluation Report 6-7).

College’s Response/Action Taken on the Recommendation

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

Since the committee’s suggestions were made, Chancellor Mark Silliman has implemented several of them. The first, called for administrators to receive constructive feedback on their job performance, which was already being done through an annual review process called the 360° Evaluation. In recent years, the UH Human Resources Office has sent by e-mail an evaluation form to selected faculty and staff. This evaluation technique randomly selects a total of 35-50 respondents from three categories. Peers or colleagues working at the same level of responsibility may be drawn from throughout the Community College (CC) System. Subordinates and “constituents” from the campus whom the administrator serves provide for the other two categories of respondents. The evaluation format asks the respondents for a rating of the administrator employing a Likert Scale to gauge performance in eight areas. (See Appendix #3.) These evaluations are completed and returned to the Chancellor to share with administrators. The Chancellor and administrators are using the results in a constructive way to determine how past performance has been perceived by the campus community.
Additionally, Chancellor Silliman has supplemented the 360° evaluative system with a request that all administrative officers including himself prepare specific professional and personal goal statements to be shared with the administrative staff at the beginning of the academic year. In the end of year review of the results of the 360° Evaluation the Chancellor and each administrator also discuss the progress made toward accomplishing identified goals.

Staff development measures may also contribute to the administrative staff’s energy, will power, and sense of preparedness for their challenging jobs. Pursuant to this end, the Chancellor has authorized the administrative team to budget funds for one professional development trip per academic year for each administrator. Administrators are also experimenting with President Evan Dobelle’s suggestion of spending a day out of their offices to allow for concentrated, undisturbed attention to their duties and to help alleviate morale problems. Accordingly, this new feature of the administrative milieu and practice at the college enables the administrative team the freedom to focus time, effort and attention on projects requiring concentrated effort, or otherwise requiring time away from the desk. The discipline and demands of the desk generally dictate time modules of no more than twenty uninterrupted minutes before the next inquiry, request or problem arises. The day away from the desk allows administrators some respite from this discipline without damaging the College because the administrative team remains accessible by cellular phone and/or e-mail for pressing emergencies. Moreover, the days away from the desk are spaced out to assure that the campus is at all times served by the Chancellor or Vice Chancellor/CAO.

Additionally, the Board of Regents’ Executive and Managerial policy commits the UH System Human Resources Office to filling new administrative posts with a salary figure that is equal to at least the 20th percentile of the College and University Professional Association for Human Resources (CUPA-HR) index of comparative salaries for administrators nationally. Although the UH System had hoped to bring all administrators up to this level, budgetary constraints have required the fall-back position of bringing only newly engaged administrators up to this level. Nonetheless, this commitment by the system provides some comparability between administrative salaries in Hawai‘i compared to the U.S. mainland. CUPA-HR standards are keyed to the budgetary size of the institution, hence to be pegged at the 20th percentile approaches median salaries at comparably sized institutions.

Suggestions produced by a campus-wide Reorganization Committee to relieve the heavy administrative workload by taking on additional staff, have proven much more difficult to implement. Chancellor Silliman had appointed the Reorganization Committee to determine if the College’s programs and services would be improved if changes in its organizational structure were made, a move strongly recommended by then-Chancellor of the Community College System, Dr. Joyce S. Tsunoda. After its investigations, the Reorganization Committee concluded that changes might be beneficial. However, organizational changes at the College level were delayed until the larger reorganization changes proposed by the newly appointed University of Hawai‘i System President, Evan Dobelle, were put into effect.
Under this new UH System reorganization, the Provosts of the community colleges have become Chancellors of their respective campuses, the Office of the Chancellor for the Community Colleges has been replaced with the Council of Chancellors, and Chief Academic Officers have been created at each community college. The Chancellor will be in charge of budget and external matters. The job description of the new Chancellors shows that the post carries the authority of a Chief Executive Officer of the campus with reporting lines direct to the President of the University. (See Appendix #4 for functional description.)

The completion of the University of Hawai‘i reorganization was the cue to pursue a College plan that would mesh with the UH System reorganization. Pursuant to this end, the College’s reorganization called for a Chief Academic Officer’s position that will entail general supervisory responsibility over Student Services, the Office of Continuing Education and Workforce Development (OCEWD), as well as the previous duties overseeing the academic programs and their support services. The Dean of Student Services and the Director of OCEWD would both be addressed as Deans and fall under the purview of the Vice Chancellor/CAO along with three other officers: two Assistant Deans to become Deans (the position of Assistant Dean of Instruction will be upgraded and titled the Dean of Arts and Sciences, and the Assistant Dean for Academic Services will also be upgraded to Dean of Academic Services), and a new administrative position, Dean of Career and Technical Education. All three officers would be on the same level with the heads of Student Services and OCEWD. (See Appendix #4 for functional descriptions.) The replacement of an Assistant Dean of Instruction by two new Deans replaces a staff administrator with two line administrators who will subsume the duties of a Dean of Instruction as it relates to the respective academic divisions under their charge. (See Appendix #5 for organizational charts).

Two other administrators will report directly to the Chancellor: 1.) the already existing Director of Administrative Services with oversight of the Human Resources Office, Business Office and Operations and Maintenance, and 2.) the proposed Director of Planning, Policy, and Assessment, with oversight of the institutional research and assessment services, the strategic planning process, the accreditation process, and the marketing strategy for the College. (See Appendix #4 for functional descriptions.) These positions will not be directly under the Vice Chancellor/CAO but will have the status on campus similar to the Deans.

Under the old structure, the Dean of Instruction oversaw all six of the College’s academic divisions. Under the new structure, the Dean of Arts and Sciences is responsible for four divisions, and the Dean of Career and Technical Education for two. Moreover, the College has taken on a Marketing Officer whose duties include the publication of course schedules and catalog under the general supervision of the Instructional Services Office to substantially reduce pressure on the deans. Such a division of labor should alleviate the stressful work load situation confronting the Instructional Services Office and address the evaluation team’s recommendation. It is also hoped that placing student services and OCEWD functions directly under the Vice Chancellor/CAO will better coordinate campus affairs, especially since there is often overlap between the various services. Finally, the addition of a Director of Policy, Planning and Assessment will address the
ongoing challenges of effective and efficient program review and strategic planning for a
campus that is located in the fastest growing district of O‘ahu.

This restructuring plan was unveiled in January 2003 and there has been a great deal of
discussion regarding its merits throughout the campus. Chancellor Silliman facilitated a
broad based campus discussion by employing mass e-mailing of the plan, its rationale
and accompanying proposed organizational charts. Additionally, the Chancellor hosted a
campus forum that was attended by more than 80 faculty and staff where concerns were
gathered and adjustments made in the organizational chart. Both the Faculty Senate and
the Campus Council had extensive discussion on the positive and negative effects of the
reorganization. The Faculty Senate passed the reorganization proposal on Wednesday,
March 5th, while the Campus Council approved it on Thursday, March 6th. Both bodies
wanted it understood that constituent faculty and staff be represented in the development
of job descriptions, as well as the selection process for the new positions and their
eventual occupants. The College will need to revisit accreditation concerns regarding
administrative instability. Presently, the Committee feels it is too early to institutionalize
further evaluative procedures.

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

The use of the 360° Evaluation system provides a broad based source of information
about administrator strengths and weaknesses. Respondents are encouraged to make
written comments about the administrator in question. Taken together with the
discussion of goals statements, the review of the results of the 360° Evaluation provides
each member of the administrative team a chance to hold constructive discussions with
Chancellor Silliman to review personal performance in the context of the overall campus
situation. The effect of these evaluative measures has been perceived by the
administrative team as being a constructive team building measure.

The budgeted professional development trips, as well as the day away from the desk, are
appropriate responses to the problem of administrative turnover insofar as each can
contribute to alleviating a sense of isolation. The commitment to a professional
development trip each academic year helps to break the geographic isolation from
administrative colleagues outside the state. Finally, the day away from the office has the
potential to free the administrators from the tyranny of the desk and helps to accomplish
goals requiring concentrated effort or allows direct personal interaction with campus
constituents.

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

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

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

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

Recommendation

"The team recommends that the college reexamine and adapt the application of the Program Health Indicators (PHI) model (or another appropriate program review model) to all its programs, and especially to student services, so that a structure, process, and culture are developed for its effective use in planning, decision making and program performance improvement" (ACCJC 2000 Evaluation Report 8).

Concerns of the Visiting Team

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

College Response/Actions Taken on the Recommendation

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

The Faculty Senate appointed a chair for the proposed Program Review Committee, a committee of the Faculty Senate responsible for program review of instructional programs. This committee will be similar to the current Curriculum Committee (with representation from each division) and carry out the policy regarding instructional program reviews under the direction of the Vice Chancellor/CAO. To help the committee set goals and priorities, data received from Educational Testing Service (ETS), based on the Academic Profile (See Documents Room) that the College administered to a random sample of students in spring 2003, will be used to establish benchmarks for reading, writing, math, and critical thinking. The Program Review Committee will review the work of faculty assessment committee members who have designed assessment instruments for writing, speech, and math, and incorporate these assessment instruments into the instructional program review process, to the extent possible.
While the Faculty Senate's Program Review Committee will oversee the review of instructional units, the Deans of the non-instructional units will oversee the review of their units' services. For example, in spring 2003, the Dean of Student Services and the Student Services Division commissioned its units to begin identifying unit mission statements and outcome measures.

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

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

During the spring semester 2002 the University of Hawai'i system began the deployment of a new student information system (SIS) known as Banner. Since the community college system had completed the contract with its SIS provider (Aldrich), the UH System determined that the community colleges should lead the way in the immediate implementation of the new SIS. Due to the extraordinary time commitments placed on Student Services personnel by the implementation of Banner, the Visiting Team's specific charge regarding student services has not proceeded as expeditiously as the College had hoped; however, the process of creating the policy has enabled the College to make important decisions with regard to the relevance and applicability of its other program review process, PHIs. PHIs are used successfully to review Carl Perkins programs; however, the PHI model was found to be too limited and restrictive in its applicability to instructional units and was therefore modified to reflect the needs of instructional programs.

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

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

The individual units under the Student Services Division will begin their data collection in fall 2003. Individual units will establish procedures and timelines for their program reviews that comply with the policy and fit their unit's needs. Other non-instructional administrative support units/areas will begin to develop outcome measures for their units at the discretion of the Chancellor and unit Dean/Directors. Individual units will establish procedures and timelines for program reviews that comply with the policy and fit their unit's needs. Data collection will begin in spring 2004.
The College plans to develop an assessment website in fall 2003 where assessment information and the approved template report forms may be posted. A draft of an assessment handbook is currently in process.

**LEARNING OUTCOMES**

**Recommendation**

"The team recommends that the college identify and make public expected learning outcomes for all its degree and certificate programs; that the general education component of all degree programs be published in clear and complete terms in the general catalog; that the general education component be based on a philosophy and rationale that are clearly stated and publicized; and that criteria be provided by which the appropriateness of each course in the general education component is determined" (ACCJC 2000 Evaluation Report 7).

**Concerns of the Visiting Team**

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

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

Leeward Community College has three degree programs (A.A., A.S., and A.A.S.) and four certificate programs. The general education component of all degree programs and learning outcomes for these degrees and certificates were formulated and approved at the CC Systems level and can be found in Chancellor for Community Colleges Memo (CCCM) #6004 (November 4, 1996) and University of Hawai‘i General Education Project: Status Report and Recommendations for Action, January 1997. (An additional skills standard, "abstract thinking," was added by the LCC Senate.) These outcomes were incorporated into the appropriate sections of the LCC Catalog beginning in 2002-2003. (See Documents Room.)

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

The criteria for the appropriateness of the inclusion of courses into the general education component were, again, established at the CC Systems level. University of Hawai‘i General Education Project Status Report and Recommendations for Action, January 1997, provides an explanation of the mechanism through which these standards were developed. The appropriate section reads as follows:
"The skill standards set forth in this document are the result of (1) a 1995-96 survey of faculty, the results of which were presented at 12 campus and system meetings, (2) a 1996 survey of graduating/leaver students at all University of Hawai‘i campuses, (3) five system-wide meetings of faculty and administrators, and (4) faculty responses to previous drafts of these skill standards” (Page 2 of 10).

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

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

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

The College’s adoption of the 1997 product of the General Education Project was taken after considerable campus dialogue about the comprehensiveness of the project’s product. Although the General Education Project identified five sets of skill standards as criteria for inclusion in the general education curriculum, the College debated and determined the need for a sixth set. Led by the Arts and Humanities Division the College was challenged to consider the inclusion of an Abstract Thinking set of standards for the general education curriculum of the Associate in Arts Degree program. After considerable discussion at the Faculty Senate the sixth set was added to the College’s rationale for General Education requirements in September 1997.

A more recent initiative completed by the College was the Educational Testing Services’ Academic Profile Exam. This exam measured students’ general education competencies in the areas of reading, writing, math, and critical thinking. The results suggested that the students at Leeward Community College perform at a level comparable to community college students nationally. (See Documents Room.)

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

To ensure the continued success of the College’s efforts, the program review policy and the curriculum revision and review policy will be implemented so that the general education requirements of all degree and certificate programs are continually appraised. General education requirements will need to be examined and integrated, not only between community college campuses, but also with the general education requirements of UH Manoa, where the general education requirements have undergone major revision in the last several years. Pursuant to that end, the campus will review and modify its Associate in Arts degree program during the current academic year.
PLACEMENT TESTING IMPACTS

Recommendation

"The team recommends that the college review the changes in placement scores that have resulted from its use of the COMPASS test and develop appropriate response strategies in the student services and instructional areas to ensure that students achieve their educational goals in as timely and efficient a manner as possible" (ACCJC 2000 Evaluation Report 8).

Concerns of the Visiting Team

The College's use of the COMPASS placement test resulted in "an increase in students placing into remedial courses and a decrease in students placing into college-level courses, especially in writing" (ACCJC 2000 Evaluation Report 8).

College Response/Action Taken on the Recommendation

Because the University of Hawai'i Community College System follows a policy of common cutoff scores for its COMPASS placement test the scores could not be changed independently. Moreover, ACT (formerly American College Testing Program) data had to be received and reviewed before the Community Colleges, acting as a system, could make any decisions regarding the validity of the test's interpretation and cut-off scores. Consequently, the College implemented the following strategies to address this recommendation:

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

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

3. In addition, for the Math portion of the COMPASS test, the order of the questions has been changed, with algebra appearing first, to best accommodate the prior knowledge of average math students, who can begin the test with what they know best and work toward higher math as the test progresses.
4. Math 22, a course designed to provide students with further work in algebra and preparation for advanced mathematics courses, and English 18/19, two courses created to provide students with essential reading and writing skills, have been added to the curriculum to help students prepare for college level work.

In addition, current response strategies that focus on test preparation are:

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

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

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

4. The College's Assessment Coordinator, in cooperation with Waipahu High School and the community colleges, offered the opportunity to take the COMPASS test to 500 juniors at Waipahu High School in the spring of 2004.

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

6. In March 2003 the CC System reported to the campus the results of the four year Hawaii CC campuses/ACT validity study. LCC English and Math faculties are currently studying the ACT recommendations and may recommend changes in cut-off scores as part of a UH System-wide effort in the near future. The availability of this data will facilitate the refinement of our current cut-off scores in order to provide students with more accurate placement.

Assessment of the Progress Made in Addressing the Team's Recommendation
The College's current practice of employing multiple assessment instruments is pedagogically appropriate with regard to placement testing.

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

To ensure the continued success of the College's efforts, UH System-wide cut-off scores and the validity of test interpretations will be explored and analyzed. The College will also participate in a UH System-wide meeting to look at alternatives to the COMPASS tests.
STORAGE AND SAFETY OF STUDENT RECORDS

Recommendation

"The team recommends that the college review its practices related to storage and safety of student records to determine if they are in compliance with established guidelines. The college should pay particular attention to requirements related to ensuring that files are protected from fire and other disasters" (ACCJC 2000 Evaluation Report 9).

Concerns of the Visiting Team

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

College Response/Actions Taken on the Recommendation

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

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

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

The College believes it has successfully addressed this recommendation.

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

None
STRATEGIC PLANNING FOR TECHNOLOGY AND INFORMATION/LEARNING RESOURCES

Recommendation

"The team recommends that the college formalize its planning procedures in the areas of technology and information and learning resources to address needs in the following areas: determining the sufficiency of information and learning resources, planning for the acquisition and maintenance of educational equipment and materials, ensuring accessibility of information and learning resources, providing professionally qualified staff, ensuring sufficient and consistent financial support, forging outside agreements, and evaluating the adequacy and effectiveness of learning and information resources and services" (ACCJC 2000 Evaluation Report 9).

Concerns of the Visiting Team

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

College Response/Action Taken on the Recommendation

Currently, the campus is in the process of a major reorganization. The proposed organization restructures the Academic Support area into five units under a Dean of Academic Services. As part of this reorganization, Campus Server Services, College Computing Labs, Computer Repair, Networking, and Campus Computing have been organized into one unit, the Information Technology Group. (See Appendix #7 for organizational chart.) The reorganization required each Academic Service unit to formally adopt functional statements clearly stating the responsibilities and activities of each unit. In addition, during spring 2003, the Academic Service units drafted formal mission statements. (See Appendix #7.) These activities have clarified sometimes ambiguous roles and, particularly in the case of the Information Technology Group, have brought coherence and order to computer services.

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

Two activities are underway to address these concerns. In order to receive the broad-based support necessary for the overall campus to have input into long-term planning for technology and information/learning resources, the AIC for Strategic Planning and Information/Learning Resources, with representation from across the campus, was created to develop a process for formalizing planning and policies for Academic Services. Each campus unit will review recommendations from the AIC, document
current practices, determine proposed strategies, and develop annual assessment tools that utilize internal and external validity to measure the success of these unit goals. Currently, each unit is evaluating the adequacy and effectiveness of its present services. These studies will consist of a survey of all campus units. With input from the survey, each unit, in collaboration with the Dean of Academic Services, will develop a set of annual goals. The goals will serve as an evaluative tool at year’s end. The second process is to create a formal Strategic Plan for Information Technology Committee to document current practices and determine plans for the future. The end result will be a Strategic Plan for Technology that aligns itself with the current Strategic Plan for Information Technology created for the UH System. The AIC for Strategic Planning and Information/Learning Resources plans adoption and implementation in the following timetable:

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

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

The College believes it has made progress in this area and has a firmly established framework for future actions. The formation of The Information Technology Group provides a structure for the planning and purchasing of information and learning resources.

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

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

STANDARD 1 - INSTITUTIONAL MISSION

1. 1.4 Evaluation and Revision. "The campus at large, including faculty, staff, students, and administrators, will be given the opportunity to review the mission statement before any additional changes are made by any one group" (LCC 2002 Self-Study 46).

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

STANDARD 2 – INSTITUTIONAL INTEGRITY

2. 2.1 Representation of the College to the Public. "The College will compile and maintain an up-to-date listing of current publications that represent their programs and services" (LCC 2002 Self-Study 50).

In fall 2001, Kathleen Cabral, LCC Marketing Officer, compiled an inventory of publications to determine the quality and accuracy of the College's publications. (See Appendix #8.) The LCC Marketing Officer will conduct an inventory of all College publications every January and maintain a file of all listed publications in her office.

3. 2.9 Institutional Self-Evaluation. "The College needs to assign responsibility for the Website to a staff member or hire a webmaster to maintain the Website" (LCC 2002 Self-Study 62).

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

STANDARD 3 – INSTITUTIONAL EFFECTIVENESS

4. 3A.3 Accomplishment of Mission and Purposes. "The College will identify the time frames for conducting program reviews, identifying specific offices of responsibility, and developing outcome measures for the systematic review of programs and services for all of its activities" (LCC 2002 Self-Study 69).
The newly adopted program review policy (See Appendix #6) outlines the systematic review of the College's instructional programs and non-instructional services including Instruction, Academic Support, Student Services, Administrative Services, OCEWD, and the Chancellor's office. Each administrator is responsible for the assessment of his or her unit.

5. 3C.1 Specification of Intended Outcomes and Documentation of Their Achievement. "The Academic Assessment committee will develop methods to assess and document student achievement in the remaining competencies specified in Standards 4B.3, 4B.6 and 4C.4" (LCC 2002 Self-Study 77).

In lieu of a campus-wide academic assessment committee, the College adopted a policy that delegates responsibility for program review to each unit administrator. With oversight by the respective Deans, all academic/instructional areas of the campus will be under the purview of the Faculty Senate committee on program review.

6. 3C.1 Specification of Intended Outcomes and Documentation of Their Achievement. "The College will develop methods to measure and document the achievement of its intended institutional outcomes in areas outside of academics" (LCC 2002 Self-Study 77).

Non-instructional areas/units will be modeled according to the approved organizational structure. The units within one area will be reviewed at the same time. What happens in the area will be determined by the units and the Dean/Director and/or Chancellor. Each area will follow the Unit/Area Review (Program Review) policy and procedures.

STANDARD 4 - EDUCATIONAL PROGRAMS

7. 4A.1 General Provisions: Educational Needs. "The College will develop a better survey mechanism to collect data about the educational needs and wants of its students and the community-at-large" (LCC 2002 Self-Study 87).

The Office of Continuing Education and Workforce Development (OCEWD) is in the forefront of data collection because of its function to address the community's educational needs and demands. The new OCEWD course registration form now includes a brief survey instrument at the top of the form inquiring as to the needs and wants of prospective students for additional types of courses. Additionally, a new course evaluation form was developed by OCEWD in the summer of 2001 to assess the College's noncredit programs. (See Appendix #9.) The evaluation form will be used to assess Motorcycle Safety Training in summer 2003. The form may undergo revision at the end of fall 2003 following recommendations by staff, faculty and students.

8. 4B.3 Degree and Certificate Programs: Expected Learning Outcomes. "Policies and procedures of assessment in learning outcomes will be completed by the LCC Assessment Committee. Implementation of policies and procedures will be based on the
recommendations of the committee in consultation with faculty” (LCC 2002 Self-Study 95).

In lieu of the assessment committee, the Faculty Senate committee on Program Review will address the assessment of student learning outcomes in all instructional/academic areas.

9. **4B.5 Degree and Certificate Programs: Competence in Language and Computation.** “Policies and procedures of assessment in learning outcomes will be completed by the LCC Assessment Committee. Implementation of policies and procedures will be based on the recommendations of the committee in consultation with faculty” (LCC 2002 Self-Study 96).

In lieu of the assessment committee, the Faculty Senate committee on Program Review will address the assessment of student learning outcomes in all instructional/academic areas.

10. **4B.6 Degree and Certificate Programs: Documentation of Technical and Professional Competence.** “Policies and procedures of assessment in learning outcomes will be completed by the LCC Assessment Committee. Implementation of policies and procedures will be based on the recommendations of the committee in consultation with faculty” (LCC 2002 Self-Study 97).

In lieu of the assessment committee, the Faculty Senate committee on Program Review will address the assessment of student learning outcomes in all instructional/academic areas.

11. **4C.1 General Education: Publication of General Education.** “The College will identify in the LCC Catalog which specific courses are general education courses” (LCC 2002 Self-Study 98).

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

12. **4C.1 General Education: Publication of General Education.** “The College will determine and clearly indicate in the LCC Catalog which general education courses are required for each program” (LCC 2002 Self-Study 98).

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

13. **4C.2 General Education: Philosophy and Rationale.** “The College will add an explanation of the College’s general education philosophy and a rationale for the general education requirements to the LCC Catalog” (LCC 2002 Self-Study 100).
The College describes its general education philosophy and rationale in the 2002-2003 LCC Catalog on page 45.

14. 4C.3 General Education: GE Program Content and Methodology. “Policies and procedures of assessment in learning outcomes will be completed by the LCC Assessment Committee. Implementation of policies and procedures will be based on the recommendations of the committee in consultation with faculty” (LCC 2002 Self-Study 101).

In lieu of the assessment committee, the Faculty Senate committee on Program Review will address the assessment of student learning outcomes in all instructional/academic areas.

15. 4C.4 General Education: Competence in Oral and Written Communication, Scientific and Quantitative Reasoning, and Critical Analysis/Logical Thinking. “Policies and procedures of assessment in learning outcomes will be completed by the LCC Assessment Committee. Implementation of policies and procedures will be based on the recommendations of the committee in consultation with faculty” (LCC 2002 Self-Study 102).

In lieu of the assessment committee, the Faculty Senate committee on Program Review will address the assessment of student learning outcomes in all instructional/academic areas.

16. 4.D.1 Curriculum and Instruction: Processes for Establishing and Evaluating Educational Programs. “The College will investigate the present Program Health Indicators in relationship to the College's mission and institutional evaluation and planning and insure that faculty are informed about and participate in this process” (LCC 2002 Self-Study 104).

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

17. 4.D.1 Curriculum and Instruction: Processes for Establishing and Evaluating Educational Programs. “The College will evaluate the Liberal Arts AA degree program and integrate this evaluation with those of all the other established academic programs as part of the overall institutional evaluation and planning” (LCC 2002 Self-Study 104).

In lieu of the assessment committee, the Faculty Senate committee on Program Review will address the assessment of student learning outcomes in all instructional/academic areas.
18. 4D.2 Curriculum and Instruction: Quality of Instruction, Academic Rigor, and Educational Effectiveness. “The College will give instructors the final grades of all sections of the courses they taught so that they can compare the grades they gave with the aggregate grades of all other sections of the same course” (LCC 2002 Self-Study 107).

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

19. 4D.2 Curriculum and Instruction: Quality of Instruction, Academic Rigor, and Educational Effectiveness. “The College will gather random samples of Course Outlines for specific courses taught at the College and at other institutions in the System, compare them, and determine if they show the same academic rigor” (LCC 2002 Self-Study 107).

The curriculum revision and review policy states that review of course outlines for academic rigor and educational effectiveness will be done on a regular cycle of at least every six years, with divisions determining the schedule. The policy’s procedures call for the division/discipline coordinators to be responsible for initial curriculum revision and review. The review by the faculty will ensure the academic rigor, integrity, and currency of the core outlines and their continued articulation with the courses of system colleges. Also, the articulation of transfer courses has been undertaken by a UH System-wide committee.

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

The Faculty Senate’s Student Committee was given this task and asked to survey the campus for feedback.

45. 21. 4D.3 Curriculum and Instruction: Evaluation of Student Learning. “The College will identify the minimum letter grade for each prerequisite and state in the LCC Catalog descriptions of all affected courses” (LCC 2002 Self-Study 109).

Divisions will be instructed to make corrections for the 2004-2005 College Catalog. The respective Deans will be alerted to supervise this process.

22. 4D.5 Curriculum and Instruction: Delivery Systems and Modes of Instruction” The College will evaluate the long-term need for alternative delivery systems and provide funding for those deemed important to the College’s mission” (LCC 2002 Self-Study 115).

The College is currently reviewing its mission statement. Any action in this area would be premature.
23. **4D.6 Curriculum and Instruction: Course and Program Design, Approval, Administration and Evaluation.** “The College will resolve the credit-non-credit differences and integrate various evaluation components and processes into its overall institutional evaluation and planning” (LCC 2002 Self-Study 118).

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

24. **4D.7 Curriculum and Instruction: Electronic Delivery Systems.** “The College will insure that the appropriate resources are provided to its DE program as the number of sections offered and student enrollment change” (LCC 2002 Self-Study 122).

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

**STANDARD 5 – STUDENT SUPPORT AND DEVELOPMENT**

25. **5.9 Student Records.** “The College will look into purchasing fire-resistant containers that are especially designed to protect tapes and film. The College will re-locate the back-up tapes that are currently in the Admissions and Records Office to another building on campus that is at a distance from the computers where the hard disk resides” (LCC 2002 Self-Study 140).

The College believes it has successfully addressed this recommendation. See discussion on Storage and Safety of Student Records on page 20.

26. **5.10 Evaluation of Student Services.** “The Student Services Division will review the PHI to determine if measures identified and the criteria established are appropriate for each of the programs evaluated. Revisions will be made appropriately. The Dean will work with each program to develop a dynamic instrument that will help the Division identify ways in which it can continually improve its delivery of services” (LCC 2002 Self-Study 142).

The implementation of Banner SIS has significantly impacted the Student Services Division and has delayed progress in this action. In fall 2003 the division will complete the identification of outcome measures and begin collecting data on these measures.

27. **5.10 Evaluation of Student Services.** “As stated in Standard 3C.1, the College will form an Institutional Assessment Committee to develop methods to measure and document the achievement of intended outcomes in Student Services as well as academic and other non-academic areas” (LCC 2002 Self-Study 142).
The College chose to delegate responsibility for assessment to each unit administrator rather than to a campus-wide assessment committee. The Dean of Student Services will oversee the assessment of his or her unit.

STANDARD 6 – INFORMATION AND LEARNING RESOURCES

28. 6.1 Sufficiency of Information and Learning Resources. “The College will clearly communicate plans regarding information and learning resources to faculty and staff” (LCC 2002 Self-Study 147).

No action taken to date. Plans are in place for a strategic plan to be created and posted on the campus website for broad-based review. See also pages 21-22.

29. 6.2 Acquisition and Maintenance of Educational Equipment and Materials. “The College will reconvene the Strategic Planning for Information Technology Committee, which will be tasked with coming up with goals and recommendations regarding technology on campus” (LCC 2002 Self-Study 149).

The Strategic Plan for Information Technology Committee will develop a strategic plan to explore the College’s resource needs, especially in the areas of Information and Learning Resources. See also pages 21-22.

30. 6.3 Accessibility of Information and Learning Resources. “The College will develop a plan to reassess learning resource needs based on demands from winter and two summer sessions” (LCC 2002 Self-Study 151).

The College has determined that funds from the summer and winter sessions are adequate to support all of the necessary academic support services, e.g. Library, Learning Resource Center, etc.

31. 6.7 Adequacy and Effectiveness of Learning and Information Resources and Services. “The College will develop a plan so that all Learning Resource units conduct surveys of users to assess the effectiveness and currency of their services and resources” (LCC 2002 Self-Study 158)

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

STANDARD 7 – FACULTY AND STAFF

32. 7A.3 Qualifications and Selection: Criteria for Selecting Faculty. “The College will, with regard to changes in faculty position advertisements from initiating units to higher levels of review, improve communication and consultation in both directions” (LCC 2002 Self-Study 166).
The LCC Human Resources Office is responsible for monitoring all job advertisements. The UH System-wide Human Resources Office is responsible for approving all job advertisements. When a change is mandated by the UH System office, the LCC Human Resources Office will notify the appropriate dean who will be responsible for transmitting the news to the division where the position originated.

33. 7B.1 Evaluation: Evaluation of Staff. “The College will evaluate the new APT and Administrative evaluation procedures are [sic] implemented, the College will evaluate the procedures for effectiveness and fairness” (LCC 2002 Self-Study 170)

The APT and Administrative evaluation procedures are mandated by the UH System’s Human Resources Office.

Feedback will be given by the administrative team concerning the 360° Evaluation system for administrators and the LCC Human Resources Office will gather information on the APT evaluation system.

34. 7C.1 Evaluation: Opportunities for Professional Development. “The College will explore ways to allow time for all categories of staff to learn and improve skills” (LCC 2002 Self-Study 174).

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

35. 7C.1 Evaluation: Opportunities for Professional Development. “The College will develop an ongoing faculty-run teaching forum to exchange ideas on campus” (LCC 2002 Self-Study 174)

A number of faculty-run activities that encourage the exchange of ideas on campus are scheduled through the monthly College Colloquium schedule. An Innovation Institute dedicated to the sharing of teaching and learning innovation was initiated in spring 2003. The Technology Mentoring Program and Web Fundamentals Program have been growing over the past two years with much success. Currently a needs assessment for new faculty is being developed to be distributed in fall 2003.

36. 7C.1. Evaluation: Opportunities for Professional Development. “The College will implement a supervisory skills training program open to all supervisors including staff members who supervise student assistants” (LCC 2002 Self-Study 174).

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

STANDARD 8 – PHYSICAL RESOURCES
37. 8.1 Appropriateness and Adequacy of Space Allocation. “The College will work with the Facilities Planner at the Chancellor’s Office and the faculty and staff to justify the expansion of the College and to examine ways to redesign and reallocate current space according to changing needs and functions. The College will revisit its Long Range Development Plan to support this effort” (LCC 2002 Self-Study 184-185).

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

No action to be taken.

38. 8.1 Appropriateness and Adequacy of Space Allocation. “The College will look into fire safety codes to insure that it is in compliance” (LCC 2002 Self-Study 184-185).

The University of Hawai‘i’s Environmental Health and Safety Office recently visited the College to assess fire safety. The College was authorized to spend $1,118,600 for fire safety improvements. Construction was completed in summer 2003 and replaced the College’s existing fire alarm system.

39. 8.3 Access, Safety, Security, and Healthy Environment. “The College will look into improving entry access to the LRC and Library and will explore options for providing covered parking or a covered drop-off and pick-up area and a Handi-van phone line for persons with disabilities” (LCC 2002 Self-Study 189).

After looking into options for covered parking or a covered drop-off and pick-up area for Handi-van users and other disabled persons, it was determined that current budgetary constraints prevent the College from receiving the necessary funds to provide this convenience. The College has included and will continue to include, in its list of needed Repairs and Maintenance projects, automatic doors for the Library building doors to more fully comply with ADA code.


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

STANDARD 10 – GOVERNANCE AND ADMINISTRATION
41. **10B.4 Institutional Administration and Governance: Administrative Officer’s Training, Experience, Duties and Responsibilities.** “The College will insure that administrators are given annual written evaluations of their strengths and weaknesses and be held accountable for making changes in the areas of weaknesses” (LCC 2002 Self-Study 224).

The 360° Evaluation system along with follow-up analysis and interpretation between the Chancellor and the respective administrators has been accomplishing this.

42. **10B.4 Institutional Administration and Governance: Administrative Officer’s Training, Experience, Duties and Responsibilities.** “The College will insure that faculty and staff have a significant opportunity to comment on the job performance of administrators with whom they work” (LCC 2002 Self-Study 224).

The 360° Evaluation system provides opportunity for administrators to be evaluated by 35-50 persons each year depending upon the response rate of the randomly selected evaluators. The three categories of evaluators include peers, subordinates, and constituents (faculty and staff). The latter category comprises approximately two-thirds of the selected evaluators of an individual administrator.

43. **10B.4 Institutional Administration and Governance: Administrative Officer’s Training, Experience, Duties and Responsibilities.** “The College’s process for evaluating administrators will itself be evaluated on a regular basis” (LCC 2002 Self-Study 224).

The College’s newly approved Program Review policy requires administrators to lead scheduled reviews of their respective programs. Pursuant to this commitment, the Chancellor will carry out periodic reviews of the system employed to evaluate administrators reporting to him.

44. **10B.6 Institutional Administration and Governance: Faculty Role in Institutional Governance.** “The College will widely publicize the roles and responsibilities of the Campus Council” (LCC 2002 Self-Study 229).

The College’s Shared Governance Policy, with a description of the various governing bodies and their roles (See Appendix 3), can be found on the campus website and in the FYI Guidebook. (See Documents Room.)

45. **10B.6 Institutional Administration and Governance: Faculty Role in Institutional Governance.** “The College will communicate to all faculty and staff the decisions and actions of the Campus Council” (LCC 2002 Self-Study 229).

Campus Council minutes are printed regularly in the Campus Bulletin.
46. 10B.7 Institutional Administration and Governance: Faculty Senate Input Regarding Institutional Governance. "The Faculty Senate will put [the] revised Charter and By-Laws into effect" (LCC 2002 Self-Study 230)

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

47. 10B.8 Institutional Administration and Governance: Faculty Participation in Governance and on Appropriate Policy, Planning and Special Purpose Bodies. “The College will communicate its process for shared decision-making to make it clearer and more fully understood by the faculty” (LCC 2002 Self-Study 232).

The College’s Shared Governance Policy, with a description of the various governing bodies and their roles (See Appendix #2.), can be found on the campus website and in the FYI Guidebook. (See Documents Room.)


A formal organization of the Operations and Maintenance staff was formed with formal by-laws adopted in May 2002. (See Documents Room.)
Appendix #1
Aloha all Faculty and Staff,

This is to inform the campus community that, on 3/18/03, I approved the attached Policy on Curriculum Revision and Review.

The policy was drafted by the Accreditation Implementation Committee (AIC) on Curriculum Revision and Review co-chaired by Patricia Kennedy, Associate Professor of History, and Bernadette Howard, Acting Assistant Dean of Instruction. Also attached is the memorandum, dated 3/17/03, from the Co-Chairs to me transmitting the policy for my approval. As noted in that memorandum, the policy in essence has been extensively debated and reviewed and was accepted by the Faculty Senate (with certain recommended changes) at its meeting on 2/5/03.

The Recommendation of the October 2000 Accreditation Visiting Team

As you may recall, the AIC on Curriculum Revision and Review was established to review and help implement the following recommendation made by the October 2000 accreditation visiting team: "...that curriculum review and revision be made a systematic and cyclical process with the goal of assuring academic rigor and integrity in all courses and programs." This recommendation in essence was a carryover from the following recommendation made by the 1994 visiting team: "...that curriculum documentation and review become systematic and consistent in order to ensure that variations [between approved Core Outlines and individual course syllabi] are in the realm of professional latitude rather than substantive and qualitative in nature as at present."

The team's concerns. In making its recommendation, the October 2000 visiting team was concerned, among other things, with the following: "...while courses are reviewed as they are developed and modified, there is no systematic review of courses once they are taught repeatedly"; "A comparative review of sample Core Outlines and corresponding syllabi suggests that there are substantive inconsistencies between the outline (as the prescriptive document) and the syllabus (as the descriptive document)"; "critical curriculum information was not consistently described in the Core Outlines"; "...division chairs should ensure that all syllabi are regularly compared with their relevant [Core] Outline to provide assurance that the objectives and student competencies for all sections of a given course, wherever and by whomever offered, are consistent with the outline of record for that course"; "Periodic review of established Core Outlines should be
formalized and institutionalized to assure the currency and continued appropriateness of curriculum content, instructional methods, course activities and objectives, and student competencies."

The Policy and Its Implementation

As you will note from the attached Policy, its purpose is "To establish policy and procedures for institutionalizing curriculum revision and review, and for the periodic review of core outlines and course syllabi...."

The policy is a major step in implementing the accreditation team's above-quoted recommendation. I thank and commend the Committee, the various disciplines and Divisions, the Faculty Senate, and the faculty at large for all of your efforts in reviewing and debating the various issues, in making accommodations, and in reaching consensus agreement on the final draft of the policy.

I now ask all of you to support the purpose and intent of the policy by respectively doing what we need to do, in good faith and on a timely basis, to implement the policy and the procedures prescribed in the policy.

The Importance of the Focused Mid-Term Report

As you know, although the Accrediting Commission for Community and Junior Colleges accepted our Interim Report, we are now subject to a Focused Midterm Report with Visit. One of the accreditation recommendations we must especially focus on in the Midterm Report is the above-quoted recommendation relating to curriculum review and revision. Because it is a carryover recommendation from the 1994 visiting team, or two accreditation cycles ago, we must show resolution of the concerns which precipitated the recommendation or show substantial additional progress, subsequent to the Interim Report, in achieving such resolution.

The broad purpose of accreditation is institutional quality and self improvement.

Mahalo,

Mark Silliman
Provost

Attachments (2)
March 17, 2003

MEMORANDUM

To: Provost Mark Silliman

From: AIC on Curriculum Revision and Review Committee Co-chairs, Pat Kennedy and Bernadette Howard

Subject: Policy Draft

Attached find the committee’s final version of a policy on Curriculum Revision and Review.

The policy was developed in response to the accreditation team’s recommendation. It was extensively researched and debated by the committee members themselves, and received broad-based input from a campus-wide open forum, from division review and input, and finally by the Faculty Senate where it was unanimously recommended for approval at their Feb 5 meeting.

The committee now submits it to you for your approval and adoption as campus policy.

Approved:

/s/ Mark Silliman 3/18/03

Mark Silliman, Provost Date
Policy on Curriculum Revision and Review  
Leeward Community College

Purpose: To establish policy and procedures for institutionalizing curriculum revision and review, and for the periodic review of core outlines and course syllabi with the goal of assuring academic rigor and integrity in all courses and programs and of assuring the continued appropriateness of curriculum content, instructional methods, course activities and objectives, and student competencies.

Implementation:

1. The division will be responsible for determining which courses will be reviewed each year, so long as all courses are reviewed over a six-year cycle.
2. Each discipline will review its own courses, ensuring the accuracy of the core outlines, their academic rigor, integrity and currency, and the continued articulation of the courses with system colleges, should that be the case.
3. If the courses to be reviewed need no modification, the division chair will input approval into Curriculum Central.
4. If the core outlines that are reviewed need modification, normal curriculum procedures for course modifications as determined by the Chancellor for Community Colleges Memos (CCCM) will be followed within the current semester. The discipline representative will be present at the Curriculum Committee meeting to present the rationale, etc., for the changes.
5. Curriculum Central will be modified so that the essential elements needed for course syllabi are standardized with the same initial information. This standard information will become the first page(s) of each course syllabus to ensure that course alpha and number, title, credits, prerequisites, description, goals, and learning outcomes, are presented uniformly regardless of the instructor. Also on the first page(s) will be the fields for the instructor’s personalized information: name, office, office hours, phone number, email address, course section number, classroom, course meeting days and times, and requisite textbooks and supplies. Additional pages of the syllabus will reflect the individuality, style, and creativity of the instructor.
6. Each discipline will compare the core outlines of the revised courses with the individual syllabi of the faculty within the current semester.
7. If the syllabi do not reflect the required elements of the core outline, the discipline, along with the division chair, will work with the faculty to correct the discrepancies within the current semester.

Approved 3/18/03
Mark Silliman, Provost
Date: May 8, 2003

To: Provost Mark Silliman

From: Accreditation Implementation Committee on
Campus Council Constituencies & Shared Governance

James West, Secretary & Acting Chair (Dale Hood the Chair retired 12-31-2002)
Derrick Uyeda
Terry Richter
Cindy Martin
Ralph Toyama
Andy Rossi

Dottie Sunio
Cliff Togo
David Donaldson

Subject: Completion of Mission, Recommended Shared Governance & Final Report of the Committee

The committee’s final report is attached. We have also attached the Shared Governance Policy and Principles of Shared Governance both approved by the Faculty Senate on November 27, 2002 and by the Campus Council on March 6, 2003. This completes the work of the AIC on Campus Council Constituencies and Shared Governance. Your signature will establish the attached Shared Governance Policy and Principles as the Shared Governance Policy of Leeward Community College.

The policy was developed in response to the accreditation team’s recommendation relating to governance issues. It was observed that the college lacked a written shared governance policy. The committee developed a proposed policy with widespread input from all campus constituencies as well as the Faculty Senate. The committee met many times over the last two years. The campus community was given many opportunities for input including several open forums. The reports and the governance documents were discussed and approved by both the Faculty Senate and the Campus Council.

The committee also addressed the issue of the relationship of the Campus Council and the Faculty Senate. The committee’s report contains a clear description of the Campus Council Constituencies, as well as the relationship between the Campus Council and the Faculty Senate on various types of issues. The most prominent concern of a minority of Senators and assumedly other members of the community is that the Campus Council seems to usurp the Faculty Senate in setting budgetary policies of the college. The majority believed this is not an issue. However, the committee recommends that the college establish a record of the congruence and or divergence of recommendations made on budgetary decisions, which would show the Faculty Senate recommendations, the Campus Council’s recommendations and the actual priorities implemented.
Aloha all Faculty and Staff,

This is to inform the campus community that, on 5/15/03, I approved the attached Shared Governance Policy of Leeward Community College and the Principles of Shared Governance at Leeward Community College (hereinafter collectively referred to as the Shared Governance Policy or the Policy).

The Policy was drafted by the Accreditation Implementation Committee (AIC) on Campus Council Constituency Roles and Governance, initially chaired by Dale Hood until he retired in December 2002 and then by Acting Chair James West.

Also attached is the memorandum, dated 5/8/03, from the Committee to me transmitting the Policy for my approval. As noted in that memorandum, the Shared Governance Policy was developed "with widespread input from all campus constituencies," including through several open forums, and was approved by the Faculty Senate on 11/27/02 and by the Campus Council on 3/6/03. See the approval or signature section of the attached Policy.

Also attached is the document, dated 4/11/03, entitled "Report on the Relationship of the Faculty Senate to the Campus Council and a Description of Campus Council Constituencies." Although technically not a part of the Shared Governance Policy, this Report is integral to understanding the Policy and the respective roles of the Faculty Senate and the Campus Council in the context of shared governance and the relationship of one to the other. The Report also articulates for the College community a description of the various constituencies represented on the Campus Council and their respective roles on the Council and within the College as a whole. The Report therefore directly addresses the accreditation recommendation discussed below. As Provost, I officially accepted this Report, including the description of the various Campus Council constituencies, on 5/15/03. On the attached copy of the Report, my acceptance is indicated and dated on the last page.

Also attached is Committee's Progress Report dated 4/11/03. This Report provides helpful background information on the Committee's work and the development of the Shared Governance Policy and other written work products cited above.

The Recommendation of the October 2000 Accreditation Visiting Team

The AIC on Campus Council Constituency Roles and Governance was established in
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August 2001 to review and help implement the following recommendation made by the October 2000 accreditation visiting team: "...that the college clearly define the role of all constituencies on the Campus Council." The related, earlier recommendation of the 1994 visiting team was as follows: "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 [a]ffected by the decisions and clearly states the role and participation of faculty, support staff and students on College governing, policy making, planning, staff budgeting and special purpose bodies."

The recommendation made by the 2000 visiting team was a follow-up or carryover recommendation from the 1994 recommendation. In determining that the follow-up recommendation was necessary, the 2000 visiting team indicated as follows:

"The college set up the Campus Council, a representative governance body in response, and established a Charter and By-laws for the body. This was a major effort, and the College should be commended for its work. However, at the time of the team visit, there was considerable tension on campus regarding the roles of constituent groups in the Campus Council. The Faculty Senate was circulating a policy [draft of a shared governance policy] that would put all academic matters, as well as budgeting and planning, under their purview. Other segments of the college felt that this change would be tantamount to excluding them from college governance. This issue dominated college meetings at the time of the accreditation review, and it was clear to the team that the problem that led to the 1994 recommendation has not yet been put to rest."

In another part of its report, the 2000 visiting team indicated that "...the role of the faculty in governance has been contentious. Some on the Faculty Senate view their roles as guardian of academic issues to include personnel, budget and planning decisions. This view is in conflict with the representative organization of the Campus Council. This issue, which must be addressed internally, was a major point of discussion during the team visit."

In the context of the foregoing, the 2000 visiting team indicated that it was therefore recommending "that the college clearly define the role of all constituencies on the Campus Council."

For additional concerns expressed by the visiting team, see the team's Evaluation Report which has been posted on the LCC accreditation website at:

http://www.lcc.hawaii.edu/ac2006/

The Policy and Its Implementation

The approval of the Shared Governance Policy, including my official acceptance as Provost of the "Report on the Relationship of the Faculty Senate to the Campus Council and a Description of Campus Council Constituencies," in essence addresses and resolves the recommendation of the 1994 visiting team calling for a shared governance policy and
the recommendation of the 2000 visiting team to define the role of the various constituencies on the Campus Council.

I thank and commend the Committee, the Faculty Senate, the Campus Council, the various constituencies represented on the Campus Council, and the faculty and staff at large for all of your efforts in reviewing and debating the various issues and in reaching consensus agreement on the final draft of the policy. I consider this a major achievement in collegial decision-making. I especially acknowledge and applaud James West for his diligent efforts in shepherding this policy initiative through its various reviews and revisions to its final approval.

As indicated in the attached 4/11/03 Progress Report of the AIC on Campus Council Constituency Roles and Governance, the College must now "publicize the policy to insure that all constituencies and decision makers throughout the college know that the policy exists, understand the policy, and practice the policy." (Emphasis added.) This e-mail gives notice to the campus community that the Shared Governance Policy has now been approved as College policy and transmits electronic copies of the Policy and related documents. It is an important step in disseminating and publicizing the policy.

The Policy will also be included in the next update of the LCC handbook for faculty and staff: "For Your Information: A Guidebook for Faculty and Staff." By the end of Summer 2003, the Policy will also be posted on an LCC "policy webpage" together with other LCC policies so as to make them more readily accessible to the campus community. Effective Fall 2003, the Policy will also be covered in orientation sessions for new employees.

One of the principles enumerated in the Policy states as follows: "The Provost and the administration and all campus constituency leaders and representatives shall adhere to the shared governance policy." (Emphasis added.) As Provost, I pledge my support and the support of the Administrative team in following the Shared Governance Policy. May I also ask that everyone in the campus community and all campus constituencies and their respective leaders or decision-makers also support and follow the Policy and Principles of Shared Governance.

In the future there may arise honest differences of opinion as to whether the Shared Governance Policy and Principles were fully or strictly adhered to in particular cases or by particular decision-makers. However, as a campus community let us all do our very best, in good faith, to follow the Policy and the principles enunciated in the policy.

The definitions section of the Policy defines "shared governance" as "the act of collegial decision-making." In turn, "collegial decision-making" is defined as "the process of enabling constituencies, through consultation, to participate in giving input to affect decisions made at Leeward Community College." Relatedly, the policy section states in part that "Any individual or group of individuals on campus has the right to provide their views on any issue important to them. The college shall educate the faculty and staff of this right and provide opportunities for faculty and staff to provide input." And as
indicated in the attached Progress Report: "Shared governance can only become a reality when individuals both understand the decision-making processes and engage themselves in those processes in a creative, meaningful, and collegial manner."

In my view, the process involved in formulating, reviewing, debating, revising, and approving the attached Shared Governance Policy was itself a noteworthy example of shared governance--of collegial decision-making.

The broad purpose of accreditation is institutional quality and self improvement.

Mahalo,

Mark Silliman
Provost

Attachments (4 Word documents):

1. Shared Governance Policy and Principles; approved by Provost on 5/15/03.
2. 5/8/03 Committee Transmittal Memo to Provost
3. 4/11/03 Report on the Relationship of Faculty Senate to Campus Council & Description of Campus Council Constituencies
4. 4/11/03 Committee Progress Report

Content-type: application/msword;
name="Shared Governance Policy and Principles - approved by Provost on" 5-15-03.doc"
Content-disposition: attachment;
filename="Shared Governance Policy and Principles - approved by Provost on" 5-15-03.doc"
Date: Thu, 05 Jun 2003 11:58:15 -1000
From: Terry Richter <trichter@hawaii.edu>
Subject: Shared Governance Report: Corrected Copy
Sender: owner-lccfacstaff-l@hawaii.edu
X-Sender: trichter@mail.hawaii.edu (Unverified)
To: lccfacstaff-l@hawaii.edu
X-Mailer: QUALCOMM Windows Eudora Version 5.2.0.9

The message below is from the Provost:

############################################################

Aloha all Faculty and Staff:

**RE: Shared Governance Report: Corrected Copy**

Reference is made to my earlier e-mail--dated 5/22/03, Subject: Approval of Shared Governance Policy--in which I informed the campus community of my approval of the Shared Governance Policy and to which I attached four Word documents relating to "shared governance."

The purposes of this e-mail are (1) to correct one of the "shared governance" documents that was attached to that e-mail and (2) to transmit to the campus community the corrected or revised document. The affected document, dated 4/11/03, is entitled "Report on the Relationship of the Faculty Senate to the Campus Council and a Description of Campus Council Constituencies."

Subsequent to my 5/22 e-mail, I received on 5/29 a letter dated 5/25/03 from James West, Acting Chair of the Accreditation Implementation Committee (AIC) on Campus Council Constituency Roles and Governance, which had drafted the report, that there was an inadvertent error in that 4/11/03 "Report." The error was in the form of an inaccurate paragraph on page 2 of that "Report" that should have been deleted from the Committee's final version of the report. The subject paragraph read as follows:

"Dissolution:
The Board of Regents may dissolve the Faculty Senate. The Campus Council may be dissolved by a majority vote of its members, a majority vote of the Faculty Senate and finally by approval by the Provost."

The second sentence of the quoted paragraph is inaccurate because the Charter and Bylaws of the Campus Council is silent on the issue of the Council's dissolution. And because the quoted paragraph is not materially consequential to the report, the intent of the Campus Council, at its meeting on March 6, 2003, was that the subject paragraph be deleted from the final version of the "Report."

**Corrected Report Attached**
For the updated information of the entire campus community, I have attached a copy (as a Word document) of the corrected or revised "Report" from which the quoted, inaccurate paragraph has been deleted. Please disregard the earlier, 4/11/03 version of the "Report" that was attached to my e-mail of 5/22/03. Attached as the third of four Word documents, it was labeled "4-11-03 Report on Faculty Senate & Campus Council Constituencies.doc". I had officially accepted that "Report" on 5/15/03, as indicated on the last page of that document.

To avoid future confusion, the attached corrected "Report" has been redated "Revised May 29, 2003." On the last page of that revised "Report," my acceptance of the report now indicates that the "Revised Report" was accepted by the Provost on May 30, 2003. This "Revised 5/29/03 Report" officially supersedes the earlier April version of the Report.

Mark Silliman
Provost

Attachment (Word document): Revised 5/29/03 Report on the Relationship of Faculty Senate to Campus Council & Description of Campus Council Constituencies

Terry Ann Richter CPS
Secretary to the Chancellor, Office of the Chancellor
Leeward Community College, 96-045 Ala Ike, Pearl City HI 96782
Phone: 808/455-0215 / Fax: 808/455-0641 / email: trichter@hawaii.edu
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Report on the Relationship of the Faculty Senate to the Campus Council and a Description of Campus Council Constituencies

Revised May 29, 2003

Shared Governance and Shared Leadership Differentiated:
The Faculty Senate and the Campus Council facilitate shared governance not shared leadership. Shared leadership is the act of decision-making and is carried on by those authorized to make decisions. Many leadership decisions are embedded in various positions of authority throughout the college. Shared governance is the process by which leaders and decision makers exchange ideas with those affected by decisions. Through the Campus Council and the Faculty Senate input is provide primarily to the Provost in regards to recommending college policies, priorities and procedures to the Provost. The entire college however is committed to a shared governance policy and all embedded leaders are to consider the policy in their areas of decision-making. This report focuses on the faculty Senate and the Campus Council and the constituencies they serve.

The Faculty Senate Overview:
The Board of Regents chartered the Faculty Senate to be the primary voice of faculty in the academic governance of the college. All faculty with Board of Regent’s appointments are eligible to serve on the Faculty Senate. The faculty elects twenty-one members at large with half of the Senate elected each year. The Faculty Senate also allows two nonvoting guests to participate but not vote at its meetings – one representing Lecturers, who are ineligible to serve on the Senate and another representing students who are also ineligible to serve on the Faculty Senate.

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

The Faculty Senate elects its own leadership and these leaders represent the Faculty on broad based system policy recommending bodies such as the All Campus Faculty Senate Chair, which brings together the many Senate chairs from across the system. In addition to providing its own input to the Provost, Chancellor of Community Colleges, President of the University of Hawaii or Board of Regents of the University of Hawaii, the Faculty Senate is also one of the constituency groups represented on the Campus Council.

The Campus Council Overview:
The Faculty Senate, the administration and all other identifiable campus interest groups established the Campus Council in 1995. The Campus Council is a constituency advisory group whose twenty-one members represent all organized constituencies on campus.

1 Prepared by the Accreditation Implementation Committee on Campus Council Constituency Roles and Governance, Leeward Community College, to address the recommendation of the October 2000 accreditation visiting team relating to shared governance and the need to define the role of all constituencies on the Campus Council.
The Campus Council functions as a recommending and advisory body of the college especially in matters relating to the budgetary priorities of the college. The primary purposes of the Campus Council are to make recommendations in matters relating to budget planning and resource allocation and to allow for all campus constituencies an opportunity to provide input and report back to their constituencies. Unlike the Faculty Senate, the campus council does not involve itself in matters relating to curricular development or academic policy except insofar as these raise substantial budgetary issues.

The Campus Council members have the responsibility of insuring that the flow of information upon which priority or preference decisions are made includes the input and the feedback of the constituencies they represent. Through the Campus Council all constituencies on campus are given a chance to provide input and have their input passed on to the Provost.

The Campus Council and Faculty Senate Compared:

Membership:
The Faculty Senate has twenty-one members, all of whom are elected at large by the faculty. The Campus Council has twenty-one members; one is drawn at lot from faculty volunteers and twenty represent specific constituencies at Leeward Community College.

Authority:
The Faculty Senate is authorized by the Board of Regents to be the voice of the Faculty at Leeward Community College. The Campus Council is authorized by the Faculty Senate, the Provost and the constituencies of the college to allow all campus constituencies a voice in the governance of the college and especially in budgetary matters relating to the college.

Charters and Amendments or Changes of Charters:
The Campus Council and Faculty Senate each have a charter. The Faculty Senate Charter can only be changed with the approval of the Board of Regents. The Campus Council may make changes to its own Charter.

Advisory Role:
The Faculty Senate is the voice of the faculty on matters of curriculum, academic policy, budgetary overview and any other issue that it chooses to address. It is the official voice of the Faculty. The Campus Council’s is the voice of campus constituencies, including not only faculty but also administration and numerous other constituencies that are listed and described below. The Campus Council is not intended or charged by its Charter to
advise on curriculum issues. The Campus Council is charged to provide constituency input on issues before the college and especially on budgetary priorities.

**Extent of its Advisory Role:**
The Faculty Senate represents Leeward Community College on many matters and issues beyond the campus level. The Campus Council functions only as an advisory body on issues at the college and especially on budgetary matters on campus.

**Campus Council Constituencies:**
The Campus Council has twenty-one members: ten represent faculty constituency groups, seven represent administration, one represents students, one represents members of the Administrative, Professional and Technical employees, one represents the clerical staff and one represents the academic support personnel.

**Administration Representatives on the Campus Council:**
1. The Provost – Nonvoting
2. Dean of Instruction
3. Dean of Students
4. Director of Administrative Services
5. Director of the Office of Continuing Education
6. Director of Leeward Community College – Waianae
7. Director of Operations and Maintenance

**Faculty Representatives on the Campus Council**
8. Faculty Senate Chair
9. Chair of Student Services
10. Chair of Arts and Humanities
11. Chair of Social Science
12. Chair of Business Education
13. Chair of Language Arts
14. Chair of Vocational Technology
15. Chair of Math and Science
16. Lecturer Group Representative
17. Faculty at Large – Chosen by lot from faculty who volunteer

**Student and Staff Representatives on the Campus Council**
18. Academic Support Group Designate
19. Administrative, Professional and Technical Designate
20. Clerical Staff Council Designate
21. Student Government Representative
Student Government

The Board of Regents chartered The Associated Students of the University of Hawaii at Leeward Community College (ASUH-LCC) to be the primary voice of students in matters of student interest. All credit students of Leeward Community College are members of ASUH-LCC. Students elect their own leaders, including a President, Vice-President, Secretary and Treasurer as well as a Senate with up to fourteen members. Student Government has one representative on the Campus Council.

The Clerical Staff Council

The Clerical Staff Council has been organized since 1975. It is one of the oldest staff constituency groups on campus. All clerical staff at the college are eligible to join the Clerical Staff Council. The purpose of the Clerical Staff Council is to promote and improve communication and mutual understanding among the clerical staff, faculty, staff, students, administration and the community. The Clerical Staff Council has one member on the Campus Council.

The Administrative, Professional and Technical Group

The members of the Administrative, Professional and Technical (APT) classification established the APT Group in 1994 to provide input and advice on campus priorities and to provide a forum for its members to exchange ideas. The groups objectives are: to exchange information relevant to its members, to address their concerns, to participate in Campus Council deliberations and other decision making committees and to provide an interpersonal networking environment for all APT ‘s. The APT Group is composed of members with unique and diverse skills working in partnership with the campus and the community in a wide variety of roles, such as: lab managers, education specialists, student services specialists, media specialists, theatre personnel, human resources staff and fiscal officers. The APT Group has one member on the Campus Council. During the 2001-2002 school year there were thirty-four members in this group.

The Operations & Maintenance Group

The Operations and Maintenance Staff Development Group has been meeting since Fall 1999 to discuss staff development needs and issues. This group is in the process of transitioning into a formal Operations and Maintenance group. The O & M membership serves the college in a wide variety of roles such as: security workers, maintenance workers, grounds keepers and janitors. The O & M Group has one member on the Campus Council.

The Division Chairs

The seven instructional divisions at Leeward Community College each have a Chair. Each of the chairs serve as both elected leader of the faculty of their division as well as
the constituency representative of their respective divisions on the Campus Council. The election and appointment of Division Chairs is one of the clearest examples of successful shared governance at Leeward Community College since it illustrates the delicate interaction of input to administration, i.e., election results, and administration's willingness to listen to and implement that input when the division's choice is named Chair. The Division Chairs, in addition to teaching some classes, coordinate the teaching assignments, schedules, and workload of the faculty in their respective divisions. The Chairs also oversee the budget, the equipment, and the personnel of their respective divisions.

**The Lecturer Group**

The Leeward Community College Lecturer Group organized in 1998. Lecturers, also known as adjunct faculty, are teachers who teach on soft money and do not, as do full-time and half-time faculty, have Board of Regents appointments. The Lecturer Group is diverse and includes those who teach as few as one section to those who may teach as many as five sections. There are approximately 60 lecturers hired each semester at Leeward Community College. This group is organized to bring concerns germane to lecturers to the attention of the college. They have solved numerous issues over the past few years. The lecturers of the college elect a voting member to the Campus Council and a nonvoting member to the Faculty Senate.

**The Academic Support Personnel**

The Academic Support staff includes the college staff that work in the Library, in the Media Center, in the Staff Development Office, in the Assessment Office, in the Computer Center, in the Learning Resource Center, in Electronic Repair, in Duplicating Services, in Graphics, in Video Production and in the College's computer labs. These workers may be classified as Faculty or Administrative, Technical and Professional Staff or Clerical Staff. They are organized under the leadership of the Assistant Dean of Academic Services. Those who are faculty may be elected to serve on the Faculty Senate. Those who are APT's may join the APT Group. As a group, they have one seat on the Campus Council.

**Leeward Community College – Waianae (LCCW)**

Leeward Community College operates a branch campus in Waianae. This satellite campus serves approximately four to five hundred students each semester. Its facilities house computer labs, several classrooms, a small library and a learning lab. Due to its unique role as Leeward Community College's outreach college its director serves as a representative of the Campus Council.

End of report

Revised Report accepted by
Mark Silliman, Provost
May 30, 2003
3-18-2003

The Shared Governance Policy of Leeward Community College

1. Any individual or group of individuals on campus has the right to provide their views on any issue important to them. The college shall educate the faculty and staff of this right and provide opportunities for faculty and staff to provide input.

2. Administrators shall demonstrate a willingness to incorporate a large amount of faculty and staff input into decision-making especially relating to academic policies, academic procedures, and financial and budgetary matters.

3. Administrators and other decision makers shall provide reasons for decisions that are contrary to the wishes of constituency groups and other recommending bodies.

The Principles of Shared Governance at Leeward Community College

1. The Provost and the administration and all campus constituency leaders and representatives shall adhere to the shared governance policy.

2. The college should provide on-going education regarding the agreed upon shared governance policy.

3. The administration must solicit and consider Faculty Senate input before decisions are made that have a direct impact on the academic policy, the academic curriculum or the academic procedures of the college.

4. A team approach to planning and problem solving should be employed.

5. Committee members and constituency representatives are responsible for keeping the people they represent informed.

6. Committee members on administrative and campus wide committees should be selected or nominated by the groups they represent or at least chosen from lists submitted by elected leaders of those groups.

7. Decision-makers should communicate their actions and decisions with reasons appropriate to those decisions to those directly affected by the decision.

8. The Campus Council and Faculty Senate’s recommendations on budgetary priorities should be given heavy weight in administrative decisions relating to those matters.
General Comments about the meaning of words used in the Shared Governance Policy and the Principles of Shared Governance

I. Definitions:

1. Governance is the act of decision-making.
2. Shared governance is the act of collegial decision-making.
3. Collegial decision-making is the process of enabling constituencies, through consultation, to participate in giving input to affect decisions made at Leeward Community College.

II. Clarifications:

1. Shared Governance does not take away the authority invested in decision-makers to make decisions.
2. Collective Bargaining is a form of shared governance. Unions and Management negotiate to establish working conditions and salaries.
3. Shared Governance dictates that individuals will have an opportunity to participate in decision-making. Individuals may participate by voicing opinions, voting, making recommendations, investigating, writing reports, evaluating leaders, serving as consultants, leading forums, attending forums, serving on senates and councils and committees. This is not an exclusive list.
4. Committees, senates, councils, divisions and constituency groups are a mainstay of shared governance. These groups are empowered by shared governance to make formal recommendations on issues before them.

The Shared Governance Policy and the Principles of Shared Governance were approved by the following:

The Faculty Senate of Leeward Community College on November 27, 2002

/s/ James Goodman
By James Goodman, Faculty Senate Chair

The Campus Council of Leeward Community College on March 6, 2003

/s/ Manuel Cabral
By Manuel Cabral, Chair of the Campus Council

The Provost of Leeward Community College on May 15, 2003

/s/ Mark Silliman
Mark Silliman, Provost of Leeward Community College
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Progress Report of the AIC on Campus Council
Constituency Roles and Governance

April 11, 2003

1. Summary of the original problem:

In response to a recommendation in the 1994 accreditation report, a representative governance body called the Campus Council was created with its own Charter and By-Laws. All campus constituencies were represented on the Faculty Senate sponsored committee that recommended the establishment of this Campus Council and the Faculty Senate and Administration subsequently gave their approval to the Campus Council.

Per its Charter, the Campus Council “shall function as the recommending and advisory body of the college in matters relating to the priorities of the college.” “Priorities” is defined in the Charter as “establishing preferences, for the direction of the college, especially in regard to budget planning and resource allocation.

The Evaluation Report of the Accrediting Commission for Community and Junior Colleges dated January 19, 2001 commended the college for “organizing the Campus Council” but noted that the college needed to “define the roles of all constituencies in governance.” Also, the report mentions that the role of faculty in governance has been contentious: “Some on the Faculty Senate view their roles as guardian of academic issues to include personnel, budget and planning decisions. This view is in conflict with the representational organization of the Campus Council.”

The Evaluation report made the following recommendations:

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

2) “The team recommends that the college develop and implement a written policy which articulates a decision making process which includes persons who will be affected by the decisions and clearly states the role and participation of faculty, support staff, and students on College governing, policy making, planning, staff budgeting and special purpose bodies.”
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Applicable Standards

Standard 10B.8 states: "The institution has a written policy which identifies appropriate institutional support for faculty participation in governance and delineates the participation of faculty on appropriate policy, planning, and special purpose bodies."

Standard 10B.9 states: "The institution clearly states and publicizes the role of staff in institutional governance."

Standard 10B.10 states: "The institution clearly states and publicizes the role of students in institutional governance."

2. Present status of the problem:

Both the Faculty Senate and The Campus Council have approved a Shared Governance Policy and a set of Shared Governance Principles. These policy and principles now await approval from the Provost. The policy and principles of shared governance once approved by the Provost will address the visiting team's main recommendation, namely that Leeward Community College establish a written Shared Governance Policy. The committee also has revised its report on the relationship between the Campus Council Constituencies and the Faculty Senate.

3. Proposal of a solution:

Once the Shared Governance Policy is approved by the Provost, it will be necessary for the college to publicize the policy to insure that all constituencies and decision makers throughout the college know that the policy exists, understand the policy and practice the policy.

Shared governance can only become a reality when individuals both understand the decision-making processes and engage themselves in those processes in a creative, meaningful, and collegial manner. The ultimate success of the policies and principles of shared governance and their beneficial effect on campus morale and indeed campus decision making itself needs to be assessed in a systematic manner.

The college must put in place the resources to assure that the policy is well known and widely practiced.
4. **Review of the campus community:**

The Committee after a lengthy discussion and review process during the 2002-2003 school year revised the Shared Governance Policy and Principles of Shared Governance and revised the report on the relationship between the Campus Council and the Faculty Senate. On November 27, 2002 the Faculty Senate reviewed and approved of the Shared Governance Policy, the Principles of Shared Governance and the Report on the relationship between the Faculty Senate and the Campus Council. On March 6, 2003 the Campus Council reviewed and approved of the same Shared Governance Policy, Principles of Shared Governance and draft report.

5. **Shift from plan to implementation:**

During the 2003-2004 school year the committee recommends the college establish a committee or persons in charge of promoting and assessing the Shared Governance Policy. The three key questions that must be addressed are: How does the college promote and practice shared governance? How do we know that? And how could we do it better?
Appendix #3
## 2003 360 Evaluation Ratings for

### A. Leadership
Provides vision and direction in a positive environment that encourages innovation and creativity in staff and faculty, instills confidence in others to achieve excellence; supports faculty and staff to work collegially and effectively to accomplish goals, missions and projects for the benefit of the University's students.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Eval Category</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>NA</th>
<th>Sum</th>
<th>Avg*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL 36</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subordinate</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peer</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constituent</td>
<td>23</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### B. Relations with Others
Establishes and maintains positive and supportive working relationships with colleagues within the UH system, legislature, Board of Regents and other relevant agencies which demonstrably has a positive impact on the program/campus. Identifies and supports staff development and career paths for subordinates to improve and become more successful in their area of assignment. Is clearly a team member.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Eval Category</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>NA</th>
<th>Sum</th>
<th>Avg*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL 35</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subordinate</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peer</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constituent</td>
<td>23</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### C. Planning
Forecasts, anticipates and projects future directions such that the program/campus/program is poised to effectively respond and take advantage of such identified tasks, identifies short-term and long-term needs and plans for them; monitors progress toward planned objectives and takes appropriate actions, as needed.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Eval Category</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>NA</th>
<th>Sum</th>
<th>Avg*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL 35</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subordinate</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peer</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constituent</td>
<td>23</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### D. Decisiveness
Recognizes when immediate decisions are required to ensure the accomplishment of goals, objectives, and missions, withholds decision-making as appropriate, understands the impact of decisions made, is willing to take risks and embark on new and innovative directions as the result of decisions made, recognizes when a decision is required, the operational interrelationships and impact of the decision, and acts effectively and expeditiously.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Eval Category</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>NA</th>
<th>Sum</th>
<th>Avg*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL 35</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subordinate</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peer</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constituent</td>
<td>23</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### E. Problem Solving
Anticipates and identifies issues, concerns and problems that may affect academic and/or administrative programs or areas of responsibility, guides and/or participates in analytical processes which ensure all relevant facts, issues and concerns are addressed, uses creativity and initiative to “problem solve” with the best interests of the University fully considered.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Eval Category</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>NA</th>
<th>Sum</th>
<th>Avg*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL 35</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subordinate</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peer</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constituent</td>
<td>23</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### F. Organizational Abilities
Plans for, and schedules and controls work of others effectively and efficiently; uses resources in an optimal fashion; deals effectively with heavy workload demands.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Eval Category</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>NA</th>
<th>Sum</th>
<th>Avg*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL 35</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subordinate</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peer</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constituent</td>
<td>23</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### G. EEO/AA
Demonstrates commitment and leadership in advancing and supporting the equal employment opportunity and affirmative action programs of the college/campus or program; provides opportunities for the development and mentoring of women, minorities, persons with disabilities and veterans.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Eval Category</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>NA</th>
<th>Sum</th>
<th>Avg*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL 35</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subordinate</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peer</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constituent</td>
<td>23</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### H. Safety
Displays a safety sensitive perspective to ensure the safety of persons, programs and facilities under their purview. Is cognizant of safety concerns/issues and develops appropriate preventative measures and takes decisive and appropriate action.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Eval Category</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>NA</th>
<th>Sum</th>
<th>Avg*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL 35</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subordinate</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peer</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constituent</td>
<td>23</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### I. Overall Rating

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Eval Category</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>NA</th>
<th>Sum</th>
<th>Avg*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL 35</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subordinate</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peer</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constituent</td>
<td>23</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Rating Scale: 1 = Not Applicable; 2 = Below Expectations; 3 = Meets Expectations; 4-7 = Exceeds Expectations.
Leeward Community College provides a comprehensive, postsecondary program in the liberal arts and a broad spectrum of program offerings in the vocational-technical areas. Leeward Community College:

- offers liberal arts programs which lead to the Associate in Arts degree and lower-division preparation for baccalaureate degrees;
- offers occupational programs which lead to Certificates of Achievement and Associate in Science degrees;
- offers vocational-technical programs which lead to Certificates of Achievement and Associate in Science degrees;
- offers continuing education, workforce development, and community services programs of both the credit and non-credit variety.

OFFICE OF THE CHANCELLOR

This office is charged with the overall responsibility for the College’s planning, policy and assessment, instructional, student services, academic support and continuing education and training and workforce development and institutional support programs. The Chancellor serves as the Chief Executive Officer (CEO) of the College as the college’s liaison officer to the President of the University of Hawaii system, the Board of Regents, and the State Legislature.

The Chancellor supervises the Vice Chancellor & Chief Academic Officer, the Director of Planning Policy and Assessment and the Director of Administrative Services.

Specific functions assigned include the following:

- provides leadership for all programs.
- oversees the development and implementation of the strategic plan, long range development plan, and accreditation process;
- responsible to ensure that governmental regulations, Board of Regents,
Executive and college policies and procedures are adhered to;
• coordinates, facilitates, and ensures effective communication internal and external to the College;
• responsible for the financial resources of the College;
• responsible for the fundraising, marketing, and public relations of the college.
• sets the broad instructional goals and mission.

OFFICE OF THE DIRECTOR OF PLANNING, POLICY AND ASSESSMENT

This office is responsible for college wide planning efforts, developing and coordinating policy, and coordinating institutional assessment and analysis. The Director for Planning, Policy and Assessment reports directly to the Chancellor.

Specific functions assigned include the following:

• provide institutional research services;
• coordinate policy development/analysis and institutional assessment;
• oversees and coordinates the strategic planning process;
• oversees the college's self-study and accreditation process;
• oversees and coordinates the long range development planning process;
• maintain and keep current the college's policies and procedures;
• manages student, course and curricula information for the college.
• manages the College's marketing and recruitment plan.
• coordinates the production of all College publications.
• manages the art and layout for the campus publications.

OFFICE OF THE VICE CHANCELLOR AND CHIEF ACADEMIC OFFICER (CAO)

This office is charged with the responsibility for providing leadership and overseeing the credit and non-credit instructional operations of the College, and insures that all programs and services provided are in accord with approved instructional goals as articulated in the campus academic development plans, strategic plan, and master plans, University and governmental regulations, Board of Regents, Presidential policies and procedures and provisions of employee contracts are applied accordingly.

As the Vice Chancellor and CAO, this position supervises the Dean of Arts and Sciences, the Dean of Career and Technical Education, the Dean of Academic Services, the Dean of Student Services, and the Dean of Continuing Education and Workforce Development.
Specific functions assigned include the following:

- Represents the College's academic programs and other units within the University, City/State/Federal governments, and the community at large;
- Establishes planning parameters for the development of academic program plans, budgets for and expenditure plans; approved these plans and incorporates them into instructional plans;
- Oversees the scheduled evaluation and assessment of all academic programs and services offered;
- Reviews all recommendations for all personnel actions involving all College instructional services staff (hiring, renewing contracts, terminations, tenure, promotions, leave requests, etc.);
- Receives and resolves grievances and disputes involving faculty, academic staff and students at the College, within established guidelines.

OFFICE OF THE DEAN OF ARTS & SCIENCES

This unit is headed by the Dean of Arts and Sciences. It is a line position responsible for the overall administration and management of the LCC transfer curricula, general education, developmental and remedial education. The position is directly responsible for the provision of instructional programs and courses, curriculum development and approval, and overall management of the credit function of the Arts & Sciences instructional divisions. The Dean provides leadership in planning and setting priorities for the Arts and Sciences instructional divisions, managing resources, and ensuring implementation of statutes, regulations and policies.

The Dean is charged with providing administrative support and supervising the operation of all the Arts and Sciences instructional activities offered at the College. The Dean reports to the Vice Chancellor and CAO and is assigned a staff of Division Chairs elected by the faculty to assist in carrying out assigned functions.

Specifically, this unit is charged with responsibility for the following functions:

- develops program plans and targets for Instruction;
- provides for the scheduled evaluation of all activities in these program units;
- develops a budget and expenditure plan for all approved activities (including staffing plans, equipment acquisition plans, etc.) and supervises the expenditure of funds allocated to operating units supervised;
- responds to requests for information, problems, adjudicating disputes and
grievances, within established guidelines;
• represents the College at meetings on matters related to Arts & Sciences Instruction;
• supervises the recruitment, hiring and evaluation of staff; also, assigns workload;
• plans and implements a program of staff development for faculty and staff assigned to the unit;
• develops informational materials on programs and services offered within the unit.

General Education Programs

The Dean supervises the instructional divisions (Arts and Humanities, Language Arts, Math and Natural Sciences, Social Sciences, and LCC@Waianae) charged with general education responsibilities. It is their function to provide transfer curricula, general education, remedial and developmental education. The division offices perform administrative functions to facilitate the realization of the goals of the College and University in these areas of instruction:

• responsible for the administration, supervision, assessment, development and improvement of the faculty and curriculum;
• coordinates teaching assignments and the scheduling of courses;
• secures instructional materials for division personnel and prepares divisional budgets;
• assists in the development of new courses and programs and facilitates in-service training as necessary;
• makes recommendations to the Vice Chancellor and CAO regarding faculty evaluation and the selection of new personnel;
• serves as a liaison between the division and other units of the College.
• provides for the planning, evaluation and implementation of all instructional and support services.

OFFICE OF THE DEAN OF CAREER & TECHNICAL EDUCATION

This unit is headed by the Dean of Career & Technical Education. This office is charged with the responsibility for overseeing the career and technical education degree and certificate programs. The Dean provides leadership in planning and setting priorities for the career and technical education instructional divisions, managing resources, and ensuring implementation of statutes, regulations and policies.

The Dean reports to the Vice Chancellor and CAO and is assigned a staff of
Division Chairs to assist in carrying out assigned functions.

Specific functions assigned include the following:

- develops program plans and targets for Instruction;
- provides for the scheduled evaluation of all activities in these program units;
- develops a budget and expenditure plan for all approved activities (including staffing plans, equipment acquisition plans, etc.) and supervises the expenditure of funds allocated to operating units supervised;
- responds to requests for information, problems, adjudicating disputes and grievances, within established guidelines;
- represents the College at meetings on matters related to Career and Technical Education;
- supervises the recruitment, hiring and evaluation of staff; also, assigns workload.

OFFICE OF THE DEAN OF ACADEMIC SERVICES

This unit is headed by the Dean of Academic Services. This office is charged with the responsibility for overseeing the academic service operations of the College and ensuring that all academic service programs, including those undertaken by the Educational Media Center, Learning Resource Center, Library, the Information Technology Group, Staff Development Office, Assessment/Placement Office, International Education, and Grants Office, are in accord with the approved education plans, university and government regulations, and provisions of employee contracts.

The Dean of Academic Services is a line position responsible for providing administrative support and supervising the operation of all Academic Service operations offered at the College. The Dean reports to the Vice Chancellor and CAO and is assigned with a staff of appointed unit heads to assist in carrying out assigned functions.

Specifically, the Office of the Dean of Academic Services is charged with the responsibility for the following functions:

- develops program plans and targets;
- provides for the scheduled assessment and evaluation of all activities in Academic Services;
Leeward Community College
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• develops a budget and expenditure plan for approved activities (including staffing plans, equipment acquisition plans, etc.) and supervises the expenditures of funds allocated to the operating units;
• responds to requests for information, problems, adjudicating disputes and grievances;
• represents the College at meetings on matters related to Academic Services;
• supervises the recruitment, hiring and evaluation of staff;
• assigns workload;
• plans and implements a program of staff development for a faculty and staff assigned to unit;
• informs College, University, and the community on programs and services of the unit;
• represents Academic Services at system-wide activities as necessary;
• assists in the coordination and implementation of system-wide activities;
• responds to the requests from University offices;
• serves as staff for special assignments for the Vice Chancellor and CAO;
• other duties as assigned.

The Academic Services unit is charged with supporting the academic operations of the College. It is their primary function to provide a broad range of services to the academic programs of the College. The Academic Services units also provides where appropriate, services to all units of the College.

Educational Media Center (EMC)

Provides support for teaching and student learning through the integration and use of the various media and technology

• plans, organizes and administers the educational media services for the College;
• produces programming for the college including but not limited to distance education and other instructional materials;
• coordinates distance education for the College;
• conducts in-service training services for faculty and staff;
• coordinates the use and maintenance of media facilities and resources;
• assesses EMC services and programs.

Learning Resource Center (LRC)

Provides assistance and support to students for the promotion of student learning.
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- provides learning support including but not limited to tutoring, workshops and Supplemental Instruction to promote development of writing, technology, and learning skills as well as mastery of academic subjects;
- provides students with study materials, educational technology, and other resources;
- offers academic testing services for courses offered by the College and Distance Education courses offered by other institutions;
- develops and implements a full range of services for students with disabilities through the Kako'o Ike (KI) program;
- assesses LRC services and programs.
- provides training for students in advanced technology.

Information Technology Group (ITG)

Provides a supportive information technology environment for enrichment of student learning.

- manages and maintains College computer classrooms and laboratories;
- plans, designs, implements, and maintains the college networking infrastructure;
- provides desktop and software support services for faculty, staff, and students;
- maintains computers, servers and peripherals;
- inventories College software and licenses;
- provides network services and applications;
- assesses information technology services.
- provides training for students in advanced technology.

Library

Provides access to information resources that support student learning.

- acquires, catalogs, circulates, and maintains library resources such as books, periodicals, and recordings;
- provides instruction to students and other patrons on finding, accessing, and evaluating information resources and research strategies;
- develops local and/or specialized information resources including print collections and databases;
- provides research assistance and services to students and other patrons;
- assesses library collection and services.
Special Projects

Grants Office

Seeks extramural funding to support and enhance programs promoting student learning.

- researches and writes grants from government and private agencies;
- provides assistance and training in grant writing for faculty and staff;
- maintains a resource of grant information for the College;
- assesses grant services.

Assessment/Placement Office

Insures students are placed at an appropriate level within College programs to maximize their learning.

- provides a comprehensive program of assessment and placement testing for all incoming students;
- provides interpretation, counseling and advice to students on placement scores;
- serves as an adjudicator on appeals of placement decisions;
- makes recommendations on placement instruments and services to the College administration;
- assesses placement services.

Staff Development Office

Provides comprehensive training and professional development programs for faculty and staff enabling the College to provide the best possible environment for student learning.

- develops, organizes and implements workshops, classes, colloquia, and other forums of professional and personal development for faculty and staff;
- serves as resource center for materials on professional and personal development;
- advises and assists faculty and staff on external professional and personal development resources;
- assesses staff development services.
International Education Office

Provide a wide variety of support services for international education.

- Develops, organizes and implements programs that will enhance international education;
- Serve as a resource center for international students.
- Assesses international education service.

OFFICE OF THE DEAN OF STUDENT SERVICES

This unit is headed by the Dean of Student Services and reports directly to the Vice Chancellor and CAO. The office is charged with the responsibility for supervising and coordinating the College's student services programs including student activities, registration, admissions, student records, financial aid, counseling and advisement, career advising and job placement, health center, and special projects.

The Dean of Student Services supervises the Student Services Division Chairperson, Counseling and Advisement, Job Placement, Admissions and Records, Student Life and Development, Financial Aid, and the Campus Health Center. Specific functions assigned include the following:

- oversees the planning, direction, and overall coordination of the programming and operations of the programs in student services;
- recommends and monitors the student services budget including operating funds, student activity funds, and special funds;
- coordinates activities with major component areas such as instruction, academic support; and administrative services.
- represents the College at meetings and conferences involving student affairs.

Student Services Division

The Student Services Division is headed by a Division Chairperson held by a member elected from the professional staff. The Division Chairperson:

- facilitates the development and implementation of student services programs;
- coordinates the budget preparation, processes and monitors the expenditure of these funds for the division;
supervises the daily functions and facilitates the interaction of all the student services units.

### Counseling and Advisement

- conducts a systematic program of advisement and orientation for all new/returning/transfer students;
- provides counseling assistance to any student requesting such services in the areas of academic planning, career exploration and development, and academic/ interpersonal problems and barriers;
- oversees the continued development and administration of the self development and career exploration courses;
- oversees the services to special groups of students such as the disadvantaged, veterans, immigrants, women's groups, and other target groups in need of special help;
- oversees the general counseling and advising student services at designated satellite centers to the College like the LCC-Waianae Education Center.

### Job Placement Services

Job Prep Services (JPS) is the office where career and technical education students can prepare for the job hunt, and research employment opportunities. The JPS Office:

- provides job search strategies and job referrals;
- provides workforce readiness workshops;
- assists student to identify job positions that match their career objectives;
- advises students individually, and in small groups, with resume review, mock interviews, and employer background information;
- provides computer access to research companies and complete online applications.

### Admissions and Records

- coordinates and supervises the activities relating to admissions and records;
- serves all areas of the College and the community regarding the activities of the Admissions and Records Office;
- serves as a liaison with the Community College Institutional Research Office in the maintenance of records;
Student Life/Development

- coordinates and develops extracurricular programs and services of benefit and interest to students;
- serves as the advisor to the Associated Students of Leeward Community College (ASLCC).

Financial Aid Office

- administers the financial program, including student loans, scholarship, grants and tuition waivers support from federal and state funds. The office provides financial aid counseling and manages awards.

Campus Health Center

- provides emergency and non-emergency care on nursing level and conducts health screening;
- provides health education and counseling for students and academic community on demand;
- provides workshops, programs, and classes on current health issues and topics of vital interest to the students and the academic community;
- provides first aid training to the emergency health officers on the campus.

OFFICE OF THE DEAN OF CONTINUING EDUCATION AND WORKFORCE DEVELOPMENT

This unit is headed by the Dean of Continuing Education and Workforce Development and reports directly to the Vice Chancellor and CAO. The Dean supervises and coordinates all educational activities and special programs that are not part of the regular instructional program of the college.

- manages and coordinates educational and related programs not part of the regular credit instructional program of the College;
- develops, coordinates, and solicits external sources of funding for non-credit courses and programs;
- oversees the college's public service mission in continuing education, workforce development and extension service;
- oversees the use of college facilities for non-credit programs and events and for community users, exclusive of credit instructional programs;
• oversees the operations of the college theatre. Works closely with theater staff and community users in implementing and administering theater events and programs;
• assesses and reviews current programs and services, budget, Strategic Plan, new programs and outreach;
• works in close partnership with credit instructional departments in the co-sponsorship of non-credit programs including program and budget administration, marketing and related activities.

OFFICE OF THE DIRECTOR OF ADMINISTRATIVE SERVICES

This unit is headed by the Director of Administrative Services who reports directly to the Chancellor. The Director is responsible for the planning, organizing, and directing of all administrative support services required by the College. These services include, but are not limited to, overall management processes, budgetary and financial management, personnel management and administration, procurement and property management, building and grounds maintenance, security, and physical planning of both repair and maintenance and capital improvement projects and auxiliary services.

Human Resources Office

The Human Resources Office is responsible for all aspects of personnel management and administration. The areas of responsibility are, but not limited to are:

• recruitment and appointments;
• employee benefits;
• employee relations
• labor relations;
• classification and compensation
• worker’s compensation;
• student employment;
• collective bargaining contracts;
• EEO/AA policies and procedures;
• maintains and handles personnel record keeping and transactions
• develops and implements applicable policies and procedures
• other human resources functions
Business Office

The Business Office is responsible for the overall financial management of the College. The areas of responsibility are but not limited to:

- financial accounting;
- accounts receivables;
- disbursing and accounts payables;
- cashiering;
- contracts and grants management;
- RCUH financial management;
- UH Foundation management;
- procurement;
- payroll;
- maintaining financial internal control;
- other Business Office functions.

Operations and Maintenance

The Operations and Maintenance unit is responsible for the day to day operations of the physical plant and grounds. The areas of responsibility are but not limited to:

- electrical maintenance;
- plumbing;
- carpentry;
- janitorial;
- security;
- telecommunications;
- mailroom service;
- air conditioning maintenance;
- elevator maintenance;
- movement;
- grounds and roadway maintenance;
- lost and found;
- parking;
- construction and repairs administration;
- other operations and maintenance duties.
Appendix #5
Aloha all Faculty and Staff,

This is to inform the campus community that, on 5/12/03, I approved the attached Policy on Unit/Area Program Reviews.

The policy was drafted by the Accreditation Implementation Committee (AIC) on Program Reviews/Program Health Indicators co-chaired by Kathy Hill, Associate Professor of Accounting, and Emily Uribe, Instructor of Mathematics. Also attached is the memorandum, dated 5/8/03, from the Committee to me transmitting the policy for my approval. As noted in that memorandum, the policy has been extensively researched and debated by the Committee, "received broad-based input from a campus-wide open forum, and was presented to the Faculty Senate on February 12, 2003 and to the Campus Council on March 6, 2003."

The Recommendation of the October 2000 Accreditation Visiting Team

As you may recall, the AIC on Program Reviews/Program Health Indicators was established in 8/01 to review and help implement the following recommendation made by the October 2000 accreditation visiting team: "...that the college reexamine and adapt the application of the Program Health Indicators (PHI) model (or another appropriate program review model) to all its programs, and especially to student services, so that a structure, process, and culture are developed for its effective use in planning, decision making, and program performance improvement."

The team's concerns. In making its recommendation, the October 2000 visiting team was concerned, among other things, with the following: "... The team was aware the college has done fine work in using the Program Health Indicators (PHI) as a tool for assessing its vocational instructional programs. However, program review needs to be done across the campus, and student services stands out as an area particularly in need to effect a process that will guide decision making and program improvement." "... For some time, the college has been using the Program Health Indicators (PHI) model to provide an annual index of the health and effectiveness status of its vocational technical programs and has attempted to adapt this model to evaluate other academic programs and student service[s] performance. While the model is theoretically sound, it is clear to the team, as it is to the college staff, that the model and the PHI reports are not being used effectively to improve programs and services." "As indicated in the self study, the college is aware that it needs to incorporate the program review process more effectively
into planning and include not just academic programs but also every program and unit of
the college."

For additional concerns expressed by the visiting team, see the team's Evaluation Report
which has been posted on the LCC accreditation website at:

http://www.lcc.hawaii.edu/ac2006/

The Policy and Its Implementation

The policy is a significant step in implementing the accreditation team's above-quoted
recommendation. I thank and commend the Committee (especially Kathy Hill), the
Faculty Senate, the Campus Council, and the faculty and staff at large for all of your
efforts in reviewing and debating the various issues and in reaching consensus agreement
on the final draft of the policy.

As noted in part I of the attached Policy, the overall purpose of the program review
process "is to provide the College with a formal and systematic method for conducting
ongoing assessment and the collection of data that provides valuable feedback to the
campus community." The assessment and feedback will inform campus decision-making
at all levels and will be an integral part of the College's planning, implementation, and
budgeting process.

As also indicated in part I, the main focus of unit and area reviews "is to provide
evidence that each unit/area of the College is providing quality support of student
learning and related student outcomes." See also part II, item 6. And as prescribed in
part III, item 4, a program review will assess whether the unit/area is meeting its goals
and objectives in terms of the "outcome measures" (part III, item 2) which had been
developed by that unit or area. Item 5 then prescribes that current or potential problems
be identified and action plans formulated for program improvement.

Such review, documentation, and assessment for program improvement will be critical
under the new ACCJC Accreditation Standards with its central emphasis on student
learning outcomes. As stated in the new Standards (Standard 1: Institutional Mission
and Effectiveness; B. Improving Institutional Effectiveness):

"The institution demonstrates a conscious effort to produce and support student learning,
measures that learning, assesses how well learning is occurring, and makes changes to
improve student learning. The institution also organizes its key processes and allocates
its resources to effectively support student learning. The institution demonstrates its
effectiveness by providing 1) evidence of the achievement of student learning outcomes
and 2) evidence of institution and program performance. The institution uses ongoing
and systematic evaluation and planning to refine its key processes and improve student
learning."

The complete text of the new ACCJC Accreditation Standards is posted at:
http://www.accjc.org/

I now ask the campus community to support the purpose and intent of the attached policy by respectively doing what we need to do, in good faith and on a timely basis, to implement the policy and the procedures prescribed in the policy.

If you have any questions about the policy, two principal resources are our Institutional Research Analyst Andy Rossi and Kathy Hill. Ms. Hill will also be serving in academic year 2003-2004 as the Chair of the LCC Faculty Senate's Program Review Committee, thereby helping lend continuity from policy formulation to the initial phases of policy implementation.

The broad purpose of accreditation is institutional quality and self improvement.

Mahalo,

Mark Silliman
Provost

Attachments (2 Word documents)
Date: May 8, 2003

To: Provost Mark Silliman

From: Accreditation Implementation Committee on Program Reviews/Program Health Indicators

Kathy Hill, Co-Chair
Gail Levy
Mike Pecsok
Andy Rossi

Stu Uesato
Emily Uribe, Co-Chair
Gwen Williams

Subject: Policy on Unit/Area Program Reviews

The committee’s final version of a Policy on Unit/Area Program Reviews is attached.

The policy was developed in response to the accreditation team’s recommendation relating to program reviews. It was extensively researched and debated by the committee members themselves, received broad-based input from a campus-wide open forum, and was reviewed by the Faculty Senate on February 12, 2003, and the Campus Council on March 6, 2003.

The two concerns that were voiced from the Senate are presented as follows:

1) The Senate has a concern that the demand of setting program/unit outcomes and collecting and analyzing the data may prove time consuming and will eventually become a workload issue for faculty and unit members.

2) The Senate is also concerned that whatever outcomes are established, they should meet the ACCJC Standards of Accreditation and, at the same time, be of value to the faculty/unit members in order to help them improve the delivery of instruction.

No comments or concerns were noted from the Campus Council.

The committee now submits the policy for your approval and adoption as campus policy.

Approved:

/s/ Mark Silliman 5/12/03

Mark Silliman, Provost
Policy on Unit/Area Program Reviews
Leeward Community College

I. Introduction

1. The overall purpose of the unit/area review process is to provide the College with a formal and systematic method for conducting ongoing assessment and the collection of data that provides valuable feedback to the campus community. The feedback or assessment process is instrumental to the decision-making for all units/areas and at all levels throughout the Campus and is an integral part of the College's planning, implementation, and budgeting process.

2. The main focus of the unit/area review process is to provide evidence that each unit/area of the College is providing quality support of student learning and related student outcomes. Each individual unit/area has the integral responsibility for establishing this evidence.

3. This policy was developed to supplement the guidance provided by the University of Hawaii, Executive Policy – Administration, E5.202 Review of Established Programs, June 1987. The purpose of this document is to clarify and further define the existing UH program review policy to better fit the organizational structure, culture, and institutional programs of Leeward Community College.

4. For the purposes of this unit/area review process, a unit/area is defined as any one, or set of degree/certificate programs or areas of instruction, and/or administrative support activities that are deemed by the Campus to be sufficiently related in terms of objectives, clients served, resources used, or other common identification for the purposes of evaluating performance, determining accountability, and improving quality.

5. A list of review units, modeled after the approved organizational structure (Appendix A), is provided below.

    Units/Areas
    a. Office of the Provost (Provost responsible)
       i. Marketing
       ii. Fund Development
       iii. Institutional Research
    b. Academic Support (Asst. Dean of Academic Support responsible)
       i. Educational Media Center
       ii. Grants Writing
       iii. Information Technology Group
       iv. International Education
       v. Learning Resource Center
       vi. Library
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vii. Staff Development

c. Student Services (Dean of Student Services responsible)
   i. Admissions & Records
   ii. Counseling
   iii. Financial Aid
   iv. Job Placement
   v. Student Health Center
   vi. Student Life
   vii. Student Publications

d. Community Services (Director of OCET responsible)
   i. Contract Training
   ii. Facilities Use
   iii. Non-Credit Instruction
   iv. Theatre

e. Administrative Services (Director of Administrative Services responsible)
   i. Business Office
   ii. Human Resource Office
   iii. Operations & Maintenance
   iv. Security

f. Instruction (Dean of Instruction responsible)

Note: The approved organizational structure divides instruction into divisions, but the complexity of this unit/area may require other subdivisions according to location (Pearl City and Waianae), method of instruction (distance education and face-to-face), and degrees and certificates (AA & Gen Ed/AS/AAS). The subdivisions of this unit/area will be determined by the Faculty Senate and Dean of Instruction.

6. Several units may be included in one area. For example, the Business Office, Human Resources Office, and Operations and Maintenance are units in the Administrative Services area. These units will be reviewed at the same time and the Director of Administrative Services will be ultimately responsible. What happens in this area is determined by the units, the Director of Administrative Services, and the Provost.

7. A subcommittee of the Faculty Senate will oversee the review process for the instruction area because of its complexity. What happens in this area is determined by the units, the Faculty Senate, the Dean of Instruction, and the Provost.

8. Excluded from the purview of this policy are the programs or activities that receive special funding through grants. Examples of these are: Title III, Ka Hanauna Project (Native Hawaiian Program); the Carl Perkin’s Vocational and Technical Education Act; and the Housing and Urban Development (HUD) Waianae Coast Telecommunications Institute. These grants/projects are unique in that they have different reporting/evaluation timetables, different reporting format requirements,
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and have mandated outcome measures. In effect, the assessment processes for these unique programs are mandated by the granting agency. This significantly hampers the College from modifying the review process in order to increase the efficiency and effectiveness of the assessment vehicle. While assessment of these programs is important, these reviews are viewed as separate initiatives and do not come under this policy.

II. Policy Objectives

1. To provide Program Managers, Administrators, Faculty, and Staff with important information that is used for "internal" control and assessment within units/areas and for the Campus' integrated planning, implementation, and assessment process.

2. To establish a model or method for conducting unit/area reviews that facilitates the efficient evaluation of all units/areas (instructional programs and administrative support activities).

3. To identify key positions and specific responsibilities that are essential to the unit/area review assessment process.

4. To identify the organizational units/areas to be assessed and a time frame for conducting the reviews.

5. To prescribe an administrative reporting format that is prescriptive, yet generic enough, to accommodate the different organizational units/areas and the variety of data that will be collected.

6. To help assure that each functional unit/area of the College is providing quality support of student learning and related student outcomes.

III. Review Procedures: At a minimum, annual reviews will include the following information utilizing the template (Appendix B).

1. Develop a list of unit/area goals and/or objectives as they relate to the College's mission statement and strategic plan.

2. Develop outcome measures based on unit/area goals and/or objectives.

   A. Each unit/area will have the option of selecting outcome measures that provide quantitative/qualitative data useful for managing the unit/area and evaluating student learning or related student learning outcomes. Appendix C is a list of potential outcome measures that may serve as a starting point from which to choose. However, each unit/area is not
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restricted to this list but rather should select outcome measures that provide meaningful feedback.

B. The selection of outcome measures requires a joint perspective of all affected persons within the unit (in addition, including student input where appropriate) and the immediate supervisor as well as upper level supervisors of units/areas who should be involved in the selection of outcome measures. Additionally, each level of the College hierarchy (Division Chairs, Deans, Directors, Provost) may select other quantitative measures that present them with valuable information relative to their perspectives.

3. Review data annually. Data (based on outcome measures) will be collected and provided to Administrators, Division Chairs, Program Managers, and the unit/area so that frequent, on-going feedback to and management of these units/areas can proceed efficiently. Data may be centrally collected by an Institutional Researcher or others depending on the specific outcome measures selected.

4. Assess whether or not the unit/area is meeting its goals and/or objectives.

5. Identify any present or potential problems plus a description of any action plans that may lead to unit/area improvement.

6. Follow up on results.

IV. **Policy Change:** In the event that a review unit/area requests a change or adjustment to this review policy, the Provost and the administrative team will become the Program Review Oversight Committee. Units/areas should contact their immediate supervisors through the College hierarchy until the request reaches the Dean/Director of the unit/area. The request for policy change would become an agenda item on the regularly scheduled meeting of the administrative team.

Approved 5/12/03

Mark Silliman
Provost
Leeward Community College
Organizational Structure

Appendix A
## EXAMPLE

### Unit/Area Review: Title III Grant

**Goal 1:** Improving the college enrollment figures of native Hawaiian students

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Outcome Measure</th>
<th>Definition</th>
<th>Method of Collection &amp; Source</th>
<th>Expected Level of Performance</th>
<th>Actual Level of Performance</th>
<th>Intended Use of Results</th>
<th>Previous Year's Actual Results &amp; Actions Taken</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. The percentage of Hawaiian students enrolled at LCC.</td>
<td>The total number of Hawaiian students enrolled at LCC at the end of the Fall semester, divided by the total number of students attending LCC during the same time period.</td>
<td>Data collected using the Banner System. <strong>Source:</strong> Title III Enrollment Report.</td>
<td>Using the previous 5-year average as a baseline, the percent of Hawaiian students will increase by ½ %, each succeeding year. <strong>Baseline:</strong> Fall 95 to Spring 00 (10 semesters) = 13% Hawaiians and 87% non-Hawaiians</td>
<td>Fall 2001: 13.7% Hawaiians and 86.3% non-Hawaiians</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
# REPORT TEMPLATE

## Unit/Area Review:

### Goal 1:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Outcome Measure</th>
<th>Definition</th>
<th>Method of Collection &amp; Source</th>
<th>Expected Level of Performance</th>
<th>Actual Level of Performance</th>
<th>Intended Use of Results</th>
<th>Previous Year's Actual Results &amp; Actions Taken</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Potential Outcome Measures

1. **Total Student Registrations:** The total number of students registered in all liberal arts classes. (Source: Aldrich)

2. **Percentage of Student Registrations by AcademicDivision:** The total number of student registrations by academic division, divided by total student registrations. (Source: Aldrich)

3. **Student Semester Hours:** The sum of the semester hours taken by all students registered in liberal arts classes. (Source: Aldrich)

4. **Number of Classes:** The total number of liberal arts classes offered by the college. (Source: Aldrich)

5. **Average Class Size:** Total Student Registrations divided by the total number of classes. (Source: Aldrich)

6. **Occupancy Rate:** The Total Student Registrations divided by the total seats available (class capacity). (Source: Aldrich)

7. **Student Faculty Ratio:** FTE Students divided by FTE Faculty. (FTE Students equals the Total Student Registrations divided by 15, and FTE Faculty equals the Number of Semester Hours Taught divided by 15). (Source: Aldrich)

8. **Number of Small Classes:** The number of classes taught with an enrollment lower than 10 students. (Source: Aldrich)

9. **Cost per Class:** Total program costs (Direct Instructional Costs) divided by the number of classes taught. (Source: Aldrich)

10. **Credits Earned Ratio:** Student registrations, which earned the credits attempted, divided by the total students registrations (% of Grades “D” and above). (Source: Aldrich)

11. **Number of Transfer Students:** The total number of students enrolling at another college or university having previously attended Leeward Community College. (Source: MAPS, Transfer Patterns of Undergraduate Students, UH, Fall 1999)

12. **GPA of Transfer Students:** The grade point average of students who attended LCC and transferred to UH-Manoa, and UH-West Oahu. Note: These data are not available as yet but action is being taken to obtain this information.
13. **Student Satisfaction**: Responses obtained through the administration of the LCC Student Satisfaction Survey.

14. **Faculty/Staff Satisfaction**: Responses obtained through the administration of the LCC Faculty/Staff Satisfaction Survey.

15. **Number of Degrees Awarded (A.A., A.S., A.A.S.)**: The total number of approved degrees awarded between July 1\(^{st}\) and June 30\(^{th}\). (Source: MAPS, Degrees & Certificates Earned, UH Community Colleges)

More examples of potential outcome measures will be added as they are identified through unit/area reviews.
**Coordinator/Head Librarian is appointed by the Chancellor**

+Position to be redescribed

@Position to be reallocated to Chart III. Excluded from position count, this chart
Academic Services Mission Statements

**Library**
The mission of Leeward Community College Library is to help prepare knowledgeable, resourceful and responsible citizens for Hawaii and the global community by facilitating active exploration, discovery and synthesis of information.

*Library Goal*
As an integral part of the total educational program of the institution, the primary goal of the library program is to promote learning related to the curriculum of the institution. The means of achieving this goal is teaching students information-seeking skills for self-directed studies and lifelong learning.

To do this the library strives to provide the best possible access to information in print, media, or electronic format, and the means for delivering the information to individual users, groups, and classrooms. We work to provide this access from our own collection of materials paired with efficient supportive equipment and services. We work to integrate new information and new instructional technologies into the program, via delivery systems extended through such means as cooperative borrowing, resource sharing, renting or leasing services and materials, and the use of electronic databases and other technologies.

**Innovation Center for Teaching & Learning**
*Vision:* We envision an inclusive environment where people are excited about continually improving teaching and learning.

*Mission:* The Center’s mission is to improve teaching and learning by encouraging collaboration, inspiring innovation, and recognizing excellence. Innovation Center for Teaching & Learning Leeward Community College, Pearl City, Hawai‘i

**Information Technology Group**
Information Technology Group strives to provide quality and easy to use computing, and network accessibility to the students, faculty and staff in support of instructional, research, service and academic support.

Our mission is to assist the community college in achieving its goals of technological superiority by providing and maintaining an integrated information technology system that effectively supports the Community College's administrative and academic functions.

Our goal is to utilize new advances in technology to leverage the college's current investments in hardware, software and applications. Provide wider, more timely and easier access to the college network. Improve the quality, availability and usefulness of
the application systems and obtain and implement adequate resources to support campus applications while continuing to investigate new methods and technologies.

**Educational Media Center**

*Vision:* The Educational Media Center (EMC) will provide quality support for teaching and learning through the integration and use of technology.

*Strategic Objectives:*
1. Encourage application of technology to enhance the quality of instruction and services delivered to students both on and off campus.
2. EMC facilities will be information and technology friendly, with a reliable modern technical infrastructure equipped for services appropriate for the use of the college.
3. A committed EMC staff will assist the LCC campus community to effectively use information technology.

**Learning Resource Center**

The mission of the Learning Resource Center is:
- to help students to succeed in their courses;
- to help students become better learners;
- to assist students at all levels of ability and preparation;
- to provide LRC student employees with opportunities for personal and professional development.

To achieve this mission, the LRC will:
- serve students and faculty with respect, acceptance and competent assistance;
- provide a wide range of up-to-date computer and other educational technologies;
- remain responsive to the changing needs of students, faculty, curriculum, and the college as a whole.
Appendix #8
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Compiled and submitted by
Kathleen Cabral
Publications Specialist
September 24, 2001
Publications Assessment

Purpose:
- To gather information for the development of an institutional marketing plan
- To compile an institutional listing of publications [Action Plan item listed in Accreditation Self-Study, Standard 2.1, Attachment D]
- To prepare the College for proposed name change

Method:
A memorandum distributed to all faculty and staff on August 24 requested copies of all printed materials used for "external" communications.

This written request was followed up with an email reminder on September 10 and several phone calls to key personnel.

My first step is an assessment of all current printed materials we use for "external" communication. Please forward a copy of all brochures, program flyers and event promotional materials to me via the Provost’s Office. Please include any notes on revision plans, if any. At this time, this does not include flyers produced for on-campus use [publicizing classes, activities, or workshops for our "internal" audience].

The call for materials resulted in the compilation of more than 60 different brochures and 40 pieces of collateral materials [flyers, bookmarks, handouts from the health center and financial aid office, and various promotional items].

Analysis:
The assessment focused on 46 current publications [see Attachment A].

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Department</th>
<th>Quantity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>General LCC</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Services</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arts &amp; Humanities</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business Tech</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Language Arts</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Math &amp; Sciences</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Sciences</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vocational Ed</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic Support</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OCET</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Objective analysis was conducted using the criteria below:
- printing/copying method
- paper stock and ink color(s)
- graphics
- content
- EEO/AA policy
- web reference
- use of LCC logo
- contact information

Subjective analysis was conducted through a review of the materials by an LCC retiree, an LCC student and myself using the following criteria:
- writing style
- design style
Specific Findings:

- 40% of materials do not contain any EEO/AA statements.
- 60% of materials have no web reference [college or program website].
- Only 37.5% have a "call to action" element [listing and explanation in Attachment B]
- Inconsistent use of institution’s name [see Attachment C].
  UNIVERSITY OF HAWAI’I Leeward Community College
  Leeward Community College, a campus of the University of Hawai‘i
  LEEWARD
  Leeward, the Rainbow Community College

- Wide variety of fonts used for institution’s name, including formal serif, contemporary sans serif, script, informal handwritten and decorative outlines [see Attachment C].
- Lack of consistency across the campus creating a highly fragmented image of the College.
- Heavy use of standard copying rather than high-resolution desktop or commercial printing; 72% are simply copied.
- Extensive use of inexpensive paper; 70% of materials are copied on standard 20 lb. copier stock.
- Lack of comprehensive brochures on the College. In the primary brochure used by Student Services to promote the College ["Educational Programs"], 82.5% of the text refers to vocational programs with only 17.5% referring to liberal arts programs. According to the LCC Fact Book: 21% of our students are enrolled in vocational programs and 72% in general and pre-professional programs [1999 figures].
- Inconsistent use of graphics, specifically clip art; e.g. railroad tracks used on the TV Pro brochure.
- Social Sciences had the most consistent uniformity for all disciplines within their division. They also included a date on all materials
- Vast improvement shown in most recent materials developed for full color printing [both on campus printing and at commercial printers].
- Circulation of Materials: OCET brochures are mailed to 100,000 to area households and more 12,000 Theatre Season brochures are distributed over the course of a year. Distribution of other materials was not covered in this assessment.
Possible Reasons for Negative Findings:
- Lack of agreement on what our “message” is.
- Brochures are often thrown together quickly for a specific event [e.g. conference].
- No long range planning across the campus
- Lack of coordinated effort for publications, creating a conflicting styles and messages
- Lack of “style guides” for faculty and staff who produce their own materials

Miscellaneous Findings
- The language of some of the brochures is very academic, especially when describing the courses.
- 45% of out-dated brochures represent viable programs and should be revised

Recommendations
- Development of a style guide for all campus publications
- Establishment of standards and procedures by which the institutional message and image can be included in all campus and departmental publications
- Development of publications support that is coordinated between EMC and Publications Specialist [or Office of Public Information]. This would include consultation to determine the objectives of the brochure [the key messages and defining the audience] as well as coordinating an annual schedule to avoid last minute rush jobs.
- All brochures, with the exception of the latest Business Technology materials, need to be revised and up-dated with a more consistent College image.
- Implementation of the following new publications:

New Publications Needed:
- AA Degree
- Sales and Marketing
- Business Foundations
- Music Academic Certificate
- E-commerce
- Pre-Allied Health
- Various Liberal Arts
- Fundraising
- Distance Education
- Halau 'Ike O Pu'uloa

---

1 We currently have a very small number of brochures on liberal arts, yet it one of our strengths. 76.4% of classes offered are in the liberal arts and 23.4% in vocational [1999 LCC Fact Book].
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Format/Paper</th>
<th>Ink</th>
<th>Content</th>
<th>Contact</th>
<th>EEO</th>
<th>Web</th>
<th>Logo</th>
<th>P/C</th>
<th>Images</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>College Catalog</td>
<td>Perfect bound booklet</td>
<td>4 color</td>
<td>Required text and general information</td>
<td>Several</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>Photos</td>
<td>On-going revisions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schedule of Courses</td>
<td>Saddle stitch booklet</td>
<td>B/W</td>
<td>Semester course listings</td>
<td>Several</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>Photos</td>
<td>On-going revisions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21st Cent Tech Training</td>
<td>Tabloid; 1 fold</td>
<td>4 color</td>
<td>Tech courses/programs</td>
<td>Prov or Dean</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y-c</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>Photos</td>
<td>Splash copies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UH LCC</td>
<td>Tabloid; 1 fold; heavy st.</td>
<td>4 color</td>
<td>International students</td>
<td>Admiss</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y-c</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>Photos</td>
<td>Splash copies; out of date</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Services</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educational Programs</td>
<td>Legal trifold</td>
<td>B/W</td>
<td>About the degree and cert programs</td>
<td>Admiss</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>Logo as grad cap</td>
<td>serves as the most basic About LCC brochure;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kokua &amp; Info Services</td>
<td>Letter trifold, white</td>
<td>B/W</td>
<td>St srv programs</td>
<td>StuSrv</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>needs updating</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Handbook</td>
<td>8.5x11 booklet; 40 page blue cover (c st)</td>
<td>B/W</td>
<td>Acad griev policy; st cond code; PERPA; discr compl, sexual harass; students with disabilities</td>
<td>no #s for admin indicated</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>P</td>
<td></td>
<td>Portions of screened logo</td>
<td>1998</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P.U.E.O</td>
<td>Letter trifold coated stock</td>
<td>4 color</td>
<td>About program</td>
<td>Names, ph, email</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>Owl illus.</td>
<td>Corny acronym; nice layout; does graphic connect to HS kids?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ho'oulu</td>
<td>Letter trifold, buff</td>
<td>B/W</td>
<td>About program</td>
<td>Phone #</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>Clip art, hand drawn</td>
<td>poor quality</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Komo Mai Ctr</td>
<td>Letter tri; pre-print</td>
<td>B/W</td>
<td>Services, applying to LCC</td>
<td>Phone #</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>Clip art</td>
<td>needs improvement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hawaii Upward Bound</td>
<td>Letter trifold, lime</td>
<td>B/W</td>
<td>About the program</td>
<td>Phone #</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>Clip art</td>
<td>clip art</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upward Bound Math/Science</td>
<td>Legal trifold</td>
<td>B/W</td>
<td>Who we are; purpose; coursework; how to apply</td>
<td>Names, ph, email</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y-p</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>Photos &amp; clip art</td>
<td>mix of clip art and photos</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health Ctr</td>
<td>Letter - flyer</td>
<td>B/W</td>
<td>Services</td>
<td>Phone #</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>simple flyer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Childrens Ctr</td>
<td>Letter trifold, blue</td>
<td>B/W</td>
<td>About prog, tuition</td>
<td>Phone #</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>Map</td>
<td>cute children's art</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arts &amp; Hum.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Philippine Studies</td>
<td>Letter trifold</td>
<td>4 color</td>
<td>Prog objectives; course listing</td>
<td>Many very good</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>Varied styles</td>
<td>academic subject certificate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bus Tech</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>very mixed bag</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bus Tech</td>
<td>Letter trifold</td>
<td>4 color</td>
<td>Learn more Earn More; gen info on all BT prog collateral to above</td>
<td>Ph. fax. email</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y-p</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>High quality</td>
<td>very high tech look</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pre-Business</td>
<td>Legal trifold green</td>
<td>B/W</td>
<td>About program; transfer AA deg; LCC advanatage</td>
<td>Name, ph</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>Folders w/logo</td>
<td>5/95 on back</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervisory Management</td>
<td>Letter trifold buff</td>
<td>B/W</td>
<td>About prog AAS degree</td>
<td>Names, ph #</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>name of program??</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E-Commerce</td>
<td>Letter</td>
<td>B/W</td>
<td>Listing of courses</td>
<td>Ph, email</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subject</td>
<td>Folder Type</td>
<td>Color</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Name, Ph, E-mail</td>
<td>Y-P</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>Alum Photos</td>
<td>LCC Advantages</td>
<td>Fonts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accounting</td>
<td>letter trif</td>
<td>white</td>
<td>B/W about prog AAS degree LCC advantages</td>
<td>name, ph, email</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>Y-p</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OAT</td>
<td>letter trif</td>
<td>blue</td>
<td>B/W about prog; cert &amp; degree faculty, LCC advantage</td>
<td>name, ph, email</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lang Arts</td>
<td>letter trif</td>
<td>blue</td>
<td>B/W about prog; cert &amp; degree faculty, LCC advantage</td>
<td>name, ph, email</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ESL</td>
<td>letter trif</td>
<td>buff</td>
<td>B/W about prog; cert &amp; degree faculty, LCC advantage</td>
<td>name, ph, email</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reading Course</td>
<td>legal trif</td>
<td>buff</td>
<td>B/W about prog; cert &amp; degree faculty, LCC advantage</td>
<td>name, ph, email</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Writing Program</td>
<td>legal trif</td>
<td>lavender</td>
<td>B/W about prog; cert &amp; degree faculty, LCC advantage</td>
<td>name, ph, email</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Math &amp; Sci</td>
<td>letter trif</td>
<td>green</td>
<td>B/W about prog; cert &amp; degree faculty, LCC advantage</td>
<td>name, ph, email</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environmental Studies</td>
<td>letter trif</td>
<td>green</td>
<td>B/W about prog; cert &amp; degree faculty, LCC advantage</td>
<td>name, ph, email</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ICS</td>
<td>letter trif</td>
<td>lavender</td>
<td>B/W about prog; cert &amp; degree faculty, LCC advantage</td>
<td>name, ph, email</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Biology</td>
<td>letter trif</td>
<td>blue</td>
<td>B/W about prog; cert &amp; degree faculty, LCC advantage</td>
<td>name, ph, email</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Sci</td>
<td>letter trif</td>
<td>purple</td>
<td>B/W about prog; cert &amp; degree faculty, LCC advantage</td>
<td>name, ph, email</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economics</td>
<td>letter trif</td>
<td>lime green</td>
<td>B/W about prog; cert &amp; degree faculty, LCC advantage</td>
<td>name, ph, email</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Human Service</td>
<td>letter trif</td>
<td>lavender</td>
<td>B/W about prog; cert &amp; degree faculty, LCC advantage</td>
<td>name, ph, email</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Geography</td>
<td>letter trif</td>
<td>blue</td>
<td>B/W about prog; cert &amp; degree faculty, LCC advantage</td>
<td>name, ph, email</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anthropology</td>
<td>letter trif</td>
<td>salmon</td>
<td>B/W about prog; cert &amp; degree faculty, LCC advantage</td>
<td>name, ph, email</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Psychology</td>
<td>letter trif</td>
<td>cherry</td>
<td>B/W about prog; cert &amp; degree faculty, LCC advantage</td>
<td>name, ph, email</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sociology</td>
<td>letter trif</td>
<td>purple</td>
<td>B/W about prog; cert &amp; degree faculty, LCC advantage</td>
<td>name, ph, email</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Political Science</td>
<td>letter trif</td>
<td>blue</td>
<td>B/W about prog; cert &amp; degree faculty, LCC advantage</td>
<td>name, ph, email</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cert.-Compet</td>
<td>legal 4-fold</td>
<td>pink</td>
<td>B/W about prog; cert &amp; degree faculty, LCC advantage</td>
<td>name, ph, email</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vocational Ed</td>
<td>letter trif</td>
<td>pink</td>
<td>B/W about prog; cert &amp; degree faculty, LCC advantage</td>
<td>name, ph, email</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Food Service &amp; Culinary Arts</td>
<td>letter trif</td>
<td>blue</td>
<td>B/W about prog; cert &amp; degree faculty, LCC advantage</td>
<td>name, ph, email</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Digital Media</td>
<td>letter trif</td>
<td>yellow</td>
<td>B/W about prog; cert &amp; degree faculty, LCC advantage</td>
<td>name, ph, email</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CAD</td>
<td>letter trif</td>
<td>4 color</td>
<td>B/W about prog; cert &amp; degree faculty, LCC advantage</td>
<td>name, ph, email</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Paper Stock Used:

- 70% on 20 lb. copier stock
- 24% on special stock (parchment, glossy, card stock)
- 6% on pre-printed brochure paper stock

### Table: Publication Assessment Data

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Publication</th>
<th>Versions</th>
<th>Color</th>
<th>Goals</th>
<th>Name, Ph</th>
<th>C</th>
<th>Photos and Cars</th>
<th>Confusing Layout</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Automotive</td>
<td>2 pre-print; letter trifold</td>
<td>B/W 4 color</td>
<td>Ford Asset cert blurs; AAS req</td>
<td>yes N Y</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>RR tracks?</td>
<td>need to update text</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TV Pro</td>
<td>letter trifold; lav.</td>
<td>B/W</td>
<td>course list; about prog</td>
<td>phone no N N C</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>photos and cars</td>
<td>very confusing layout</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acad. Sup.</td>
<td>letter trifold blue</td>
<td>B/W</td>
<td>where are we</td>
<td>phone hours no Y Y C</td>
<td>maps</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Library</td>
<td>letter trifold yellow</td>
<td>B/W</td>
<td>how do I find...</td>
<td>phone hours no N Y Y C</td>
<td>none</td>
<td>very wordy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Library</td>
<td>letter trifold white</td>
<td>B/W</td>
<td>Who are we?</td>
<td>phone hours no N Y Y C</td>
<td>none also one for Library at LCCW</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Library</td>
<td>letter trifold green</td>
<td>B/W</td>
<td>What do we Have?</td>
<td>phone hours no N Y Y C</td>
<td>none</td>
<td>very wordy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hawaii Nat'l</td>
<td>9x16, 4-fold coated stock</td>
<td>B/W</td>
<td>about the seminar appl form</td>
<td>phone hours no Y Y P</td>
<td>photos</td>
<td>very wordy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Great Teachers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OCET</td>
<td>12x9; booklet [6x9]; glossy stock</td>
<td>2 color</td>
<td>non credit courses sporadic mentions of other College things</td>
<td>many yes Y-p N P</td>
<td>mixed</td>
<td>very confusing &quot;disconnected&quot; layouts</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theatre Season</td>
<td>variable 2-4 color</td>
<td>2 color</td>
<td>season events</td>
<td>phone web no Y N P</td>
<td>photos</td>
<td>order form</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UHCC Sys</td>
<td>varied varied varied</td>
<td>varied</td>
<td></td>
<td>P</td>
<td>photos</td>
<td>various brochures</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**OLD-don't know if brochures are current**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Publication</th>
<th>from 1999 accred. review</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Honors Program</td>
<td>1999</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coop education</td>
<td>change to Women in Transition?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adults in Transition</td>
<td>Education is the Foundation of a Quality of Life</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Career Development Center</td>
<td>2 color OLD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Counseling and Advising</td>
<td>2 color OLD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic Advising for Vo Ed Students</td>
<td>2 color OLD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Art Program</td>
<td>Hayashida on faculty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PAA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waianae Health Academy</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Digital Media Voc Ed</td>
<td>Create your Career in 3-D</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Honors Program from 1999 accred. review**

- Change to Women in Transition?
- General brochure; used for fundraising?

---

**Hawaii Nat'l Great Teachers**

- 9x16, 4-fold coated stock
- About the seminar appl form
- Phone hours: no Y Y P
- Photos: very wordy

**OCET**

- 12x9; booklet [6x9]; glossy stock
- Non credit courses sporadic mentions of other College things
- Many yes Y-p N P
- Mixed: very confusing "disconnected" layouts

**Theatre Season**

- Variable 2-4 color
- Season events
- Phone web: no Y N P
- Photos: order form

**UHCC Sys**

- Varied varied varied
- Photos: various brochures

**Paper Stock Used**

- 70% on 20 lb. copier stock
- 24% on special stock (parchment, glossy, card stock)
- 6% on pre-printed brochure paper stock
Call to action data

An important element in promotional publications is a “Call to Action” item, e.g. a phrase that indicates what you want your audience to do. In the 46 printed pieces reviewed, 6 were strictly informational and therefore do not necessarily need a “call to action.” These publications require only contact information.

Of the remaining 40, only 15 had any type of a “call to action.” The phrases or elements included the following:

- Invites you to explore...
- Invites you to train...
- Make it happen
- Apply Early
- Enroll Now
- For more information
- Visit our Website
- Just Do It
- Want to get started?
- Application form
- Order Form
- Registration Form

We need to be more consistent with including a “Call to Action” explaining the next step: registering for a class, calling for an application, emailing inquiries or visiting our website.
ATTACHMENT C

Samples of Text used for College’s Name
Leeward Community College

LEEWARD

Learn More!
Earn More!

Leeward Community College
A Campus of the University of Hawaii

Lee Ward Community College
Accreditation Standard Two
2.1 Representation of the College to the Public

Red emphasis not placed by writers of the accreditation self-study.

Assessment
The brochures and flyers, handbooks, semester schedules of courses, catalogs, academic calendars, the Internet, outreach programs, videos, and advertisements provide current, accurate, and consistent information to the public on the various programs, services, and policies of the College, in a clear manner that is consistent with College practice. The material is reviewed and updated by the College on an ongoing basis.²

The most visible sources of information to the community are the LCC Catalog, the Internet Website, and the Non-Credit Course Offerings. These major communication efforts are constantly under review and revision by appropriate campus constituencies.³

In 1994, the Accreditation Commission recommended that the College establish "...an ongoing review procedure for brochures to make sure they are accurate and adhere to College policy and law... [and] to maintain an up-to-date listing of available publications." Currently, review of flyers and brochures is the responsibility of the division or department that created them. This system has been acknowledged as the best way for each division to reflect its program and/or the needs of their constituencies.⁴

Currently, no one maintains an up-to-date listing of available publications that represents the College to the community.

Action Plan
The College will compile and maintain an up-to-date listing of current publications that represent their programs and services.⁵

---
² Catalog is the only publication that is reviewed institutionally. All others are reviewed by the
³ The website and non-credit brochures are NOT reviewed constantly.
⁴ Some brochures are produced by individual faculty or staff and not reviewed within their division, let alone on an institutional level.
⁵ This will be a prime responsibility of the newly established Office of Marketing and Communications or Public Relations.
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Appreciate your assistance in helping us to improve and strengthen our services to businesses, communities and those whom we serve! A few minutes of your time for some direct feedback will give us some information we're looking for to better serve you.

Please fill out this form and return it to us. To fold the return envelope:
1. cut and fold in on dotted line
2. fold in on dotted line
3. cut and fold in on dotted line
4. fold in the remaining side flaps and secure with tape. Write your return address on the top left-hand corner.

Let Us Know
__Keep me on the mail list
__Put me on the mail list
__Mail a catalog to a friend
(Use form on page 26)

Registration Information

Name ___________________________ SS# ___________________________
Phone(H) ______________________ (W) ______________________ (ext) ______ Cell ______ Email ______
Address _________________________ City _________________________ State ______ Zip ______
Payment Method: Check# ______ PO# ______ Visa or MasterCard# ______
Expiration Date ______ Authorized Signature ______

If special assistance is required, please describe _____________________________

Course No. ___________________________ Course Title ___________________________ Date ______ Tuition ______

Total Amount Due $ ______

Appendix #9

Non-Credit Registration

At Your Service!
Leeward Community College's Office of Continuing Education & Training would appreciate your assistance in helping us to improve and strengthen our services to businesses, communities and those whom we serve! A few minutes of your time for some direct feedback will give us some information we're looking for to better serve you.

Please fill out this form and return it to us. To fold the return envelope:
1. cut and fold in on dotted line
2. fold in on dotted line
3. cut and fold in on dotted line
4. fold in the remaining side flaps and secure with tape. Write your return address on the top left-hand corner.

Professional and Personal Development Interests include:

--- Computer Technology
--- Business/Industry Training
--- had prior training
--- Visitor Industry Training
--- consider self intermediate
--- Agriculture/Agribusiness
--- consider self knowledgeable
--- Small Business Training
--- Culinary
--- Health & Medical
--- Personal Enrichment
--- Commercial Driver's Training
--- Other --- Please list:
--- Art & Crafts
--- Culinary

Preferences:

Days ______ Mon ______ Tues ______ Wed ______ Thurs ______ Fri ______ Sat ______ Sun ______
Times ______ Evenings ______ from 4:00pm ______ 5:00pm ______ 6:00pm ______ 7:00pm ______
--- AM ______ before 8:00am ______ from 8:00am ______ 9:00am ______ 10:00am ______
--- PM ______ 12:00pm ______ 1:00pm ______ 2:00pm ______
Length ______ 90 minutes ______ 2 hours ______ 3 hours ______ 4 hours ______
--- 6 hours with appropriate breaks ______ 8 hours with appropriate breaks ______
Comments: _____________________________

Age Group: ______ 20-25 ______ 26-30 ______ 31-40 ______ 41-50 ______ 51-60 ______ 61-70 ______ 71-80+ ______

Registrar ___________________________
ACCREDITATION IMPLEMENTATION OVERSIGHT COMMITTEE

MEMBERSHIP COMPOSITION

The Accreditation Implementation Oversight Committee will consist of the following members:

Provost: Mark Silliman (Chair)

Chairs or Co-Chairs and Vice Chairs of the following 7 Accreditation Implementation Committees:

**Administrative Instability and Turnover:**
Donald Thomson; Terry Richter & Cheryl Mokuau

**Campus Council Constituency Roles and Governance:**
Sage Hood; Terry Richter

**Curriculum Revision and Review:**
Bernadette Howard; Patricia Kennedy

**Degrees and Certificates (Learning Outcomes & General Education Component):**
Jake De Ste Croix & Candy Hochstein

**Placement Testing Impacts:**
Frank Sherry; Bernadette Howard

**Program Reviews/Program Health Indicators:**
Kathy Hill & Emily Uribe

**Strategic Planning for Technology and Information/Learning Resources:**
Michael Pecsok; Irwin Yamamoto

Accreditation Liaison Officer for the next Institutional Self Study tentatively scheduled for AY 2006-2007: Gail Levy

Institutional Research Analyst: Andrew Rossi

COMMITTEE FUNCTION

To help oversee and coordinate the work of the College's various Accreditation Implementation Committees (AICs) in:

(a) implementing the formal recommendations made by the most recent accreditation visiting team (October 2000);

(b) addressing their respective secondary charges; and

(c) preparing their progress and final committee reports to the Provost.

The purpose of such oversight and coordination is to facilitate the work of the seven Accreditation Implementation Committees and their respective Chairs, Co-Chairs, and Vice Chairs by:

1. Discussing, clarifying, and resolving common questions, problems, and needs.

2. Providing mutual support to and serving as a sounding board and collective resource for the leadership of the various AICs.
3. Agreeing on a common or uniform approach of fulfilling the secondary charge to each AIC of **address[ing] those concerns, action plans, and directions for the future identified by the College in our own Institutional Self Study** which apply or relate to the accreditation recommendation and standards being reviewed by each respective AIC (but which did not result in a formal team recommendation).

4. Agreeing on a uniform or standardized format for the (AIC) progress reports and/or final committee reports to be submitted by each AIC to the Provost as to the Committee's principal findings, recommendations, and/or implementation actions taken on both the primary and secondary charges to the Committee.

**Nota Bene:** A standardized format should greatly assist the College when we compile and write both the required Interim Report (due to ACCJC by November 1, 2002) on the three follow-up accreditation recommendations* and the required Midterm Report (due to ACCJC by November 1, 2003) on all of the formal recommendations and our own, College-identified concerns. (* being addressed by the first 3 AICs listed above.)

In this connection, the Accreditation Implementation Oversight Committee will need to carefully review the respective ACCJC guidelines on the nature, format, and content of Interim Reports and Midterm Reports.

5. Discussing respective AIC timetables and plans of action in order to help facilitate timely progress by each AIC in relation to the College's overall Interim/Midterm Reports timeline, and to prepare such Reports for internal review and final approval by the Chancellor and the BOR Chair in advance of ACCJC deadlines.

6. Discussing and resolving other issues raised by Committee members. This may include issues related to policy and procedure recommendations made by the various AICs and the necessary follow-through and/or approvals required for such policy recommendations.

Rev. Apr. 10, 2002
Accreditation Implementation Committee

Committee 1: Administrative Instability & Turnover

Members:

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

Meeting Notes:

- Meeting of September 14, 2001
- Meeting of October 19, 2001 (Rev. 11/27/01)
- Meeting of March 14, 2002

Subcommittee Notes: None available at this time

Committee Reports:

- Report of the Committee, Revised September 18, 2002 - [ PDF ] and [ HTML ]

Committee Documents: None available at this time

Last revised: 27-May-2003
Accreditation Implementation Committee

Committee 2: Campus Council Constituency Roles and Governance

Members:

- Administration Representative: Clifford Togo
- Faculty Senate Chair: James Goodman
- Clerical Staff Council representative: Terry Richter; Vice Chair
- APT Group representative: Kathleen Cabral
- Auxiliary Services Officer: Derrick Uyeda
- ASLCC President (or designee): David Donaldson
- Division Chair representative: James West; Co-recorder
- Academic Support/Services faculty representative: Ralph Toyama
- Lecturer designate on Campus Council: Dorothy Sunio; Co-recorder

Meeting Notes:

- Meeting of September 24, 2001
- Meeting of October 8, 2001
- Meeting of October 29, 2001
- Meeting of November 19, 2001
- Meeting of December 10, 2001

Subcommittee Notes: None available at this time

Committee Reports:

- Progress Report of the Committee, April 12, 2002 - [ PDF ] and [ HTML ]
- Progress Report of the Committee, April 11, 2003 - [ HTML ]
- Completion of Mission, May 8, 2003 - [ HTML ]

Committee Documents:

- Approval of Shared Governance Policy, May 22, 2003
- The Shared Governance Policy of Leeward Community College and The Principles of Shared Governance at Leeward Community College, March 18, 2003
- Report on the Relationship of the Faculty to the Campus Council
and a Description of Campus Council Constituencies, May 29, 2003

Last revised: 05-Jun-2003
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Accreditation Implementation Committee

Committee 3: Curriculum Revision and Review

Members:

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

Meeting Notes:

- September 10, 2002 - [PDF] and [HTML] (revised)
- October 1, 2002 - [PDF] and [HTML]
  - Example of Core Outline and Course Syllabus (both PDF)
- October 15, 2002 - [PDF] and [HTML]
- November 19, 2002 - [PDF] and [HTML]

Subcommittee Notes: None available at this time

Committee Reports:

- Progress Report of the Committee, revised September 2002
- Distance Education Report, posted April 2002
• Approval of Policy on Curriculum Revision and Review, March 21, 2003
• Progress Report of the Committee, April 2003

Committee Documents:

• Course Syllabus Sample - Final - [ PDF ] and [ HTML ]
• Policy Approval Memo on Curriculum Revision and Review, - March 17, 2003
• Policy on Curriculum Revision and Review, March 2003

Last revised: 02-Sep-2003
Accreditation Implementation Committee
Committee 4: Degrees and Certificates
(Learning Outcomes and General Education Component)

Members:

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

Meeting Notes:

- October 4, 2002 - [ PDF ] and [ HTML ]

Subcommittee Notes: None available at this time

Committee Reports:

- Progress Report of the Committee, April 1, 2002
- Catalog Additions, April 2002
- Assessment Progress Report, June 2003

Committee Documents: None available at this time

Last revised: 02-Sep-2003
Accreditation Implementation Committee

Committee 5: Placement Testing Impacts

Members:

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

Meeting Notes: None available at this time

Subcommittee Notes: None available at this time

Committee Reports:

- Progress Report, dated October 9, 2002
- Progress Report, dated March 18, 2003

Committee Documents: None available at this time

Last revised: 27-May-2003
Accreditation Implementation Committee
Committee 6: Program Review/Program Health Indicators

Members:

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

Meeting Notes:

- September 16, 2002 - [PDF] and [HTML]
- October 7, 2002 - [PDF] and [HTML]
- October 21, 2002 - [PDF] and [HTML]
- November 4, 2002 - [PDF] and [HTML]
- November 25, 2002 - [PDF] and [HTML]

Subcommittee Notes: None available at this time

Committee Reports:

- Progress Report of the Committee, April 2002
- Progress Report of the Committee, April 2003

Committee Documents:

- Approval of Policy on Program Reviews, May 12, 2003
- Policy on Unit/Area Program Reviews, May 8, 2003
- Policy on Unit/Area Program Reviews Leeward Community College, May 12, 2003

Last revised: 27-May-2003
Accreditation Implementation Committee
Committee 7: Technology and Information/Learning Resources

Members:

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

Meeting Notes:

- June 20, 2002 - [ PDF ] and [ HTML ]
- September 6, 2002 - [ PDF ] and [ HTML ]
- September 27, 2002 - [ PDF ] and [ HTML ]
- October 9, 2002 - [ PDF ] and [ HTML ] (thread started Sept. 26, 2002)
- November 1, 2002 - [ PDF ] and [ HTML ]
- November 21, 2002 - [ PDF ] and [ HTML ]

Subcommittee Notes:

- Adequacy & Effectiveness of Learning and Information Resources
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and Services
  o December 5, 2002 - [ PDF ] and [ HTML ]

• Formal Agreements with other Institutions
  o September 27, 2002 - [ PDF ] and [ HTML ]

• Professionally Qualified Staff
  o August 8, 2002 - [ PDF ] and [ HTML ]
  o August 23, 2002 - [ PDF ] and [ HTML ]
  o September 16, 2002 - [ PDF ] and [ HTML ]

• Strategic Plan
  o February 7, 2003 - [ PDF ] and [ HTML ]

Committee Reports:

• Report of the committee, dated Apr. 2, 2002
• Report of the committee, dated April 1, 2003

Committee Documents: None available at this time

Last revised: 27-May-2003