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Statement of Report Preparation

The Provost asked the Campus Council to recommend a committee to oversee the development of the college’s Mid-Term accreditation report. When only one person offered to serve on such a committee, the Provost suggested to the Council Chair that Professor Garman Pond be asked to head up the process, given his extensive experience with the accreditation process.

Professor Pond reviewed lists of faculty and staff and identified individuals who had background appropriate to serve on small teams investigating each of the nine recommendations of the Accrediting Commission. These groups were refined in consultation with the Provost; members are listed in the Appendix. The Provost asked each member to serve and provided them with the portion of the Commission’s 1995 evaluation report relevant to their task. In addition, the team which handled the two major recommendations received a copy of the report to the commission which was submitted last year, as well as the evaluator’s response to that report. All individuals agreed to serve. The one volunteer from the Campus Council, Professor Grace Miller, agreed to work with Professor Pond to oversee pulling the total report together.

The Provost also asked each administrator to assemble brief responses to each of the 63 action plans which the campus had identified for itself in its Self Study. Professors Pond and Miller reviewed and prepared brief summaries of the rather substantial amount of narrative and documentation received.

The summary report, prepared by the two coordinators, was reviewed by the Provost, who recommended some changes and corrections. It was circulated to the Campus Council membership for review. (More needs to be added here, when we know who all reviews it.) It then went to the Senior Vice President and Chancellor for Community Colleges and the Secretary of the Board of Regents for approval.

Barbara B. Polk, Provost Date
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Visiting Team Recommendations and College Responses:

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

The Provost has supported a clear and well-organized process to create the College's new Academic Development Plan (ADP). Though parts of this document are still in draft form, the bulk of it has been completed. The formation of this academic plan has, through many drafts and revisions, been the work of nearly the entire campus; all units of the College have participated in its development. Campus leaders in both the Faculty Senate and the Campus Council have reviewed and worked to improve the plan. Division meetings have played an integral part of the review process. The entire process was coordinated by the Campus Council. During its development the ADP has been integrated with other system plans such as the Hawaii Community Colleges Strategic Plan and the University of Hawaii Strategic Plan.

Academic and non-academic units have reviewed and revised their plans annually in relationship to the ADP. ADP priority activities were those submitted as budget requests to the State legislature for biennium 1997-1999 (although they were not funded). Internal allocations of discretionary funds have been guided by the ADP as well.

Institutional research issues are addressed in 1.2 below. Due to lack of staffing, program assessment is not yet fully integrated into the planning and budgeting process, although the wealth of system generated data guide decisions on class scheduling and staffing. Improvement in this area will be a major emphasis of the campus prior to the next accreditation review.

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

The Provost has given full support to the inclusion of all campus governance groups in the Campus Council. The Council is the primary vehicle for all campus leaders to gather and plan for the future of the College. A review of Leeward's progress in shared governance involves looking at the strengths and weaknesses of the Council as a shared governance vehicle.

The broad membership of the Council includes faculty, staff, students and administrators each representing their particular constituent group. Regularly scheduled meetings, published minutes and committee formation activities allow for all members of the team to have a voice in the governance of the College. It is generally agreed that the Council has succeeded in increasing the flow of information between the administration and the broader campus population.
The success of the Council is even more extraordinary given the current economic crisis in the State and the continuing budgetary restraints under which the College must operate. Funding has decreased, costs have risen, initiation of new programs or expansion of existing ones generally means current programs must be reduced or eliminated, and little budgetary flexibility exists. Nevertheless, the Council has succeeded in carrying out several initiatives on the campus. For example, the College was able to establish Internet access for all divisions on campus (which entailed wiring of many campus buildings). It has also been able to centralize duplication services and consolidate several computer labs.

The role of the Campus Council, to many, seems to bring it into conflict with the Faculty Senate's traditional role as the prime advisor to the Provost. The review team notes that the Council has been more effective in dealing meaningfully with the College's budget and resource allocation issues while the Faculty Senate still retains its role as the primary vehicle for advising the administration on curriculum matters and academic policies. It will be important for the College to monitor the relationship between the two bodies and effectively educate the campus at large of the respective roles that are played by each.

Old criticisms of the College's administration have resurfaced recently. The College still finds itself at the mercy of decisions made beyond it. In the Spring of 1997 a decision was made at the System level and in the State's political arena to relocate more than 20 portable buildings from Kapiolani Community College to Leeward to house the University of Hawaii West Oahu campus for the next two decades. A campus site was chosen. The Senate and the Council objected vigorously to the lack of proper consultation. Both groups felt they should have been properly informed and asked to give input on this major issue. The Senate condemned the administration for failing to consult with it on this decision. This is the type of breakdown in shared governance that the College hopes will be remedied in the future with better communication between the Administration, the Council and the Senate. The Administration must ensure that information is provided in a timely fashion to all concerned parties and campus decision makers. Individuals and consultative groups must also take the initiative to voice concerns in a timely manner when information is provided.

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

The College currently has a Vocational/Technical Institutional Analyst who gathers and evaluates data relating to the Vocational/Technical areas. One half-time position has been reallocated for a research person, and the College is currently negotiating with the Chancellor's Office for a second, half-time position. These two half-time positions will allow the College to hire one full-time APT researcher whose responsibility will be to conduct the research studies necessary to meet the needs of the College. In support of this research effort, a Committee on Institutional Research has already been formed. Membership includes the Deans of Instruction and Student Services, the Assessment Specialist, the Interim Coordinator of Enrollment Services, the VocTech Analyst and the Institutional Researcher, when hired. The goal of the Committee
will be to support and encourage research at the College and to assist in the coordination and implementation of that research. The Committee will continue to work closely with the System Research office to ensure that information relevant to LCC is received and utilized.

The College is fully aware of its increasing responsibility to systematically evaluate its programs and activities. With the additional Institutional Research position, such evaluation should be substantially expanded and refined by the time of the next accreditation visit.

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

The College's Curriculum Specialist developed a core outline form that was used from the Spring of 1996 to the present to create core outlines for all courses at the College. Approximately 100 core outlines were received, reviewed by the Curriculum Committee and passed by the Faculty Senate that first semester. An additional 379 core outlines were approved by the Curriculum Committee and the Senate in the Fall of 1996, and 189 passed both bodies in the Spring of 1997. Each new course and every modified course required a core outline to be attached to the proposal for this three-semester period. In May 1997, a computerized version of this process began. A database program was designed to track the entire curriculum process. All current catalog information was transferred electronically to the new database while additional input is still in progress for the three-semesters worth of data on core outlines.

The database can be accessed via the Internet from Macintosh or IBM compatible computers. Course proposers interact with the database on-line; review at each level—division, Curriculum Committee, Faculty Senate, Dean of Instruction and Provost—is recorded with the proposal. Proposed courses are maintained in the database until approved or disapproved, and thus, the new program maintains a database of archived, current and proposed core outlines. The program also has the capacity to generate course syllabi that take the basic course information—description, credits, alpha and number—from the catalog database. Additional information—course goals and objectives, course content, textbooks, supplies, etc.—from the core is available for individual instructors if desired. Individual instructor-designed syllabi are maintained on-line so that they may be compared to the core outline of record as needed. Students will be able to access the display mode of the program, if they desire, for any course on campus.

Finally, the program takes all new materials such as course descriptions, and replaces the catalog information as required. In this manner, catalog information is updated automatically to match the actual transactions of the curriculum process. At any given point in time the entire college catalog can be produced from the course database and the catalog database that this program manages.

Since most instructor course syllabi are not yet on-line, the college will need to monitor the relationship between the core course outlines and course syllabi as this new system is implemented.
2.2 The team recommends that the College review and revise the general education requirements for the Associate in Science degree so that requirements meet the expectations established by the accrediting commission in Standard 2C, regarding the content and methodologies of major areas of knowledge—the humanities, the fine arts, the natural sciences and the social sciences—as well as critical thinking. (2C.1, 2C.3)

In 1996 a University of Hawai‘i Community College system-wide committee that had been charged with review of the Associate of Arts degree developed a document, *A Blueprint for Learning - The Report of the Associate Degree Task Force*, which contained the recommendation that all associate degree programs within the Community College System be based on an educational approach emphasizing four integrated themes of learning, specifically thinking, communicating, knowing and using. This document has guided the general education requirements for Associate in Science and Associate in Applied Science (AS and AAS) degrees at the college, all of which had a minimum of 15 credits in general education coursework, in addition to Math and English requirements at the time of the last accreditation review. Since that time, all vocational programs have undergone review and revision. The fine arts, the humanities, the natural sciences and the social sciences are now requirements in those AS and AAS degree programs which have completed their revisions. The revision of the remaining programs should be complete and in conformity with the accreditation Standard 2C by the end of this academic year. Critical thinking is not addressed through specific coursework in the College's AS and AAS degree programs but is an intrinsic part of most regular coursework in all vocational programs.

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

Although most Divisions have long had regular provisions for evaluations of lecturers, not all have done so regularly. The Division Chairs have now developed a plan to evaluate lecturers based on discipline and division-based criteria as well as the college-wide criterion of demonstrated teaching effectiveness. Lecturers with two or fewer years of continuous service (or less than 36 teaching credits) will be evaluated annually by their respective Division Personnel Committees (DPCs). Lecturers with three or more years of continuous service (or 36 or more teaching credits) will be evaluated at least every other year by the DPCs. The DPCs will report their findings to the Division Chairs (DCs) who are in charge of rehiring lecturers. The DCs will use the DPC evaluations as one of the criteria for the decision to continue employment of lecturers who have undergone the evaluation process. The next step will be to submit the plan to the Faculty Senate for consideration.

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

The Learning Resource Laboratory at LCC-Waianae now provides terminal access to the LCC Library database and the UH West Oahu Library database including the Expanded Academic Index for access to journal articles and full-text, a SIRS Periodical Index of current full-text
journal articles, and access to the Hawaii State Library System. Updated and expanded resource materials including textbooks references, magazines and reserve materials in support of Liberal Arts courses; subscriptions to news magazines and journals in Nursing and Allied Health; and over 150 Nursing and Allied Health texts are available in the collection. Ordering, delivery and return of circulating texts from the main campus library is available to LCCW students in a timely fashion.

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

Prioritized lists of instructional and operational equipment have been compiled through a campus-wide process. A list for new acquisitions and a list for replacement items have been compiled. It should be noted that funds to replace instructional equipment that were available in the past have not been released recently. Purchase of new and replacement equipment is likely to take place at the end of the academic year when operational expenses have been accounted for. The aforementioned prioritized lists assure that purchases will be in line with campus-determined needs as identified in the master plan.

Major projects in facilities maintenance which have been deferred for budgetary reasons are also prioritized along the lines of the College's master plan.

Maintenance of instructional and operational equipment is handled in several ways. Maintenance of most office equipment--typewriters and copiers-- is by contract. Maintenance of most facilities equipment--air conditioning, telephones and elevators-- is also by contract. Maintenance of instructional equipment is managed by the respective divisions and paid for with division funds. The repair of certain equipment--computers, media and maintenance-related equipment--is completed by campus staff.

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

The administrative turnover noted by the visiting team occurs for a variety of reasons. Some corrective action has been taken; other action still needs to be taken. An unusually heavy workload is created by the fact that the Dean of Instruction has only two Assistant Deans; additionally, a lack of clerical and administrative support add to the workload. An additional administrative position, Assistant to the Provost was briefly provided to the College by the legislature, but was lost during the funding cutback. This position could have greatly relieved the administrative workload burden for both the Dean and the Provost.

Frank discussions between faculty, staff, and administrative team members and the Chancellor of Community Colleges concerning the administrative leadership style of the Provost on this campus were held during the Spring 1997 semester. The Chancellor invited the open
exchange of concerns that individuals from the aforementioned groups had. Early in the Fall 1997 semester, the Chancellor held open meetings with faculty, staff and administrative team members to report the results of her inquiry and follow-up discussions with the Provost. All involved are hopeful that reasonable efforts will be made to achieve constructive changes in leadership style. Indeed this year the Provost has set upon the task of making major changes to the leadership style she employs. The campus community is currently maintaining an optimistic outlook as it anticipates possible outcomes from the events of the past six months.

Summary Discussion of Self-Identified Issues:

Standard 1: Institutional Integrity

The College has made considerable progress in fulfilling nearly all its plans in this area. Noteworthy is the establishment of a Community Relations Committee to ensure adherence of College program brochures' content to policy and legal requirements and uniformity of design. The Campus Council has accepted the responsibility to monitor the progress on the Academic Development Plan. The Faculty Senate still needs to take up the issue of administration and evaluation of student and peer evaluations.

Standard 2: Educational Programs

Most issues identified by the College in this area are well under way toward fulfillment. Considerable effort has been expended in matters relating to the curriculum process from maintaining a current database of courses to tracking the authorization process of all proposed course outlines. The process additionally serves to maintain a consistent relationship between the course on record and the course as delivered. Also noteworthy: the College's effort to offer alternatives to traditional course offerings to meet the diversity of student demands and take advantage of increased technological opportunities; the plan to implement a system-wide package for Student Information Systems (known as Buzzed) which will empower users to conduct independent research; efforts to improve community connections through the formation of the LCC Community Relations Committee.

Standard 3: Students Services and the Co-Curricular Learning Environment

The college has made substantial progress in addressing the issues it had identified. Most
importantly, the Student Services Division implemented a “health indicators” system of assessing their activities beginning in 1996; purchased a system for digitizing student records to improve security and access to historical records and is about half way through scanning the records; began reorganization of the division to create an enrollment services unit; expanded collection and use of data on student characteristics and needs; and reorganized the space in the Financial Aid Office to better serve students. Attempts by the Dean to provide opportunities for student input into service development and delivery have resulted in useful feedback, but have been difficult to maintain due to lack of student willingness to serve on advisory committees. However, the college will continue to provide these opportunities.

Standard 4: Faculty and Staff

The College divisions have developed procedures for systematic evaluation and follow-up evaluations for Division Chairs and Unit Heads. A College-wide plan has been proposed to evaluate all part-time lecturers. Policies on peer evaluation and the study of the outcomes of such evaluation as well as ways in which to allow all faculty and staff the opportunity to evaluate administrators is still needed.

Standard 5: Library and Learning Resources

While most issues in this area have been addressed, two accomplishments are significant. The Campus Computing Committee is now responsible for assessing the ongoing needs of the College with respect to technology. A task force has recommended to this Committee, the Campus Council and the Provost that several computer labs on campus be consolidated. Thus far, the consolidated laboratory has realized greater efficiency than before. Also, formalized procedures for tutorial training have been established and are in place. The Learning Resource Center now provides a series of workshops, videotaped modules and tutoring manuals to ensure adequate preparation of the tutorial work force.

Standard 6: Physical Resources

The State budget crisis has reduced the College's ability to respond to all physical needs. Nevertheless, through creative financing, cooperation with the Chancellor's Office, and increased involvement of all parties affected through the Campus Council, most of the issues identified in this area have been addressed.

Standard 7: Financial Resources

The College has continued to seek more funding from outside sources. Several small grant proposals for credit and non-credit curriculum development projects have been successfully
funded. Additionally, the College is participating in system-wide fund raising efforts through the University of Hawai'i Foundation. The College has been successful in involving the faculty, staff and students in the budgeting process through the Campus Council. However, typically rushed time frames and dwindling discretionary funds often make useful input difficult at times.

Standard 8: Governance and Administration

Shared governance remains important to the College and most self-identified issues in this area have received considerable attention. As the College continues to define and describe the roles of the Faculty Senate and the Campus Council and their relationship to the Administration, additional benefits will be realized. The role of the Associated Students of Leeward Community College in shared governance needs cultivation.
Appendix:

Mid-Term Report Task Groups

Major Recommendations 1.1 and 8.1 (Planning and Governance)
- James West, Assoc. Prof., C.C., Philosophy
  Past Faculty Senate Chair
- Robert Hochstein, Assoc. Prof., C.C., Television Production
  Faculty Senate Chair
- Ronald Flegal, Assoc. Prof., C.C., Engineering
  Accreditation Liaison
- Michael Peckok, Professor, C.C., Media Coordinator
  Campus Council Chair
- Kathleen Young, Professor, C.C., Office Administration and Technology
  Business Division Chair, Campus Council Member
- Bernadette Clemente, Auxiliary Services Officer
  Campus Council Member
- Dixie Kawamura, Secretary
  Past President, Clerical Staff Council

Recommendation 1.2 (Means of meeting research needs)
- Frank Sherry, Professor, C.C., Assessment Specialist
  Warren Mau, Registrar
- Roy Kamida, Professor, C.C., Accounting,
  Past Business Division Chair

Recommendation 2.1 (Curriculum review and documentation)
- Barbara Hotta, Asst. Professor, C.C., Computer Science
  Past Curriculum Committee Chair
- Jean Hara, Professor, C.C., Office Administration
  Past Curriculum Committee Chair
- Michael Bauer, Asst. Professor, C.C., Computer Science
  Curriculum Committee Chair
- Mark Silliman, Dean of Instruction

Recommendation 2.2 (General Ed. Requirements for vocational programs)
- Tommylynn Benevente, Asst. Professor, C.C., Food Service
- Milton Matsunaga, Asst. Professor, C.C., Drafting Technology
- Warren Imada, Professor, C.C., Accounting
Recommendation 4.1 (Evaluation of lecturers)
* Sinikka Hayasaka, Professor, C.C., Japanese Language
  Language Arts Division Chair
Barbara Saromines-Ganne, Professor, C.C., Art History
  Arts and Humanities Division Chair
Mary Jane Dobson, Professor, C.C., Sociology

Recommendation 5.1 (Print media at Waianae)
* Dean Garrett, Professor, C.C.,
  Coordinator, LCC at Waianae
Gloria Bridges, Instructor-Counselor, LCC at Waianae
Laurence Goldstein, Assoc. Professor, C.C.
  Librarian

Recommendation 6.1 (Equipment acquisition and maintenance)
* Marilyn Bauer, Professor, C.C., English
  Learning Resource Center Coordinator
Fern Tomisato, Assoc. Professor, C.C., Food Service
  Vocational and Technical Division Chair
Jackson Tsujimura, Electronics Technician
Clifford Togo, Director of Administrative Services

Recommendation 8.2 (Administrative turnover)
* Kenneth Tokuno, Dean of Student Services
Lucy Gay, Director of Continuing Education and Training
Elena Bumanglag, Assistant Dean for Instruction
Douglas Dykstra, Acting Assistant Dean for Instruction
Mark Silliman, Dean of Instruction
Cliff Togo, Director of Administrative Services

* Task Group Coordinator
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**Appendix:** Mid-Term Report Task Groups 9
Statement of Report Preparation

With the concurrence of the Campus Council, the Provost selected Professor Garman Pond to head up the review process, given his extensive experience with the accreditation process. Professor Pond reviewed lists of faculty and staff and identified individuals who had background appropriate to serve on small teams investigating each of the nine recommendations of the Accrediting Commission. These groups were refined in consultation with the Provost; members are listed in the Appendix.

Each team reviewed the portion of the Commission's 1995 evaluation report relevant to their task. In addition, the team which handled the two major recommendations received a copy of the report to the commission which was submitted last year, as well as the evaluator’s response to that report. A volunteer from the Campus Council, Professor Grace Miller, agreed to work with Professor Pond to oversee pulling the total report together.

The Provost also asked each administrator and other relevant individuals to assemble brief responses to each of the 63 action plans which the campus had identified for itself in its Self Study. Professors Pond and Miller reviewed this material and prepared brief summaries.

The draft report, prepared by the two coordinators, was reviewed and discussed by the Campus Council. The drafts of each section were then returned to the original task groups, along with all comments received, for revision of their section. The revisions made constitute this final report.

Barbara B. Polk, Provost  Date
Visiting Team Recommendations and College Responses:

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

The Provost has supported a clear and well-organized process to create the College's new Academic Development Plan (ADP). Though parts of this document are still in draft form, the bulk of it has been completed. The formation of this academic plan has, through many drafts and revisions, been the work of nearly the entire campus; all units of the College have participated in its development. Campus leaders in both the Faculty Senate and the Campus Council have reviewed and worked to improve the plan. Division meetings have played an integral part in the review process. The entire process was coordinated by the Campus Council. During its development the ADP has been integrated with other system plans such as the Hawaii Community Colleges Strategic Plan and the University of Hawaii Strategic Plan.

Academic and non-academic units have reviewed and revised their plans annually in relationship to the ADP. ADP priority activities were those submitted as budget requests to the State legislature for biennium 1997-1999 (although they were not funded). Internal allocations of discretionary funds have been guided by the ADP as well.

Institutional research issues are addressed in 1.2 below. Due to lack of staffing, program assessment is not yet fully integrated into the planning and budgeting process, although the wealth of system generated data guide decisions on class scheduling and staffing. Improvement in this area will be a major emphasis of the campus prior to the next accreditation review.

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

The Provost has supported the inclusion of all campus governance groups in the Campus Council. The Council is the primary vehicle for campus leaders to gather together and plan for the future of the College. The broad membership of the Council includes student, faculty, staff and administrators, each representing their particular constituent group. Regularly scheduled meetings, published minutes and committee formation activities allow for all members of the community to have a voice in the governance of the college. All members of the review task group agree that the Council’s Charter and Bylaws clearly articulate a decision making process which gives a voice to administrative officers, faculty, support staff and students. The Council has become an important part of the decision making process.
The Council has been formed during a time of unprecedented economic crisis in the State. The college is operating under continuing budgetary restraints, funding has decreased, costs have risen, initiation of new programs or expansion of existing ones generally mean other programs must be reduced or eliminated, and little budgetary flexibility exists. Nevertheless, the Council succeeded in establishing Internet access for all buildings on campus as well as centralizing duplication services and consolidating several computer labs. The widespread involvement of campus leaders through the Council demonstrated the Council’s ability to be an important factor in campus decision making.

To some members of the campus community, the role of the Campus Council seems to bring it into conflict with the Faculty Senate’s traditional role as the prime advisor to the Provost. The review team notes that the Council has been effective in dealing with the College's budget and resource allocation issues. The Senate still retains its role as the primary vehicle for advising the administration on curriculum matters and academic policies. It will be important for the campus to monitor the relationship between the two bodies and effectively educate the campus at large of the respective roles that each are to play.

The Accrediting Commission’s evaluation report pointed out in regard to decision making (8.1) that “The process only works if the Provost fosters appropriate communication on the campus.” The review task group interprets this to mean that it is vital for the Provost to involve the Council, the Senate and other affected members of the college community with adequate and timely information so that their advisory roles can be properly performed. Some members of the Council report that the Provost has sometimes failed to provide adequate information or timely notice on important campus issues. One such issue was the site selection for the relocation of over twenty portable buildings for use of the University of Hawaiʻi West Oahu Campus at the east end of the Leeward campus. Some members of the Council maintain that their involvement may have lessened the significant negative impact of the relocated buildings on the aesthetics of the campus.

In order for the decision making process to work, information needs to be provided in a timely fashion to all concerned parties and campus advisory groups. Individuals and consultative groups need to also take the initiative to voice concerns and make responses in a timely manner when information is provided, and those who do so should receive timely replies from the Provost or the Administrative staff.

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

The College currently has a Vocational/Technical Institutional Analyst who gathers and evaluates data relating to the Vocational/Technical areas. One half-time position has been reallocated for a research person, and the College is currently negotiating with the Chancellor's Office for a second, half-time position. These two half-time positions will allow the College to hire one full-time researcher whose responsibility will be to conduct the research studies necessary to meet the needs of the College. In support of this research effort, a Committee on Institutional
Research has already been formed. Membership includes the Deans of Instruction and Student Services, the Assessment Specialist, the Interim Coordinator of Enrollment Services, the VocTech Analyst and the Institutional Researcher, when hired. The goal of the Committee will be to support and encourage research at the College and to assist in the coordination and implementation of that research. The Committee will continue to work closely with the System Research office to ensure that information relevant to LCC is received and utilized.

The College is fully aware of its increasing responsibility to systematically evaluate its programs and activities. With the additional Institutional Research position, such evaluation should be substantially expanded and refined by the time of the next accreditation visit.

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

The College's Curriculum Specialist developed a core outline form that was used from the Spring of 1996 to the present to create core outlines for all courses at the College. Approximately 100 core outlines were received, reviewed by the Curriculum Committee and passed by the Faculty Senate that first semester. An additional 279 core outlines were approved by the Curriculum Committee and the Senate in the Fall of 1996, and 189 passed both bodies in the Spring of 1997 (core outlines for an estimated 90 to 95% of all college courses have been reviewed and approved). Each new course and every modified course required a core outline be attached to the proposal for this three-semester period. In September 1996, the Curriculum Committee Chair and Media Specialist began discussion of a computerized curriculum database. In May 1997, the programming began and by August, the programming was completed and the system was implemented for campus-wide use. A database program was designed to track the entire curriculum process. All current catalog information was transferred electronically to the new database while additional input is still in progress for the three-semesters worth of data on core outlines. It is anticipated that the input will be completed prior to the start of the 1998-99 academic year.

The database can be accessed via the Internet from Macintosh or IBM compatible computers. Course proposers may interact with the database on-line; review at each level—division, Curriculum Committee, Faculty Senate, Dean of Instruction and Provost—may be recorded with the proposal. Proposed courses will be maintained in the database until approved or disapproved, and thus, the new program is capable of maintaining a database of archived, current and proposed core outlines. The program also has the capacity to generate course syllabi that may take the basic course information—description, credits, alpha and number—from the catalog database. Additional information—course goals and objectives, course content, textbooks, supplies, etc.—from the core will be available for individual instructors if desired. Individual instructor-designed syllabi may be maintained on-line so that they may be compared to the core outline of record as needed. Students will be able to access the display mode of the program, if they desire, for any course on campus.

Finally, the program will be able to take all new materials such as course descriptions, and replace catalog information as required. In this manner, catalog information may be updated
automatically to match the actual transactions of the curriculum process. At any given point in time the entire college catalog can be produced from the course database and the catalog database that this program manages.

Since most instructor course syllabi are not yet on-line, the College will need to monitor the relationship between the core course outlines and course syllabi as this new system is implemented.

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

In 1986 a University of Hawai‘i Community College system-wide committee that had been charged with review of the Associate degrees developed a document, *A Blueprint for Learning—The Report of the Associate Degree Task Force*, which contained the recommendation that all associate degree programs within the Community College System be based on an educational approach emphasizing four integrated themes of learning, specifically thinking, communicating, knowing and using. This document has guided the general education requirements for Associate in Science and Associate in Applied Science (A.S. and A.A.S.) degrees at the college, all of which had a minimum of 15 credits in general education coursework, in addition to math and English requirements at the time of the last accreditation review.

Since that time, all vocational programs have been undergoing review and revision. In this process, where necessary, changes in general education requirements are being made to bring them into conformity with accrediting commission standards regarding the major areas of knowledge. Several programs have completed the changes, while the remaining programs will recommend changes to the Curriculum Committee this academic year. Critical thinking is not addressed through specific coursework in the college’s A.S. and A.A.S. Degree programs, but is an intrinsic part of most regular coursework in all vocational programs.

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

Although most Divisions have had regular provisions for the evaluation of their lecturers, not all have done so consistently. The division chairs have been given the task of developing a plan to evaluate lecturers based on discipline and/or division-based criteria as well as the college-wide criterion of demonstrated teaching effectiveness. The lecturer evaluation plan will allow for accommodation for divisional differences. The plan will also be guided by the recently approved divisional personnel committee procedures required to be in place in time for the 1997 fall personnel actions (as per the 1995-99 collective bargaining contract for the faculty). It is anticipated that the lecturer evaluation procedures will be in place college-wide as of Spring 1998.
5.1 The team recommends that the College provide equitable access to print media resources for students at the Waianae site. (5A.1, 5C.2)

The Learning Resource Laboratory at LCC-Waianae now provides terminal access to the LCC Library database and the UH West Oahu Library database including the Expanded Academic Index for access to journal articles and full-text, a SIRS Periodical Index of current full-text journal articles, and access to the Hawaii State Library System. Updated and expanded resource materials including textbooks, references, magazines, and reserve materials in support of Liberal Arts courses; subscriptions to news magazines and journals in Nursing and Allied Health; and over 150 Nursing and Allied Health texts are available in the collection. Ordering, delivery, and return of circulating texts from the main campus library is available to LCCW students in a timely fashion.

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

The college’s Long Range Development Plan (LRDP), or master plan, which was under development at the time of the accreditation team visit, addresses long-range planning of physical facility needs as they relate to educational programs. The LRDP does not identify equipment acquisition, replacement, and maintenance. However, prioritized lists of instructional and operational equipment have been compiled through a campus-wide process. The prioritization assures that purchases will be in line with campus-determined needs. Purchase of new and replacement equipment is likely to take place at the end of the fiscal year after operational expenses have been accounted for.

Major projects in facilities maintenance which have been deferred for budgetary reasons are also prioritized.

Maintenance of instructional and operational equipment is handled in several ways. Maintenance of most office equipment, such as typewriters and copiers, is by contract. Maintenance of most facilities equipment, such as air conditioning, telephones, and elevators, is also by contract. Maintenance of instructional equipment is managed by the respective divisions and paid for with division funds. Repair of certain equipment, such as computers, media, and maintenance-related equipment, is done by campus staff.

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

The administrative turnover noted by the visiting team has occurred for a variety of reasons. The reasons range from administrators seeking job promotions, lateral transfers, relocation preferences, personal considerations, and workload. However, it must also be noted that individual job dissatisfaction resulting from the Provost’s management style may have also played a critical part in the high turnover rate.
Frank discussions between faculty, staff, and administrative team members and the Chancellor of Community Colleges concerning the administrative leadership style on this campus were held during the Spring 1997 semester. The Chancellor invited the open exchange of concerns that individuals from the aforementioned groups had. Early in the Fall 1997 semester, the Chancellor held open meetings with faculty, staff and administrative team members to report the results of her inquiry and follow-up discussions with the Provost. As a result of these events, the campus will be looking for sincere efforts on the part of the Provost to achieve constructive changes in leadership style.

**Summary Discussion of Self-Identified Issues:**

**Standard 1: Institutional Integrity**

The College has made considerable progress in fulfilling nearly all its plans in this area. Noteworthy is the establishment of a Community Relations Committee to ensure adherence of College program brochures' content to policy and legal requirements and uniformity of design. The Campus Council has accepted the responsibility to monitor the progress on the Academic Development Plan. The Faculty Senate begun work on the issue of administration and evaluation of student and peer evaluations.

**Standard 2: Educational Programs**

Most issues identified by the College in this area are well under way toward fulfillment. Considerable effort has been expended in matters relating to the curriculum process from maintaining a current database of courses to tracking the authorization process of all proposed course outlines. The process additionally serves to maintain a consistent relationship between the course on record and the course as delivered. Also noteworthy: the College's effort to offer alternatives to traditional course offerings to meet the diversity of student demands and take advantage of increased technological opportunities; the plan to implement a system-wide package for Student Information Systems (known as Buzzeo) which will empower users to conduct independent research; efforts to improve community connections through the formation of the LCC Community Relations Committee.

**Standard 3: Students Services and the Co-Curricular Learning Environment**
The college has made substantial progress in addressing the issues it had identified. Most importantly, the Student Services Division implemented a "health indicators" system of assessing their activities beginning in 1996; purchased a system for digitizing student records to improve security and access to historical records and is about half way through scanning the records; began reorganization of the division to create an enrollment services unit; expanded collection and use of data on student characteristics and needs; and reorganized the space in the Financial Aid Office to better serve students. Attempts by the Dean to provide opportunities for student input into service development and delivery have resulted in useful feedback, but have been difficult to maintain due to lack of student willingness to serve on advisory committees. However, the college will continue to provide these opportunities.

Standard 4: Faculty and Staff

The College divisions have developed procedures for systematic evaluation and follow-up evaluations for Division Chairs and Unit Heads. A College-wide plan has been proposed to evaluate all part-time lecturers. Policies on peer evaluation and the study of the outcomes of such evaluation as well as ways in which to allow all faculty and staff the opportunity to evaluate administrators is still needed.

Standard 5: Library and Learning Resources

While most issues in this area have been addressed, two accomplishments are significant. The Campus Computing Committee is now responsible for assessing the ongoing needs of the College with respect to technology. A task force has recommended to this Committee, the Campus Council and the Provost that several computer labs on campus be consolidated. Thus far, the consolidated laboratory has realized greater efficiency than before. Also, formalized procedures for tutorial training have been established and are in place. The Learning Resource Center now provides a series of workshops, videotaped modules and tutoring manuals to ensure adequate preparation of the tutorial work force.

Standard 6: Physical Resources

The State budget crisis has reduced the College's ability to respond to all physical needs. Nevertheless, through creative financing, cooperation with the Chancellor's Office, and increased involvement of all parties affected through the Campus Council, most of the issues identified in this area have been addressed.

Standard 7: Financial Resources

The College has continued to seek more funding from outside sources. Several small
grant proposals for credit and non-credit curriculum development projects have been successfully funded. Additionally, the College is participating in system-wide fund raising efforts through the University of Hawai‘i Foundation. The College has been successful in involving the faculty, staff and students in the budgeting process through the Campus Council. However, typically rushed time frames and dwindling discretionary funds often make useful input difficult at times.

**Standard 8: Governance and Administration**

Shared governance remains important to the College and most self-identified issues in this area have received considerable attention. As the College continues to define and describe the roles of the Faculty Senate and the Campus Council and their relationship to the Administration, additional benefits will be realized. The role of the Associated Students of Leeward Community College in shared governance needs cultivation.
Appendix:

Mid-Term Report Task Groups

The following individuals served on task groups to assess the college progress on the recommendations from the Accrediting Commission. In some cases, other individuals also joined the task groups, especially those which reconvened to discuss input from the Campus Council and others. As in any group effort, not all persons listed below agree fully with the reports from their task group, although all groups made active efforts to accommodate the concerns of all.

Major Recommendations 1.1 and 8.1 (Planning and Governance)
* James West, Assoc. Prof., C.C, Philosophy
  Past Faculty Senate Chair
Robert Hochstein, Assoc. Prof., C.C., Television Production
  Faculty Senate Chair
Ronald Flegal, Assoc. Prof., C.C., Engineering
  Accreditation Liaison
Michael Pecsok, Professor, C.C., Media Coordinator
  Campus Council Chair
Kathleen Young, Professor, C.C., Office Administration and Technology
  Business Division Chair, Campus Council Member
Bernadette Clemente, Auxiliary Services Officer
  Campus Council Member
Gloria Santiago, Secretary
  President, Clerical Staff Council

Recommendation 1.2 (Means of meeting research needs)
* Frank Sherry, Professor, C.C., Assessment Specialist
  Registrar
Roy Kamida, Professor, C.C., Accounting,
  Past Business Division Chair

Recommendation 2.1 (Curriculum review and documentation)
* Barbara Hotta, Asst. Professor, C.C., Computer Science
  Past Curriculum Committee Chair
Jean Hara, Professor, C.C., Office Administration
  Past Curriculum Committee Chair
Michael Bauer, Asst. Professor, C.C., Computer Science
  Curriculum Committee Chair
Mark Silliman, Dean of Instruction
Recommendation 2.2 (General Ed. Requirements for vocational programs)
* Tommylynn Benevente, Asst. Professor, C.C., Food Service
Milton Matsunaga, Asst. Professor, C.C., Drafting Technology
Warren Imada, Professor, C.C., Accounting

Recommendation 4.1 (Evaluation of lecturers)
* Sinikka Hayasaka, Professor, C.C., Japanese Language
  Language Arts Division Chair
Barbara Saromines-Ganne, Professor, C.C., Art History
  Arts and Humanities Division Chair
Mary Jane Dobson, Professor, C.C., Sociology

Recommendation 5.1 (Print media at Waianae)
* Dean Garrett, Professor, C.C.,
  Coordinator, LCC at Waianae
Gloria Bridges, Instructor-Counselor, LCC at Waianae
Laurence Goldstein, Assoc. Professor, C.C.
  Librarian

Recommendation 6.1 (Equipment acquisition and maintenance)
* Marilyn Bauer, Professor, C.C., English
  Learning Resource Center Coordinator
Fern Tomisato, Assoc. Professor, C.C., Food Service
  Vocational and Technical Division Chair
Jackson Tsujimura, Electronics Technician
Clifford Togo, Director of Administrative Services

Recommendation 8.2 (Administrative turnover)
* Kenneth Tokuno, Dean of Student Services
Lucy Gay, Director of Continuing Education and Training
Elena Bumanglag, Assistant Dean for Instruction
Douglas Dykstra, Acting Assistant Dean for Instruction
Mark Silliman, Dean of Instruction
Cliff Togo, Director of Administrative Services

* Task Group Coordinator
Accreditation - Midterm Report

Recommendations

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

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

James West
Ron Flegal
Dixie Kawamura
Bob Hochstein
Cathy Young
Mike Pecksok
Bernadette Clemente
Recommendation

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

Frank Sherry
Warren Mau
Roy Kamida
Accreditation - Midterm Report

Recommendation

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

Barbara Hotta
Michael Bauer
Jean Hara
Mark Silliman
Accreditation - Midterm Report

Recommendation

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

Tommylynn Benavente
Milton Matsunaga
Warren Imada
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Recommendation

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

Mary Jane Dobson
Sinikka Hayasaka
Barbara Saromines-Ganne
Recommendation

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

Larry Goldstein
Dean Garrett
Gloria Bridges
Accreditation - Midterm Report

Recommendation

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

Cliff Togo
Marilyn Bauer
Jackson Tsujimura
Fern Tomisato
Accreditation - Midterm Report

Recommendation

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

Lucy Gay
Elena Bumanglag
Ken Tokuno
Dr. David Wolf  
Executive Director  
ACCJC  
3402 Mendocino Ave.  
Santa Rosa, CA 95403

Dear Dr. Wolf:

Attached is a copy of Leeward Community College's report on our activities in response to the two major recommendations of the Accreditation team which visited us in November 1994. I delivered the original to Judith Watkins over this past weekend, at her request, so that she would have the opportunity to review it prior to her visit here next Friday. I will also be mailing a copy to you today.

The report was prepared by the Campus Council, with involvement of its Executive Committee and various administrators, and subsequently reviewed, amended and unanimously approved by the Council. We believe it reflects substantial progress in the areas of planning and decision making which were the focus of the recommendations.

We will be welcoming Judith to the campus on Friday and have made the arrangements for her visit. I believe that her visit at this time will help us continue to move forward on our major tasks.

Sincerely,

Barbara B. Polk  
Provost

cc: Ronald Flegal, Accreditation Liaison  
Michael Pecsok, Campus Council Chair
This report, at the request of the Commission, is a response to the two major recommendations of the 1994 accreditation review. These recommendations were:

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

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

Because the decision making process is fundamental to the planning process, the College's response to Recommendation 8.1 will addressed first.

Decision Making

Decision making at Leeward Community College must be examined in the context of a strong belief in shared governance, and an often top-down bureaucratic structure imposed on the University and the College by the state. In addition, decision making often must occur in a limited timeframe in which all affected parties and all useful data cannot be consulted. Nevertheless, the College's situation is not unique and the College reaffirms its commitment to continually strive towards decision making in an open participatory manner.

The major change in the decision making structure of the College was the formation of the Campus Council (Appendix A: Campus Council Charter & By-Laws) in February 1995. At the time of the Accreditation Team's visit in November 1994, the College, with the leadership of the Faculty Senate, was in the process of developing the Council. The Campus Council is the body responsible for planning, developing policy, and setting campus priorities, particularly with respect to budget and resource allocation. The Faculty Senate retains its authority in academic
matters. The Campus Council is the point at which major constituencies come together and make campus recommendations. The actions of the Campus Council are published as notes in the *Campus Bulletin*.

The Charter and By-Laws call for the Council to include a representative of each campus governance organization: Faculty Senate, Student Senate, Clerical Staff Council, and Administrative, Professional and Technical Group (APT). The Council also includes the Dean of Instruction, Dean of Student Services, Director of Administrative Services, the Director of the Office of Special Programs and Community Service, the Auxiliary Services Officer, the seven Division Chairs, the Coordinator of the Wai'anae Center, a representative from Academic Support, and an at-large faculty member. Thus, membership is comprised of 11 faculty, 4 administrators, 2 APT, 1 clerical, and 1 student. The Provost is a non-voting member. The Provost has agreed not to oppose a unanimous decision of the Council.

As a new organization, the Campus Council is still in the process of developing procedures and mechanisms for carrying out its role. In the past year and a half of its existence, all major campus budget and planning decisions have had Campus Council approval. These include:

- Response to an emergency request from the Chancellor for the Community Colleges to propose areas for budget restrictions for the 1995-96 academic year. The Council considered several alternatives and made recommendations to the Provost. Those recommendations were subsequently vetoed by the Chancellor. However, the proposed restrictions did not take place.

- Approved an Academic Computer Plan and approved the use of end-of-the-year funding towards implementation of the plan in Spring 1995. The Council is in the process of developing mechanisms for the further implementation of the plan now that greater funding is becoming a stronger possibility.

- Served as the steering committee for the College's long-range Academic Development Plan. The ADP serves as the basis for College budgeting and resource allocation.

- Asked for recommendations from the administration for the use of tuition funds returned to the College in Spring 1996. The Council subsequently reviewed, revised and approved the priorities which were then implemented.

- Performed a review of the Campus Council functions.

- Reviewed proposals and established priorities for the College 1997-99 Biennium Budget.
Campus decision making has been further defined by the formation of the Administrative, Professional and Technical Group. The Group, patterned after the Clerical Staff Council, represents APT employees. These employees are a diverse group which include the Theatre Manager, Fiscal Officer, Personnel Officer, the Auxiliary Services Manager, Computer Specialists, Electronic Technicians, Science and Shop assistants and managers, Institutional Researcher, television producers, the Registrar, and the Cafeteria Manager. It has recently approved a Charter and By-Laws and is represented on the Campus Council. As a consequence, APT employees have become increasingly involved in decision making.

Students are represented on the Campus Council and many other campus committees, although their role is limited on Faculty Senate Committees. Unfortunately, Student Government appointments and attendance by student representatives at committee meetings has been erratic. There is an obvious need to strengthen student government. One step taken was the streamlining of the Student Government Charter to allow a more timely response to issues. Secondly, the College is in the process of hiring a full-time Student Activities Director to work with student government.

The Campus Council is in the process of developing a philosophical statement on campus decision making. Since the Council is a relatively new organization, its role is still evolving. It is important that the Council strives to make its actions as public as possible and that it anticipates and plans so the College can make the best decisions possible under the severe time constraints often imposed by the system.

1.1 Planning

The College addressed the recommendation for a formal, college-wide, systematic and coordinated plan through the development of a new Academic Development Plan. The development process is described in Appendix B.

The Academic Development is the major planning document for the campus. It comes under the umbrella of the Strategic Plan for the Community Colleges which in turn comes under the umbrella of the University of Hawaii Strategic Plan. Requests to the University administration for program changes needing additional funds or reallocation of current resources must reference the strategic plans and the ADP. Thus the ADP and strategic plans drive the College budget externally.

Unfortunately, strategic plans were still in draft stages at the time the ADP was under development. However, the ADP, while organizationally different, does reflect the priorities of these two documents.

In response to the Accreditation Report recommendations, the College adopted a new format for the document which includes not only goals and objectives, but specific activities and indicators of success referenced to the objectives. Responsible
parties and timeframes are also referenced. The activities are to be reviewed and revised annually by the Campus Council. Thus the activities may be viewed as an annual plan for the College.

Indicators of Success are an attempt by the College to provide objective measurements of the accomplishment of the objectives. The precision, practicality, and utility of the indicators for each objective may vary reflecting that some objectives are more difficult to measure than others. The development of the indicators will be an ongoing process. In some cases, data may not be currently available and baselines may be educated guesses. The indicators are expected to become more valid and meaningful as the process unfolds.

As part of the ADP process, each of the College's administrative units developed unit plans. The unit plans allowed for the participation of all parties in the unit at the level that affects them most.

The next step will be for the Campus Council to examine the activities to set priorities for budgeting and resource allocation. In this manner, the ADP will drive the College's budget internally.

As the Accreditation Evaluation Report notes, the College does not have a single person responsible for planning. Given the relatively small number of College administrators and the current budget, the College is not likely to have a planning position in the near future. However, the College, for large planning projects, has typically provided significant release time for a faculty member, or in the case of the recent ADP, hired an emeritus faculty to coordinate the effort. The Campus Council and in particular, the Executive Committee, has assumed major responsibility for ongoing planning.
Preamble

By Consensus of the Faculty Senate, Clerical Staff Council, APT Association, Administration, Academic Support and the Office of Special Programs and Community Services in order to provide an organization and formal procedures by which Leeward Community College can carry out collective responsibilities in matters of campus priority setting and specifically, to determine, recommend and advise, as appropriate, concerning priorities of the college as a functioning unit of the University of Hawai‘i, while promoting and improving communications and mutual understanding among faculty, staff, administration and students, the Leeward Community College Campus Council is hereby established.

Article I
Purpose and Functions of the Council

Section 1. The Campus Council shall function as the recommending and advisory body of the college in matters relating to the priorities of the college. It has the responsibility on behalf of the constituencies of the college of recommending college priorities to the College Provost and through the College Provost to the Chancellor of the Community Colleges, President of the University of Hawai‘i and the Board of Regents of the University of Hawai‘i.

Section 2. "Priorities," under this charter, means establishing preferences, for the direction of the college, especially in regard to budget planning and resource allocation.

Section 3. The Campus Council is intended to function as part of a campus wide shared governance commitment. In this regard, the council members, as leaders of campus constituencies, will have the responsibility of insuring that the flow of information upon which decisions are made includes the input and feedback from members of their constituency.

Article II
Membership on the Council

Section 1. A member shall be defined as a representative of one of the constituencies named below.
Section 2. The Campus Council is composed of nineteen voting members and the Provost ex officio and nonvoting.

Section 3. Membership on of the Council

1. Arts and Humanities Division Chair
2. Social Science Division Chair
3. Vocational Education Division Chair
4. Business Education Division Chair
5. Math & Science Division Chair
6. Student Services Division Chair
7. Language Arts Division Chair
8. The Faculty Senate Chair or Chair’s designate
9. The At Large Member — Selected by lot from all faculty volunteers who submit their name for the drawing.
10. One Faculty Member from Academic Support
11. LCC Waianae Coordinator
12. Clerical Staff Council designate
13. APT designate
14. Auxiliary Services Officer
15. ASLCC President or President’s designate
16. The Dean of Instruction
17. The Dean of Student Services
18. The Director of Administrative Services
19. The Director of OSPCS or an OSPCS designate
20. The Provost

Section 4. By designate is meant one person appointed by the constituency to serve as that constituency’s Council member.

Article III
Terms of Office

Section 1. The At Large Member as well as constituency designates serve from May to May. The drawing for the At Large member will take place during the Spring Semester. All other members serve on the basis of their election or appointment to the position named or by designation of the constituency named.

Section 2. The council membership, as far as is possible, is to be finalized before the end of the Spring Semester.
Article IV
Organization of the Council

Section 1. The Executive Committee of the Council is the only standing committee of the Council. The Executive Committee shall consist of the Council Chair and two Council Vice Chairs. The Executive Committee shall be selected at a transitional meeting in May attended by both the current council and the incoming councilors. The incoming councilors will elect the new executive council members except where the incoming member is not yet known in which case the existing council member shall vote. Voting shall be by secret ballot, one position at a time.

Section 2. Duties of the Chair shall include:
   a. Preside at all meetings of the Council.
   b. Schedule meetings of the Council.
   c. Prepare a calendar of meetings and agendas for each meeting.
   d. To help coordinate the formation of ad hoc committees that the council creates to carry on its work between meetings.
   e. To serve as a liaison between the council and various constituencies of the campus.
   f. To coordinate the delegation of some of these duties to the Vice Chairs.

Section 3. Duties of the Vice Chairs shall include:
   a. To assist the Chair.
   b. At the request of or in the absence of the Chair to preside at meetings of the Council.
   c. To be responsible for the preparation and timely delivery of minutes, agendas, and other information to the Council members.
   d. To publish minutes of the meetings in the Campus Bulletin.
   e. To keep records of the Campus Council’s membership.
   f. To maintain an archive of the Charter, Minutes & Resolutions of the Council.
   g. To see that all new members of the Council are provided a copy of the Charter of the Council, along with all amendments to that Charter.
   h. To collect, copy, collate and distribute reports of ad hoc committees and other relevant data to the membership.
   i. To handle official correspondence of the Council.
Article V
Meetings

Section 1. Meetings of the Campus Council shall be called by the Chair of the Council or at the request of more than one-third of the voting members of the Campus Council (more than 1/3 of 19 = 7). The Council shall meet no less than twice a month. More than two thirds of the voting members shall constitute a quorum (2/3 of 19 = at least 13 members). All meetings of the Council shall be open to any member of the College community.

Section 2. The Chair may schedule executive meetings with the Vice Chairs and any other council members for the purpose of planning and preparing for general meetings. No official actions may be taken at these meetings.

Section 3. Ad Hoc Committee chairs may schedule meetings on the issues they are organized to address. No official actions may be taken at these meetings.

Article VI
Committees

Section 1. The Campus Council delegates various work to its Committees. In addition to each Committee's specific responsibilities, all Committees have the prerogative of sponsoring discussions, symposia or College Forums on topics relevant to their work. They also have the right to have items placed on the Agenda and to recommend to the Council the adoption of statements which would make clear the Council's view on issues of concern.

Section 2. The Campus Council shall have only one standing Committee, The Executive Committee, consisting of the Chair and Vice Chairs of the Campus Council. All other committees will be on an ad hoc basis.

Section 3. Any member of the campus community may serve on a Council Ad Hoc Committee.

Article VII
Recommendations

Section 1. All ad hoc committee recommendation are subject to review and ratification by the Campus Council. Committees must submit written
reports to the Council of all recommendations and the rationale for those recommendations.

Section 2. The recommendation of the Campus Council are made by voting on proposals at meetings of the campus council or through voting, in cases in which there is not time to convene the council, through the mail or electronic media. Any votes taken by mail or electronic media should be reported on at the next meeting and confirmed by the Council at that meeting.

Section 3. Members may name a standing alternate to sit in their place at the Council and such an standing alternate will be accorded full voting rights. The standing alternates name should be given to the Chair.

Section 4. Proxy voting is permitted. Members may also provide a proxy to any other member of the council to vote on their behalf on issues that come before the Council.

Section 5. There will be only "YES" or "NO" votes, no member of the Council may abstain.

Section 6. Recommendations are those recommendations approved by the members voting on the issue at a meeting with an official quorum. Recommendations are to be weighed by the Provost in accord with the preponderance of votes. When there is genuine consensus -- total agreement -- The Provost is to implement those policies insofar as possible.

Article VIII
Amendments

Section 1. Amendments may be proposed by any Council Member or Council Constituency. Proposed amendments shall be introduced in or transmitted to the Council in written form. The proposed amendment will be placed on the agenda for the next meeting at which a first reading of the proposal will take place.

Section 2. Consideration of an amendment shall take place at the first meeting of the Council after the first reading has taken place. The proposed amendment may be amended at the meeting in which it is considered.

Section 3. More than a two thirds majority of the Council membership must vote in
favor of an amendment for it to be approved. Amendments become effective upon approval by the Campus Council.

We the undersigned approve the Campus Council Charter & By-laws

Signatures

Arts and Humanities Division Chair
Social Science Division Chair
Vocational Education Division Chair
Business Education Division Chair
Math & Science Division Chair
Student Services Division Chair
Language Arts Division Chair
Faculty Senate Chair
At Large Faculty Member
Academic Support
LCC Waianae Coordinator
Clerical Staff Council
APT
Auxiliary Services Officer
ASLCC President
Dean of Instruction
Dean of Student Services
Director of Administrative Services
Director of OSPCS
The Provost

Barbara E. Suzuki
James Miller
Salvatore Arcuri
Ray Senda
Marvin Kaneto
Hawai'i Nishihira
James A. Witte
Michael T. Cohan
Barbara A. Ueki
Frederick A. Saiki
Barbara A. Ueki
Kenneth F. Kawasaki
James H. Watanabe
John W. Onaga
Appendix B

ADP PROCESS

Development

The process to develop the ADP was designed to be inclusive, participatory, and evolutionary. The process was overseen by a recently retired professor. The year-long process included campus units, constituencies, and individuals as well as input from the community. The Campus Council, the campus governance body, served as the steering committee for the ADP. The ADP was the focus of the 1995 Leadership Colloquium at the beginning of the academic year. Based on input from the Colloquium and discussion in the Campus Council, a vision statement and goals were developed by the Campus Council Executive Committee. These statements were approved as drafts by the Campus Council, and a campus forum was held.

Representative committees for each of the ADP goals were formed to develop objectives and activities. The results of these committees were presented at campus forums. Panels and presentations from community, government, and business groups were also held. The Campus Council Executive Committee, other members of the Campus Council, and the Provost drafted goals and objectives which were distributed to all faculty and staff for comment. The few comments received criticized the vagueness of the draft document.

During the summer, the Campus Council Executive Committee and the Provost revised the format of the ADP and developed sample activities and indicators of success. The 1996 Leadership Colloquium expanded on this effort and added responsibility and timeframe categories. The ADP was then presented to the Fall 1996 Convocation and discussed at division and unit meetings.

Oversight and Revision

The Campus Council will coordinate oversight of the activities stated in the ADP, provide accountability, and insure that campus priorities conform to the ADP. To accommodate this task, it is proposed that the Campus Council form a Facilitation Committee for each goal. The committees will be charged with:

1. Confirming the acceptance of responsibility of the groups or individuals named in the Responsibility column for the corresponding activity and identifying a group or individual for those activities without a named party.
2. Clarifying activities and indicators with the responsible parties.
3. Receiving progress reports on activities from the responsible parties.
4. Keeping the Campus Council informed on the progress for their respective goal.
October 2, 1997

MEMORANDUM

TO: Provost Polk
VIA: Lucy Gay

FROM: Kathleen Cabra
LCC Theatre Manager

SUBJ.: ACCREDITATION RESPONSE
STANDARD TWO

2.7 The Theatre will develop guidelines which specify the support it can give on a non-charging basis.

Theatre staff is currently in the final phase of compiling detailed expenditures for all college events for FY97. A computerized system will track the expenses incurred during the current fiscal year. When these reports are complete, the Theatre staff will meet with the Director of OCET, the Dean of Instruction and the Arts & Humanities Chair to review data and determine initial guidelines. These guidelines will then be discussed in an open forum with all college participants before guidelines are finalized and implemented.
September 30, 1997

TO: Robert Hochstein
    Faculty Senate Chair

FROM: Provost Barbara Polk

SUBJECT: Accreditation Mid-Term Report

Part of our mid-term report to ACCJC must include a brief summary of how we are progressing on the recommendations we made to ourselves in our Accreditation Self-Study. Would you review the following recommendations which involve the Faculty Senate and provide a brief statement to Jack Pond on what has been accomplished. Jack needs this report by October 7.

1.8. The Program Review, Budget and Planning Committee of the Faculty Senate will conduct a periodic review of the effect of budget reductions on the overall mission of the College, particularly the open-door policy and recommend policies and guidelines for cutting costs without compromising the mission.

8.1. The Provost and Faculty Senate will establish a more standardized policy for meetings between the administration and the Faculty Senate Executive Board.

8.4. The Faculty Senate will revive its Committee on Committees as a vehicle for the Faculty Senate to develop guidelines for creating committees and for selecting committee chairs and to recommend appropriate faculty for committee memberships.

Because the college made 68 recommendations to itself, and the Commission has emphasized that it wants only a brief report in this area, you need provide no more than two or three sentences in response to each of the above. If you need more background on the rationale for the recommendations, please consult the Accreditation Self-Study report. The recommendations are found in the sections on "Planning" in each subarea. The first number of each recommendation refers to the section of the report where it is found. The second is for identification purposes only and does not appear in the report.

I apologize for the short notice and thank you in advance for your prompt attention to this request. If you have questions or need assistance, please call me ASAP.
TO: Cliff Togo

FROM: Barbara Polk

SUBJECT: Accreditation Mid-Term Report

Attached are the recommendations from our last Accreditation Self Study which pertain to your area. I apologize for the short notice, but would you please review them and provide a brief statement of what has and has not been done on each. Please send this to Jack Pond by October 7.

Because the college made 68 recommendations to itself, and the Commission has emphasized that it wants only a brief report in this area, you need provide no more than two or three sentences in response to each of the above. If you need more background on the rationale for the recommendations, please consult the Accreditation Self-Study report. The recommendations are found in the sections on “Planning” in each subarea. The first number of each recommendation refers to the section of the report where it is found. The second is for identification purposes only and does not appear in the report.

If you have questions let me know!

cc: Jack Pond
TO:       James West
          Mike Pecsok
          Kathy Young
          Bernadette Clemente

FROM:    Provost Barbara Polk

SUBJECT: Accreditation Mid-Term Report

The college must prepare a mid-term report for the Accrediting Commission for Community and
Junior Colleges on its progress on the major recommendations during our last accreditation. I am
writing to ask your assistance in responding to the two major recommendations--but on very short
notice. To complete the report, review it on campus, provide it to the Board of Regents and get
it to the Commission by November 1, I will need your response by October 7! The
recommendations are:

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

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

Your response does not need to be lengthy. It should report briefly on what has been done to
address this recommendation and what remains to be done. Your report should go to Jack Pond
for review and incorporation into the full report. I have included the narrative from the visiting
team which supports these recommendations, as well as the college report to the Commission last
year on these items and the Commissions findings as to our progress.

I am asking Jim to take responsibility for communication between the group of you and pulling
together your response.

I apologize for the very short notice and very much appreciate your efforts to tackle this task! If you have any questions or concerns, please call me ASAP.

c: Jack Pond
TO: Frank Sherry  
Warren Mau  
Roy Kamida  

FROM: Provost Barbara Polk

SUBJECT: Mid-Term Accreditation Report

The college must prepare a mid-term report for the Accrediting Commission for Community and Junior Colleges on its progress on the major recommendations during our last accreditation. I am writing to ask your assistance in responding to one of these--but on very short notice! To complete the report, review it on campus, provide it to the Board of Regents and get it to the Commission by November 1, I will need your response by October 7! The recommendation is:

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

Your response does not need to be lengthy. It should report briefly on what has been done to address this recommendation and what remains to be done. Your report should go to Jack Pond for review and incorporation into the full report.

I am asking Frank to take responsibility for communication between the three of you and pulling together your response. You may use Elena Bumanglag as a resource from the Dean’s Office if you wish.

I apologize for the very short notice and very much appreciate your efforts to tackle this task! If you have any questions or concerns, please call me ASAP. I have included a copy of the portions of the accreditation evaluation which pertain to this recommendation.

c: Assistant Dean Bumanglag  
Jack Pond
September 29, 1997

TO: Barbara Hotta
   Michael Bauer
   Jean Hara

FROM: Provost Barbara Polk

SUBJECT: Accreditation Mid-Term Report

The college must prepare a mid-term report for the Accrediting Commission for Community and Junior Colleges on its progress on the major recommendations during our last accreditation. I am writing to ask your assistance in responding to one of these--but on very short notice. To complete the report, review it on campus, provide it to the Board of Regents and get it to the Commission by November 1, I will need your response by October 7! The recommendation is:

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

Your response does not need to be lengthy. It should report briefly on what has been done to address this recommendation and what remains to be done. Your report should go to Jack Pond for review and incorporation into the full report.

I am asking Barbara to take responsibility for communication between the three of you and pulling together your response. You may use Mark Silliman as a Dean’s Office resource if you wish.

I apologize for the very short notice and very much appreciate your efforts to tackle this task! If you have any questions or concerns, please call me ASAP. I have included a copy of the portions of the accreditation evaluation which pertain to this recommendation.

c: Jack Pond
   Mark Silliman
The college must prepare a mid-term report for the Accrediting Commission for Community and Junior Colleges on its progress on the major recommendations during our last accreditation. I am writing to ask your assistance in responding to one of these—but on very short notice. To complete the report, review it on campus, provide it to the Board of Regents and get it to the Commission by November 1, I will need your response by October 7! The recommendation is:

2.2 The team recommends that the College review and revise the general education requirements for the Associate in Science degree so that requirements meet the expectations established by the accrediting commission in Standard 2C, regarding the content and methodologies of major areas of knowledge—the humanities, the fine arts, the natural sciences and the social sciences.

Your response does not need to be lengthy. It should report briefly on what has been done to address this recommendation and what remains to be done. Your report should go to Jack Pond for review and incorporation into the full report.

I am asking Tommylynn to take responsibility for communication between the three of you and pulling together your response. I would suggest that you consult the most recent catalog and pull together a table of the general education requirements in each of our vocational associate degrees (at the time of the accreditation visit, all vocational degrees were A.S., so the recommendation refers to all current A.S. and A.A.S. degrees).

I apologize for the very short notice and very much appreciate your efforts to tackle this task! If you have any questions or concerns, please call me ASAP. I have included a copy of the portions of the accreditation evaluation which pertain to this recommendation.

c: Jack Pond
TO: Sinikka Hayasaka  
Barbara Saromines-Ganne  
Mary Jane Dobson

FROM: Provost Barbara Polk

SUBJECT: Accreditation Mid-Term Report

The college must prepare a mid-term report for the Accrediting Commission for Community and Junior Colleges on its progress on the major recommendations during our last accreditation. I am writing to ask your assistance in responding to one of these--but on very short notice. To complete the report, review it on campus, provide it to the Board of Regents and get it to the Commission by November 1, I will need your response by October 7! The recommendation is:

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

Your response does not need to be lengthy. It should report briefly on what has been done to address this recommendation and what remains to be done. Your report should go to Jack Pond for review and incorporation into the full report.

I am asking Sinikka to take responsibility for communication between the three of you and pulling together your response.

I apologize for the very short notice and very much appreciate your efforts to tackle this task! If you have any questions or concerns, please call me ASAP. I have included a copy of the portions of the accreditation evaluation which pertain to this recommendation.

c: Jack Pond
TO:       Dean Garrett
         Gloria Bridges
         Larry Goldstein

FROM:    Provost Barbara Polk

SUBJECT: Accreditation Mid-Term Report

The college must prepare a mid-term report for the Accrediting Commission for Community and
Junior Colleges on its progress on the major recommendations during our last accreditation. I am
writing to ask your assistance in responding to one of these--but on very short notice. To
complete the report, review it on campus, provide it to the Board of Regents and get it to the
Commission by November 1, I will need your response by October 7! The recommendation is:

5.1: The team recommends that the College provide equitable access to print media
resources for students at the Waianae site.

Your response does not need to be lengthy. It should report briefly on what has been done to
address this recommendation and what remains to be done. Your report should go to Jack Pond
for review and incorporation into the full report.

I am asking Dean to take responsibility for communication between the three of you and pulling
together your response.

I apologize for the very short notice and very much appreciate your efforts to tackle this task! If
you have any questions or concerns, please call me ASAP. I have included a copy of the portions
of the accreditation evaluation which pertain to this recommendation.

c: Jack Pond
TO: Cliff Togo
    Marilyn Bauer
    Fern Tomisato
    Jackson Tsujimura

FROM: Provost Barbara Polk

SUBJECT: Accreditation Mid-Term Report

The college must prepare a mid-term report for the Accrediting Commission for Community and Junior Colleges on its progress on the major recommendations during our last accreditation. I am writing to ask your assistance in responding to one of these—but on very short notice. To complete the report, review it on campus, provide it to the Board of Regents and get it to the Commission by November 1, I will need your response by October 7! The recommendation is:

6.1 The team recommends that in conjunction with the master plan activities a college-wide plan for instructional and operational equipment acquisition, replacement, and maintenance be developed and utilized.

Your response does not need to be lengthy. It should report briefly on what has been done to address this recommendation and what remains to be done. Your report should go to Jack Pond for review and incorporation into the full report.

I am asking Marilyn to take responsibility for communication between the four of you and pulling together your response.

I apologize for the very short notice and very much appreciate your efforts to tackle this task! If you have any questions or concerns, please call me ASAP. I have included a copy of the portions of the accreditation evaluation which pertain to this recommendation.

c: Jack Pond
TO: LCC Campus Council
Kathleen Cabral  Terry Richter
Manny Cabral  Barbara Saromines-Ganne
Bernadette Clemente  Mark Silliman
Dean Garrett  Clifford Togo
Sinikka Hayasaka  Ken Tokuno
Bob Hochstein  Fern Tomisato
Issac Holbon  Jonathan Wong
Grace Miller  Rich Yamane
Mike Pecsok  Kathleen Young
Barbara Polk

FROM: Executive Committee

SUBJECT: Special Campus Council Meeting, Tuesday, October 21 at 1:30pm in LA-111.

AGENDA

1. Academic Development Plan and Unit Goals.
   We need to consider where these goals will appear in the ADP, how they will be prioritized, and the level of commitment. This is particularly important for goals with funding implications (see the Provost's handout from the last meeting) since the most likely source of funding is reallocation.

2. Accreditation Response
   Review and approval of the Mid-Term Report

3. Supplemental Budget report

Are some of the highlighted statements true? What if faculty is asked?
MIDTERM REPORT

Leeward Community College
96-045 Ala Ike
Pearl City, Hawaii 96782

Prepared for the Accrediting Commission for Community and Junior Colleges
November 1, 1997
Statement of Report Preparation

The Provost asked the Campus Council to recommend a committee to oversee the development of the college’s Mid-Term accreditation report. When only one person offered to serve on such a committee, the Provost suggested to the Council Chair that Professor Garman Pond be asked to head up the process, given his extensive experience with the accreditation process.

Professor Pond reviewed lists of faculty and staff and identified individuals who had background appropriate to serve on small teams investigating each of the nine recommendations of the Accrediting Commission. These groups were refined in consultation with the Provost; members are listed in the Appendix. The Provost asked each member to serve and provided them with the portion of the Commission’s 1995 evaluation report relevant to their task. In addition, the team which handled the two major recommendations received a copy of the report to the commission which was submitted last year, as well as the evaluator’s response to that report. All individuals agreed to serve. The one volunteer from the Campus Council, Professor Grace Miller, agreed to work with Professor Pond to oversee pulling the total report together.

The Provost also asked each administrator to assemble brief responses to each of the 63 action plans which the campus had identified for itself in its Self Study. Professors Pond and Miller reviewed and prepared brief summaries of the rather substantial amount of narrative and documentation received.

The summary report, prepared by the two coordinators, was reviewed by the Provost, who recommended some changes and corrections. It was circulated to the Campus Council membership for review. (More needs to be added here, when we know who all reviews it.) It then went to the Senior Vice President and Chancellor for Community Colleges and the Secretary of the Board of Regents for approval.

Barbara B. Polk, Provost  Date
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**Appendix:**

Mid-Term Report Task Groups 8
**Accreditation - Midterm Report**

**Visiting Team Recommendations and College Responses:**

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

The Provost has supported a clear and well-organized process to create the College's new Academic Development Plan (ADP). Though parts of this document are still in draft form, the bulk of it has been completed. The formation of this academic plan has, through many drafts and revisions, been the work of nearly the entire campus; all units of the College have participated in its development. Campus leaders in both the Faculty Senate and the Campus Council have reviewed and worked to improve the plan. Division meetings have played an integral part of the review process. The entire process was coordinated by the Campus Council. During its development the ADP has been integrated with other system plans such as the Hawaii Community Colleges Strategic Plan and the University of Hawaii Strategic Plan.

Academic and non-academic units have reviewed and revised their plans annually in relationship to the ADP. ADP priority activities were those submitted as budget requests to the State legislature for biennium 1997-1999 (although they were not funded). Internal allocations of discretionary funds have been guided by the ADP as well.

Institutional research issues are addressed in 1.2 below. Due to lack of staffing, program assessment is not yet fully integrated into the planning and budgeting process, although the wealth of system generated data guide decisions on class scheduling and staffing. Improvement in this area will be a major emphasis of the campus prior to the next accreditation review.

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

The Provost has given full support to the inclusion of all campus governance groups in the Campus Council. The Council is the primary vehicle for all campus leaders to gather and plan for the future of the College. A review of Leeward's progress in shared governance involves looking at the strengths and weaknesses of the Council as a shared governance vehicle.

The broad membership of the Council includes faculty, staff, students and administrators each representing their particular constituent group. Regularly scheduled meetings, published minutes and committee formation activities allow for all members of the team to have a voice in the governance of the College. It is generally agreed that the Council has succeeded in increasing the flow of information between the administration and the broader campus population.
The success of the Council is even more extraordinary given the current economic crisis in the State and the continuing budgetary restraints under which the College must operate. Funding has decreased, costs have risen, initiation of new programs or expansion of existing ones generally means current programs must be reduced or eliminated, and little budgetary flexibility exists. Nevertheless, the Council has succeeded in carrying out several initiatives on the campus. For example, the College was able to establish Internet access for all divisions on campus (which entailed wiring of many campus buildings). It has also been able to centralize duplication services and consolidate several computer labs.

The role of the Campus Council, to many, seems to bring it into conflict with the Faculty Senate's traditional role as the prime advisor to the Provost. The review team notes that the Council has been more effective in dealing meaningfully with the College's budget and resource allocation issues while the Faculty Senate still retains its role as the primary vehicle for advising the administration on curriculum matters and academic policies. It will be important for the College to monitor the relationship between the two bodies and effectively educate the campus at large of the respective roles that are played by each.

Old criticisms of the College's administration have resurfaced recently. The College still finds itself at the mercy of decisions made beyond it. In the Spring of 1997 a decision was made at the System level and in the State's political arena to relocate more than 20 portable buildings from Kapiolani Community College to Leeward to house the University of Hawaii West Oahu campus for the next two decades. A campus site was chosen. The Senate and the Council objected vigorously to the lack of proper consultation. Both groups felt they should have been properly informed and asked to give input on this major issue. The Senate condemned the administration for failing to consult with it on this decision. This is the type of breakdown in shared governance that the College hopes will be remedied in the future with better communication between the Administration, the Council and the Senate. The Administration must ensure that information is provided in a timely fashion to all concerned parties and campus decision makers. Individuals and consultative groups must also take the initiative to voice concerns in a timely manner when information is provided.

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

The College currently has a Vocational/Technical Institutional Analyst who gathers and evaluates data relating to the Vocational/Technical areas. One half-time position has been reallocated for a research person, and the College is currently negotiating with the Chancellor's Office for a second, half-time position. These two half-time positions will allow the College to hire one full-time APT researcher whose responsibility will be to conduct the research studies necessary to meet the needs of the College. In support of this research effort, a Committee on Institutional Research has already been formed. Membership includes the Deans of Instruction and Student Services, the Assessment Specialist, the Interim Coordinator of Enrollment Services, the VocTech Analyst and the Institutional Researcher, when hired. The goal of the Committee
will be to support and encourage research at the College and to assist in the coordination and implementation of that research. The Committee will continue to work closely with the System Research office to ensure that information relevant to LCC is received and utilized.

The College is fully aware of its increasing responsibility to systematically evaluate its programs and activities. With the additional Institutional Research position, such evaluation should be substantially expanded and refined by the time of the next accreditation visit.

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

The College's Curriculum Specialist developed a core outline form that was used from the Spring of 1996 to the present to create core outlines for all courses at the College. Approximately 100 core outlines were received, reviewed by the Curriculum Committee and passed by the Faculty Senate that first semester. An additional 379 core outlines were approved by the Curriculum Committee and the Senate in the Fall of 1996, and 189 passed both bodies in the Spring of 1997. Each new course and every modified course required a core outline be attached to the proposal for this three-semester period. In May 1997, a computerized version of this process began. A database program was designed to track the entire curriculum process. All current catalog information was transferred electronically to the new database while additional input is still in progress for the three-semesters worth of data on core outlines.

The database can be accessed via the Internet from Macintosh or IBM compatible computers. Course proposers interact with the database on line; review at each level--division, Curriculum Committee, Faculty Senate, Dean of Instruction and Provost--is recorded with the proposal. Proposed courses are maintained in the database until approved or disapproved, and thus, the new program maintains a database of archived, current and proposed core outlines. The program also has the capacity to generate course syllabi that take the basic course information--description, credits, alpha and number--from the catalog database. Additional information--course goals and objectives, course content, textbooks, supplies, etc.--from the core are available for individual instructors if desired. Individual instructor-designed syllabi are maintained on-line so that they may be compared to the core outline of record as needed. Students will be able to access the display mode of the program, if they desire, for any course on campus.

Finally, the program takes all new materials such as course descriptions, and replaces the catalog information as required. In this manner, catalog information is updated automatically to match the actual transactions of the curriculum process. At any given point in time the entire college catalog can be produced from the course database and the catalog database that this program manages.

Since most instructor course syllabi are not yet on line, the college will need to monitor the relationship between the core course outlines and course syllabi as this new system is implemented.
2.2 The team recommends that the College review and revise the general education requirements for the Associate in Science degree so that requirements meet the expectations established by the accrediting commission in Standard 2C, regarding the content and methodologies of major areas of knowledge—the humanities, the fine arts, the natural sciences and the social sciences—as well as critical thinking. (2C.1, 2C.3)

In 1996 a University of Hawai‘i Community College system-wide committee that had been charged with review of the Associate of Arts degree developed a document, *A Blueprint for Learning - The Report of the Associate Degree Task Force*, which contained the recommendation that all associate degree programs within the Community College System be based on an educational approach emphasizing four integrated themes of learning, specifically thinking, communicating, knowing and using. This document has guided the general education requirements for Associate in Science and Associate in Applied Science (AS and AAS) degrees at the college, all of which had a minimum of 15 credits in general education coursework, in addition to Math and English requirements at the time of the last accreditation review. Since that time, all vocational programs have undergone review and revision. The fine arts, the humanities, the natural sciences and the social sciences are now requirements in those AS and AAS degree programs which have completed their revisions. The revision of the remaining programs should be complete and in conformity with the accreditation Standard 2C by the end of this academic year. Critical thinking is not addressed through specific coursework in the College’s AS and AAS degree programs but is an intrinsic part of most regular coursework in all vocational programs.

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

Although most Divisions have long had regular provisions for evaluations of lecturers, not all have done so regularly. The Division Chairs have now developed a plan to evaluate lecturers based on discipline and division-based criteria as well as the college-wide criterion of demonstrated teaching effectiveness. Lecturers with two or fewer years of continuous service (or less than 36 teaching credits) will be evaluated annually by their respective Division Personnel Committees (DPCs). Lecturers with three or more years of continuous service (or 36 or more teaching credits) will be evaluated at least every other year by the DPCs. The DPCs will report their findings to the Division Chairs (DCs) who are in charge of rehiring lecturers. The DCs will use the DPC evaluations as one of the criteria for the decision to continue employment of lecturers who have undergone the evaluation process. The next step will be to submit the plan to the Faculty Senate for consideration.

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

The Learning Resource Laboratory at LCC-Waianae now provides terminal access to the LCC Library database and the UH West Oahu Library database including the Expanded Academic Index for access to journal articles and full-text, a SIRS Periodical Index of current full-text
journal articles, and access to the Hawaii State Library System. Updated and expanded resource materials including textbooks references, magazines and reserve materials in support of Liberal Arts courses; subscriptions to news magazines and journals in Nursing and Allied Health; and over 150 Nursing and Allied Health texts are available in the collection. Ordering, delivery and return of circulating texts from the main campus library is available to LCCW students in a timely fashion.

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

Prioritized lists of instructional and operational equipment have been compiled through a campus-wide process. A list for new acquisitions and a list for replacement items have been compiled. It should be noted that funds to replace instructional equipment that were available in the past have not been released recently. Purchase of new and replacement equipment is likely to take place at the end of the academic year when operational expenses have been accounted for. The aforementioned prioritized lists assure that purchases will be in line with campus-determined needs as identified in the master plan.

Major projects in facilities maintenance which have been deferred for budgetary reasons are also prioritized along the lines of the College's master plan.

Maintenance of instructional and operational equipment is handled in several ways. Maintenance of most office equipment—typewriters and copiers—is by contract. Maintenance of most facilities equipment—air conditioning, telephones and elevators—is also by contract. Maintenance of instructional equipment is managed by the respective divisions and paid for with division funds. The repair of certain equipment—computers, media and maintenance-related equipment—is completed by campus staff.

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

The administrative turnover noted by the visiting team occurs for a variety of reasons. Some corrective action has been taken; other action still needs to be taken. An unusually heavy workload is created by the fact that the Dean of Instruction has only two Assistant Deans; additionally, a lack of clerical and administrative support add to the workload. An additional administrative position, Assistant to the Provost was briefly provided to the College by the legislature, but was lost during the funding cutback. This position could have greatly relieved the administrative workload burden for both the Dean and the Provost.

Frank discussions between faculty, staff, and administrative team members and the Chancellor of Community Colleges concerning the administrative leadership style of the Provost on this campus were held during the Spring 1997 semester. The Chancellor invited the open
exchange of concerns that individuals from the aforementioned groups had. Early in the Fall 1997 semester, the Chancellor held open meetings with faculty, staff and administrative team members to report the results of her inquiry and follow-up discussions with the Provost. All involved are hopeful that reasonable efforts will be made to achieve constructive changes in leadership style. Indeed this year the Provost has set upon the task of making major changes to the leadership style she employs. The campus community is currently maintaining an optimistic outlook as it anticipates possible outcomes from the events of the past six months.

Summary Discussion of Self-Identified Issues:

Standard 1: Institutional Integrity

The College has made considerable progress in fulfilling nearly all its plans in this area. Noteworthy is the establishment of a Community Relations Committee to ensure adherence of College program brochures' content to policy and legal requirements and uniformity of design. The Campus Council has accepted the responsibility to monitor the progress on the Academic Development Plan. The Faculty Senate still needs to take up the issue of administration and evaluation of student and peer evaluations.

Standard 2: Educational Programs

Most issues identified by the College in this area are well under way toward fulfillment. Considerable effort has been expended in matters relating to the curriculum process from maintaining a current database of courses to tracking the authorization process of all proposed course outlines. The process additionally serves to maintain a consistent relationship between the course on record and the course as delivered. Also noteworthy is the College's effort to offer alternatives to traditional course offerings to meet the diversity of student demands and take advantage of increased technological opportunities; the plan to implement a system-wide package for Student Information Systems (known as Buzzo) which will empower users to conduct independent research; efforts to improve community connections through the formation of the LCC Community Relations Committee.

Standard 3: Students Services and the Co-Curricular Learning Environment

The college has made substantial progress in addressing the issues it had identified. Most
importantly, the Student Services Division implemented a "health indicators" system of assessing their activities beginning in 1996; purchased a system for digitizing student records to improve security and access to historical records and is about halfway through scanning the records; began reorganization of the division to create an enrollment services unit; expanded collection and use of data on student characteristics and needs; and reorganized the space in the Financial Aid Office to better serve students. Attempts by the Dean to provide opportunities for student input into service development and delivery have resulted in useful feedback, but have been difficult to maintain due to lack of student willingness to serve on advisory committees. However, the college will continue to provide these opportunities.

Standard 4: Faculty and Staff

The College divisions have developed procedures for systematic evaluation and follow-up evaluations for Division Chairs and Unit Heads. A College-wide plan has been proposed to evaluate all part-time lecturers. Policies on peer evaluation and the study of the outcomes of such evaluation as well as ways in which to allow all faculty and staff the opportunity to evaluate administrators is still needed.

Standard 5: Library and Learning Resources

While most issues in this area have been addressed, two accomplishments are significant. The Campus Computing Committee is now responsible for assessing the ongoing needs of the College with respect to technology. A task force has recommended to this Committee, the Campus Council and the Provost that several computer labs on campus be consolidated. Thus far, the consolidated laboratory has realized greater efficiency than before. Also, formalized procedures for tutorial training have been established and are in place. The Learning Resource Center now provides a series of workshops, videotaped modules and tutoring manuals to ensure adequate preparation of the tutorial work force.

Standard 6: Physical Resources

The State budget crisis has reduced the College's ability to respond to all physical needs. Nevertheless, through creative financing, cooperation with the Chancellor's Office, and increased involvement of all parties affected through the Campus Council, most of the issues identified in this area have been addressed.

Standard 7: Financial Resources

The College has continued to seek more funding from outside sources. Several small grant proposals for credit and non-credit curriculum development projects have been successfully...
funded. Additionally, the College is participating in system-wide fund raising efforts through the University of Hawai'i Foundation. The College has been successful in involving the faculty, staff and students in the budgeting process through the Campus Council. However, typically rushed time frames and dwindling discretionary funds often make useful input difficult at times.

**Standard 8: Governance and Administration**

Shared governance remains important to the College and most self-identified issues in this area have received considerable attention. As the College continues to define and describe the roles of the Faculty Senate and the Campus Council and their relationship to the Administration, additional benefits will be realized. The role of the Associated Students of Leeward Community College in shared governance needs cultivation.
Appendix:

Mid-Term Report Task Groups

Major Recommendations 1.1 and 8.1 (Planning and Governance)

✓ James West, Assoc. Prof., C.C., Philosophy
   Past Faculty Senate Chair
Robert Hochstein, Assoc. Prof., C.C., Television Production
   Faculty Senate Chair
Ronald Flegal, Assoc. Prof., C.C., Engineering
   Accreditation Liaison
Michael Pecsok, Professor, C.C., Media Coordinator
   Campus Council Chair
Kathleen Young, Professor, C.C., Office Administration and Technology
   Business Division Chair, Campus Council Member
Bernadette Clemente, Auxiliary Services Officer
   Campus Council Member
Dixie Kawamura, Secretary
   Past President, Clerical Staff Council

Recommendation 1.2 (Means of meeting research needs)

✓ Frank Sherry, Professor, C.C., Assessment Specialist
   Warren Mau, Registrar
   Past Business Division Chair
Roy Kamida, Professor, C.C., Accounting,

Recommendation 2.1 (Curriculum review and documentation)

✓ Barbara Hotta, Asst. Professor, C.C., Computer Science
   Past Curriculum Committee Chair
Jean Hara, Professor, C.C., Office Administration
   Past Curriculum Committee Chair
Michael Bauer, Asst. Professor, C.C., Computer Science
   Curriculum Committee Chair
Mark Silliman, Dean of Instruction

Recommendation 2.2 (General Ed. Requirements for vocational programs)

* Tommylynn Benevente, Asst. Professor, C.C., Food Service
Milton Matsunaga, Asst. Professor, C.C., Drafting Technology
Warren Imada, Professor, C.C., Accounting
Recommendation 4.1 (Evaluation of lecturers)
* Sinikka Hayasaka, Professor, C.C., Japanese Language
  Language Arts Division Chair
Barbara Saromines-Ganne, Professor, C.C., Art History
  Arts and Humanities Division Chair
Mary Jane Dobson, Professor, C.C., Sociology

Recommendation 5.1 (Print media at Waianae)
✓ * Dean Garrett, Professor, C.C.,
  Coordinator, LCC at Waianae
Gloria Bridges, Instructor-Counselor, LCC at Waianae
Laurence Goldstein, Assoc. Professor, C.C.
  Librarian

Recommendation 6.1 (Equipment acquisition and maintenance)
✓ * Marilyn Bauer, Professor, C.C., English
  Learning Resource Center Coordinator
Fern Tomisato, Assoc. Professor, C.C., Food Service
  Vocational and Technical Division Chair
Jackson Tsujimura, Electronics Technician
Clifford Togo, Director of Administrative Services

Recommendation 8.2 (Administrative turnover)
✓ * Kenneth Tokuno, Dean of Student Services
Lucy Gay, Director of Continuing Education and Training
Elena Bumanglag, Assistant Dean for Instruction
Douglas Dykstra, Acting Assistant Dean for Instruction
Mark Silliman, Dean of Instruction
Cliff Togo, Director of Administrative Services

* Task Group Coordinator
TO: Accreditation Task Force Members

FROM: Provost Barbara Polk

SUBJECT: Draft Accreditation Mid-Term Report

First I want to thank you for accepting the challenge of preparing a draft report on our progress on one of the Accreditation Team recommendations on such very short notice! The reports from each of the committees were reviewed by Jack Pond, who did a great job of pulling them together into a unified report. Grace Miller and I also reviewed the draft and suggested some modifications. The draft response to the nine recommendations is attached.

When the Campus Council met today, they expressed some concern that the editing process may have inadvertently changed the intent of certain sections, and they have recommended that the draft of your section be returned to you for review and comment. Members of the Campus Council have also been asked to send any concerns they may have individually to your task group Chair. To make our deadline, the Council agreed to the following timetable:

Tuesday, Oct. 28, noon: All comments to the Task Group Chair

Wednesday, Oct. 29, noon: Modifications of report due from Chair

If you are a Chair, please review the draft right away. If you anticipate that your task group will need to meet, you may want to contact them and set up a meeting within this time frame. Your report should go to me, Mike Pecsok (as Campus Council Chair) and Grace Miller. (Jack Pond will be heading for the mainland to do an accreditation visit for a college there on Sunday so won’t be able to work on this further.)

Please contact me if you have any concerns or need assistance. Thank you again for your help on this project!

c: Grace Miller
   Mike Pecsok
   Jack Pond
Visiting Team Recommendations and College Responses:

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

The Provost has supported a clear and well-organized process to create the College's new Academic Development Plan (ADP). Though parts of this document are still in draft form, the bulk of it has been completed. The formation of this academic plan has, through many drafts and revisions, been the work of nearly the entire campus; all units of the College have participated in its development. Campus leaders in both the Faculty Senate and the Campus Council have reviewed and worked to improve the plan. Division meetings have played an integral part of the review process. The entire process was coordinated by the Campus Council. During its development the ADP has been integrated with other system plans such as the Hawaii Community Colleges Strategic Plan and the University of Hawaii Strategic Plan.

Academic and non-academic units have reviewed and revised their plans annually in relationship to the ADP. ADP priority activities were those submitted as budget requests to the State legislature for biennium 1997-1999 (although they were not funded). Internal allocations of discretionary funds have been guided by the ADP as well.

Institutional research issues are addressed in 1.2 below. Due to lack of staffing, program assessment is not yet fully integrated into the planning and budgeting process, although the wealth of system generated data guide decisions on class scheduling and staffing. Improvement in this area will be a major emphasis of the campus prior to the next accreditation review.

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

The Provost has given full support to the inclusion of all campus governance groups in the Campus Council. The Council is the primary vehicle for all campus leaders to gather and plan for the future of the College. A review of Leeward's progress in shared governance involves looking at the strengths and weaknesses of the Council as a shared governance vehicle.

The broad membership of the Council includes faculty, staff, students and administrators each representing their particular constituent group. Regularly scheduled meetings, published minutes and committee formation activities allow for all members of the team to have a voice in the governance of the College. It is generally agreed that the Council has succeeded in increasing the flow of information between the administration and the broader campus population.
The success of the Council is even more extraordinary given the current economic crisis in the State and the continuing budgetary restraints under which the College must operate. Funding has decreased, costs have risen, initiation of new programs or expansion of existing ones generally means current programs must be reduced or eliminated, and little budgetary flexibility exists. Nevertheless, the Council has succeeded in carrying out several initiatives on the campus. For example, the College was able to establish Internet access for all divisions on campus (which entailed wiring of many campus buildings). It has also been able to centralize duplication services and consolidate several computer labs.

The role of the Campus Council, to many, seems to bring it into conflict with the Faculty Senate's traditional role as the prime advisor to the Provost. The review team notes that the Council has been more effective in dealing meaningfully with the College's budget and resource allocation issues while the Faculty Senate still retains its role as the primary vehicle for advising the administration on curriculum matters and academic policies. It will be important for the College to monitor the relationship between the two bodies and effectively educate the campus at large of the respective roles that are played by each.

Old criticisms of the College's administration have resurfaced recently. The College still finds itself at the mercy of decisions made beyond it. In the Spring of 1997 a decision was made at the System level and in the State's political arena to relocate more than 20 portable buildings from Kapiolani Community College to Leeward to house the University of Hawaii West Oahu campus for the next two decades. A campus site was chosen. The Senate and the Council objected vigorously to the lack of proper consultation. Both groups felt they should have been properly informed and asked to give input on this major issue. The Senate condemned the administration for failing to consult with it on this decision. This is the type of breakdown in shared governance that the College hopes will be remedied in the future with better communication between the Administration, the Council and the Senate. The Administration must ensure that information is provided in a timely fashion to all concerned parties and campus decision makers. Individuals and consultative groups must also take the initiative to voice concerns in a timely manner when information is provided.

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

The College currently has a Vocational/Technical Institutional Analyst who gathers and evaluates data relating to the Vocational/Technical areas. One half-time position has been reallocated for a research person, and the College is currently negotiating with the Chancellor's Office for a second, half-time position. These two half-time positions will allow the College to hire one full-time APT researcher whose responsibility will be to conduct the research studies necessary to meet the needs of the College. In support of this research effort, a Committee on Institutional Research has already been formed. Membership includes the Deans of Instruction and Student Services, the Assessment Specialist, the Interim Coordinator of Enrollment Services, the VocTech Analyst and the Institutional Researcher, when hired. The goal of the Committee
will be to support and encourage research at the College and to assist in the coordination and implementation of that research. The Committee will continue to work closely with the System Research office to ensure that information relevant to LCC is received and utilized.

The College is fully aware of its increasing responsibility to systematically evaluate its programs and activities. With the additional Institutional Research position, such evaluation should be substantially expanded and refined by the time of the next accreditation visit.

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

The College's Curriculum Specialist developed a core outline form that was used from the Spring of 1996 to the present to create core outlines for all courses at the College. Approximately 100 core outlines were received, reviewed by the Curriculum Committee and passed by the Faculty Senate that first semester. An additional 379 core outlines were approved by the Curriculum Committee and the Senate in the Fall of 1996, and 189 passed both bodies in the Spring of 1997. Each new course and every modified course required a core outline be attached to the proposal for this three-semester period. In May 1997, a computerized version of this process began. A database program was designed to track the entire curriculum process. All current catalog information was transferred electronically to the new database while additional input is still in progress for the three-semesters worth of data on core outlines.

The database can be accessed via the Internet from Macintosh or IBM compatible computers. Course proposers interact with the database on line; review at each level--division, Curriculum Committee, Faculty Senate, Dean of Instruction and Provost--is recorded with the proposal. Proposed courses are maintained in the database until approved or disapproved, and thus, the new program maintains a database of archived, current and proposed core outlines. The program also has the capacity to generate course syllabi that take the basic course information--description, credits, alpha and number--from the catalog database. Additional information--course goals and objectives, course content, textbooks, supplies, etc.--from the core is available for individual instructors if desired. Individual instructor-designed syllabi are maintained on-line so that they may be compared to the core outline of record as needed. Students will be able to access the display mode of the program, if they desire, for any course on campus.

Finally, the program takes all new materials such as course descriptions, and replaces the catalog information as required. In this manner, catalog information is updated automatically to match the actual transactions of the curriculum process. At any given point in time the entire college catalog can be produced from the course database and the catalog database that this program manages.

Since most instructor course syllabi are not yet on line, the college will need to monitor the relationship between the core course outlines and course syllabi as this new system is implemented.
The team recommends that the College review and revise the general education requirements for the Associate in Science degree so that requirements meet the expectations established by the accrediting commission in Standard 2C, regarding the content and methodologies of major areas of knowledge—the humanities, the fine arts, the natural sciences and the social sciences—as well as critical thinking. (2C.1, 2C.3)

In 1996 a University of Hawai‘i Community College system-wide committee that had been charged with review of the Associate of Arts degree developed a document, A Blueprint for Learning - The Report of the Associate Degree Task Force, which contained the recommendation that all associate degree programs within the Community College System be based on an educational approach emphasizing four integrated themes of learning, specifically **thinking, communicating, knowing and using**. This document has guided the general education requirements for Associate in Science and Associate in Applied Science (AS and AAS) degrees at the college, all of which had a minimum of 15 credits in general education coursework, in addition to Math and English requirements at the time of the last accreditation review. Since that time, all vocational programs have undergone review and revision. The fine arts, the humanities, the natural sciences and the social sciences are now requirements in those AS and AAS degree programs which have completed their revisions. The revision of the remaining programs should be complete and in conformity with the accreditation Standard 2C by the end of this academic year. Critical thinking is not addressed through specific coursework in the College's AS and AAS degree programs but is an intrinsic part of most regular coursework in all vocational programs.

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

Although most Divisions have long had regular provisions for evaluations of lecturers, not all have done so regularly. The Division Chairs have now developed a plan to evaluate lecturers based on discipline and division-based criteria as well as the college-wide criterion of demonstrated teaching effectiveness. Lecturers with two or fewer years of continuous service (or less than 36 teaching credits) will be evaluated annually by their respective Division Personnel Committees (DPCs). Lecturers with three or more years of continuous service (or 36 or more teaching credits) will be evaluated at least every other year by the DPCs. The DPCs will report their findings to the Division Chairs (DCs) who are in charge of rehiring lecturers. The DCs will use the DPC evaluations as one of the criteria for the decision to continue employment of lecturers who have undergone the evaluation process. The next step will be to submit the plan to the Faculty Senate for consideration.

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

The Learning Resource Laboratory at LCC-Waianae now provides terminal access to the LCC Library database and the UH West Oahu Library database including the Expanded Academic Index for access to journal articles and full-text, a SIRS Periodical Index of current full-text
journal articles, and access to the Hawaii State Library System. Updated and expanded resource materials including textbooks references, magazines and reserve materials in support of Liberal Arts courses; subscriptions to news magazines and journals in Nursing and Allied Health; and over 150 Nursing and Allied Health texts are available in the collection. Ordering, delivery and return of circulating texts from the main campus library is available to LCCW students in a timely fashion.

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

Prioritized lists of instructional and operational equipment have been compiled through a campus-wide process. A list for new acquisitions and a list for replacement items have been compiled. It should be noted that funds to replace instructional equipment that were available in the past have not been released recently. Purchase of new and replacement equipment is likely to take place at the end of the academic year when operational expenses have been accounted for. The aforementioned prioritized lists assure that purchases will be in line with campus-determined needs as identified in the master plan.

Major projects in facilities maintenance which have been deferred for budgetary reasons are also prioritized along the lines of the College's master plan.

Maintenance of instructional and operational equipment is handled in several ways. Maintenance of most office equipment--typewriters and copiers-- is by contract. Maintenance of most facilities equipment--air conditioning, telephones and elevators-- is also by contract. Maintenance of instructional equipment is managed by the respective divisions and paid for with division funds. The repair of certain equipment--computers, media and maintenance-related equipment--is completed by campus staff.

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

The administrative turnover noted by the visiting team occurs for a variety of reasons. Some corrective action has been taken; other action still needs to be taken. An unusually heavy workload is created by the fact that the Dean of Instruction has only two Assistant Deans; additionally, a lack of clerical and administrative support add to the workload. An additional administrative position, Assistant to the Provost was briefly provided to the College by the legislature, but was lost during the funding cutback. This position could have greatly relieved the administrative workload burden for both the Dean and the Provost.

Frank discussions between faculty, staff, and administrative team members and the Chancellor of Community Colleges concerning the administrative leadership style of the Provost on this campus were held during the Spring 1997 semester. The Chancellor invited the open
exchange of concerns that individuals from the aforementioned groups had. Early in the Fall 1997 semester, the Chancellor held open meetings with faculty, staff and administrative team members to report the results of her inquiry and follow-up discussions with the Provost. All involved are hopeful that reasonable efforts will be made to achieve constructive changes in leadership style. Indeed this year the Provost has set upon the task of making major changes to the leadership style she employs. The campus community is currently maintaining an optimistic outlook as it anticipates possible outcomes from the events of the past six months.

Summary Discussion of Self-Identified Issues:

Standard 1: Institutional Integrity

The College has made considerable progress in fulfilling nearly all its plans in this area. Noteworthy is the establishment of a Community Relations Committee to ensure adherence of College program brochures' content to policy and legal requirements and uniformity of design. The Campus Council has accepted the responsibility to monitor the progress on the Academic Development Plan. The Faculty Senate still needs to take up the issue of administration and evaluation of student and peer evaluations.

Standard 2: Educational Programs

Most issues identified by the College in this area are well under way toward fulfillment. Considerable effort has been expended in matters relating to the curriculum process from maintaining a current database of courses to tracking the authorization process of all proposed course outlines. The process additionally serves to maintain a consistent relationship between the course on record and the course as delivered. Also noteworthy: the College's effort to offer alternatives to traditional course offerings to meet the diversity of student demands and take advantage of increased technological opportunities; the plan to implement a system-wide package for Student Information Systems (known as Buzzeo) which will empower users to conduct independent research; efforts to improve community connections through the formation of the LCC Community Relations Committee.

Standard 3: Students Services and the Co-Curricular Learning Environment

The college has made substantial progress in addressing the issues it had identified. Most
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Memorandum

TO: Barbara Polk, Provost
    Michael Pecsok, Campus Council Chair
    Grace Miller, Accreditation Mid-Term Report Committee

FROM: Kenneth A. Tokuno
    Dean of Student Services

RE: Revisions to Standard 8.2

The following is a revision of the report on Standard 8.2 as recommended by the task force at a meeting of Oct. 27, 1997.

Recommendation 8.2: *The team recommends that the College and System stabilize the administrative staff of the College to ensure the continuity and effectiveness of leadership, as well as limiting the disruption to the operating and planning procedures caused by frequent changes in the administrative staff.*

The administrative turnover noted by the visiting team has occurred for a variety of reasons. The reasons offered range from administrators seeking job promotions, lateral transfers, relocation preferences, personal considerations, and workload. However, it must also be noted that individual job dissatisfaction resulting from the Provost's management style may have also played a critical part in the high turnover rate.

Frank discussions between faculty, staff, administrative team members, and the Chancellor of the Community Colleges concerning the administrative leadership style on this campus were held during the Spring 1997 semester. The Chancellor invited the open exchange of concerns that individuals from the aforementioned groups had. Early during the Fall 1997 semester, the Chancellor held open meetings with faculty, staff, and administrative team members to report the results of her inquiry and follow-up discussions with the Provost. As a result of these events, the campus will be looking for sincere efforts on the part of the Provost to achieve constructive changes in leadership style.
Accreditation Mid-Term Report

6.1 The team recommends that in conjunction with the master plan activities a college wide plan for instructional and operational equipment acquisition, replacement, and maintenance be developed.

Prioritized lists of instructional and operational equipment have been compiled through a campus-wide process. A list for new acquisitions and a list for replacements items have been compiled. It should be noted that funds to replace instructional equipment that were available in the past have not been funded recently.

Purchase of new and replacement equipment is likely to take place at the end of the academic year when operational expenses have been accounted for. The existence of these prioritized lists assures that purchases will be in line with campus-determined needs.

Major projects in facilities maintenance which have been deferred for budgetary reasons are also prioritized.

Maintenance of instructional and operational equipment is handled in several ways. Maintenance on most office equipment is by contract: for example, typewriters and copiers. Maintenance of most facilities equipment is also by contract: for example, air conditioning, telephones and elevators. Maintenance of instructional equipment is managed by the respective divisions since repair is paid with division funds. Repair of certain equipment, such as computers, media, and maintenance-related equipment, is completed by campus staff.

Submitted by:
Cliff Togo
Marilyn Bauer
Fern Tomisato
Jackson Tsujimura